

OUTPOST

October 2008—Issue #215

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

Drill, Drill, Drill

Herbert Zweibon

While Russia's invasion of Georgia has been condemned, the full extent of the challenge to the West has not been widely recognized. As political science professor Efraim Inbar has noted, Putin's broader strategy is to control the global energy sector and to use this leverage to challenge America in world affairs. Invading Georgia contributes to that strategy by intimidating energy producing countries once part of the Soviet Union (like Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan) into submitting themselves to a Russian sphere of influence and by increasing European dependency on Russian-controlled oil through seizing control of the pipelines going through Georgia that transfer oil from the Caspian basin to the West.

Putin, says Inbar, is putting together an anti-American energy coalition from Iran to Venezuela. He hopes a nuclear-armed Iran will force the oil-producing Gulf states into the Iranian orbit. (The threat an emboldened Iran, backed by Russia, poses to Israel is obvious.) Putin is also linking up with the wildly anti-American oil-rich Hugo Chavez.

And while the Soviet Union's chief apologists came from the ranks of politically marginal intellectuals, today Russia, rolling in oil wealth, can rely on politically influential leaders in the West. While the best known example is former German chancellor Gerhard Schroeder (now of Gazprom), former Secretary of State James A. Baker, who recently led the Iraq Study Group, is senior partner at Baker Botts, which helps guide international businesses in Russia.

What can be done? The administration could follow the example of President Reagan who brought the Soviet Union down via its economy. When Reagan ramped up spending on defense, the Soviet oligarchs realized their economic system could not keep up and sought reform, leading to the implosion of the whole rotten structure. Today Russia's economy rests on its oil revenues, which comprise a full 20% of Russia's gross domestic product. Russia is already paying a price for Putinism--since its war on Georgia, investors have pulled more than \$35 billion from Rus-

sian markets. Russia's strength is in its \$573 billion reserve from oil and gas sales. The key to undercutting Putin's strategy lies in bringing down the price of oil and finding alternative ways to supply ourselves and Europe with energy.

That means strengthening the dollar (whose fall accounts for much of the rise in the price of oil) and getting serious about producing more energy here. The current Democratic bill is a sham, excluding from drilling those off shore areas where oil is concentrated. And as Republican Congressman John Shadegg has pointed out (*Wall Street Journal*, September 17), the bill does nothing to prevent environmental groups from suing to stop drilling--unchecked, the green lobby is guaranteed to stop a drop of new oil from reaching the market for many years.

The best thing about John McCain's choice of Alaska Governor Sarah Palin is that she brings the energy issue into focus. She points to the anti-energy lobby's fraudulent pictures of ANWR, surrounded by lakes and mountains, when it is a barren stretch of land with nary a mountain or lake in sight.

True, drilling alone does not offer a complete answer. We need alternative energy to fuel our automobiles, above all nuclear energy, halted in its tracks decades ago by the same fear-mongering environmental lobby. General Motors is investing in a battery to make the electric car a reality: nuclear power can be the basis for charging those batteries, here and in Europe, which, except for France, has been as subject to environmental blockages as we have (often worse).

Much reduced dependence on foreign oil need not be a chimera. It can not only restore our imperiled economy but shatter Putin's political strategy of bringing the West to heel through control of its energy life-line.

Nobody There But Us Facts On The Ground by William Mehlman	...3
Brandeis: School For Terrorists? by H. P. Metzger	...5
Saudia Arabia Experience by N. Landerman-Moore	...7
Self-Sabotage: The Conference of Presidents by David Isaac8
House, Divided: An Exchange	...10
The Key Arab Victory by Ruth King	...10

From the Editor

Free Speech

The struggle for free speech in the face of Islamic intimidation is heating up. On the positive side of the ledger, thanks to Rachel Ehrenfeld, the first writer to fight back (publishers have cravenly collapsed in the face of Arab lawsuits), the U.S. Congress has the opportunity to pass HR 5814, which not only bars U.S. courts from enforcing libel judgments by foreign courts against U.S. residents (when the speech would not be libelous under American law) but—most important—makes such lawsuits perilous for those who bring them. The bill permits American authors and publishers to countersue and if a jury finds the foreign suit is part of a scheme to suppress free speech, it may award treble damages.

On the negative side, a new front is opening up, with the prosecutor general in Jordan prosecuting 12 Europeans (a Danish cartoonist, 10 editors of Danish newspapers that published the cartoons and Dutch parliamentarian Geert Wilders) on charges of blasphemy, demeaning Islam and slandering and insulting the prophet Muhammad. As constitutional law attorney Elizabeth Samson notes in *The Wall Street Journal Europe* (September 10) Jordan's attempt at criminalizing free speech beyond its own borders "is part of a larger campaign to use the law and international forums to intimidate critics of militant Islam." Samson observes that Amman has already requested that Interpol apprehend Mr. Wilders and the Danes and send them to Jordan to stand trial. While there is no danger that Denmark or Holland will accede to this, the defendants have reason to worry if they travel to countries more sympathetic to the Jordanian court.

If democratic countries do not stand up to this new challenge, writes Samson, "kangaroo courts across the globe will be ready to charge free people with obscure violations of other societies' norms and customs, and send Interpol to bring them to stand trial in frivolous litigation...The case before the Jordanian court is not just about Mr. Wilders and the Danes. It is about the subjugation of Western standards of free speech to fear and coercion by foreign courts."

Ship of Evil (cont.)

Last month we reported that a large group of morally pretentious Israel haters (including the likes of Jimmy Carter, Desmond Tutu and Noam Chomsky) were planning to send two boats from Cyprus to run Israel's blockade of the Hamas-run Gaza Strip.

The boats came and Israel caved. Typically, the Israel government claimed "victory." According to one "senior political source," "Instead of letting the entire international press obsess about this for a week, the boats received almost no coverage, simply because there was no confrontation."

But as Israel never learns, such public rela-

tions "victories" have longer term costs. As Caroline Glick points out, Israel's failure to block the vessels has given Hamas and its international followers a new plan—to end Israel's embargo by operating a "ferry" service sailing from Cyprus to Gaza every two weeks. Israel recognizes what these people have in mind: forcing Israel to concede its vital interest in maintaining the blockade so as to prevent massive quantities of heavy weaponry being brought into Gaza. Unfortunately, they have no idea what to do about it.

Glick writes: "In standing down in the face of Hamas's high seas challenge, Israel demonstrated yet again that it prefers to capitulate rather than pay a price to defend its vital interests." And it shows again its unwillingness to challenge European governments who provide funding for the international groups posing as peace activists organizing this campaign—terror collaborators like the International Solidarity Movement (of Rachel Corrie fame). "Far from acting to expose these criminals as terror collaborators...and arresting, imprisoning or deporting their members, Israel has not even tried to challenge their false self-identification as 'peace activists'...In legitimizing Hamas's international allies, Israel has ensured that as they have promised, they will expand their use of blockade running ships to enable Hamas's free access to the high seas."

Sharon on "Disengagement"

"I am convinced from the depth of my heart and to the best of my understanding that this disengagement will strengthen Israel in its hold of the areas essential to our existence and will earn us the blessings and esteem of those near and far, will lessen hate, will break boycotts and blockades and will move us forward on the road to peace with the Palestinians and the rest of our neighbors."

Columnist Sarah Honig reminds us of this rosette assessment by then Prime Minister Sharon on Oct. 25, 2004 on the blessings that would attend the destruction of the Jewish communities of Gush Khatif and northern Samaria.

Could Sharon, who had earlier and often warned of the disastrous consequences of leaving
(continued on page 12)

Outpost

Editor: Rael Jean Isaac

Editorial Board: Herbert Zweibon, Ruth King

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

Americans For a Safe Israel

1751 Second Ave. (at 91st St.)
New York, NY 10128

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

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

Nobody There But Us Facts On The Ground

William Mehlman

"There is no 'there' there," Gertrude Stein famously remarked of her Oakland, California birthplace.

The "there," whose thereness is conjectural at best in the minds of half the Israeli populace, is Judea and Samaria. Its definition is also a matter of conjecture. When former Prime Minister Ehud Olmert contemplated the 98.1 percent of it he sought to lay at the feet of Mahmoud Abbas in the mother of all "confidence-building measures," he thought of places like Yitzhar and Eli and Tapuach. Mr. Abbas, who has been scouting digs in Ma'ale Adumim, French Hill, Gilo, Givat Ze'ev and other Jerusalem neighborhoods for himself and his PA *nomenclatura* must find that amusing.

Ironically, it is precisely in their disaffirmation that Judea and Samaria project a "thereness" too compelling to be ignored by even those who would brave a swim through shark-infested waters before violating the sacro-sanctity of the 1949 "green line." Member of the Knesset Benny Elon, head of the National Union coalition, put his finger on it when he observed that "if Israel will not be in Judea and Samaria, Hamas will be there." Those who find internalizing the thereness of a "West Bank" under Israeli authority too much of a strain on their delicate psyches will have to deal with it under the authority of Hamas.

As a retrofitted Kadima, headed by Tzipi Livni proceeds along its determined course of turning "red lines" into pink lines and pink lines into no lines, it is becoming increasingly hard to remember that red lines ever existed in Israel. In fact, they were once so deeply ingrained in the national consciousness that they could be ticked off by any reasonably literate taxi driver.

The reddest of those lines, defining the absolute limits to Israel's territorial flexibility, oddly enough were drawn not by the IDF but by the U.S. Defense Department, specifically in a June 29, 1967 memorandum prepared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) under its chairman, General Earle G. Wheeler. The memorandum, a terse two-page affair with a three-page appendix and a strategic map of Israel and its immediate neighbors, was prepared in response to the Defense Secretary's request for a post-Six Day War assessment of the "minimum territory...Israel might be justified in retaining in order to permit a more effective defense against possible conventional Arab attack and terrorist raids."

A copy of that document is admittedly easier to come by these days than a copy of the Camp David Accords with Egypt, but not all that easier. While the latter merely exposes the fraudulent "normalcy" Israel bought at the cost of the Sinai, its oil resources and the two most valuable military air bases in the Middle East, the Joint Chief's memorandum blows every Kadima argument for redrawing the map of Israel clear out of the water.

As stated by the Joint Chiefs, none of whom were reported to have been Zionists, "militarily defensible borders...based on acceptable tactical principles, such as control of commanding terrain, use of natural obstacles, elimination of enemy-held salients and provisions of defense in-depth for important facilities and installations" would require Israel to hold on to all of Judea south of Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip, key portions of the Sinai, the Golan Heights and more than half of Samaria, contiguous with a thickening of the Jerusalem corridor.

As a retrofitted Kadima proceeds along its determined course of turning "red lines" into pink lines and pink lines into no lines, it is becoming increasingly hard to remember that red lines ever existed in Israel.

From the tenor of their findings, the notion of creating a PLO state in Judea, Samaria and Gaza would have been as remote from the thinking of the Joint Chiefs as a rocket trip to Mars. Indeed, as Bernard Smith, a military analyst with the Jerusalem Institute for Western Defense observed in a *Jerusalem Post* article some 30 years later, "the U.S. rejected the idea of a PLO state until the Oslo Accords forced the State Department to reverse its position. The intention to create an Arab state implicit in the accords opened the competition between the U.S., the European Community and a half dozen Middle Eastern countries for influence in a weak, dependent, irreidentist country should it become a reality."

Little wonder that the Joint Chiefs' memorandum was buried under a "classified" blanket for 16 years after it was written, ignored by eight U.S. presidents. The concept of a PLO state to rule the areas enumerated as critical to Israel's defense by America's top military commanders may have been the handiwork of Israel's unhinged Left, but as Smith points out, "the U.S. doctrine of withdrawal almost to the 1949 armistice lines led to Resolution 242 adopted by the UN five months after the Johnson administration received the JCS memo. The fact was that the military logic of Israel's territorial defense requirements was of small consequence when compared with the need to pacify the Arab countries..." The JCS memorandum thus became the skunk at the garden party.

The skunk may have been locked away, but it refused to die. Lt. General Thomas Kelly, a diplomatically insouciant armored corps officer and one time director of operations for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, trotted it out for a public airing in 1991, shortly after the Gulf War. Kelly had the temerity to attach the label "critical terrain" to the mountains of Samaria and Judea as well as their approaches. "If an enemy secures these passes," he declared, "Jerusalem and all of Israel becomes uncovered. Without the West Bank, Israel is only eight miles wide at its narrowest point. That makes it indefensible."

Indefensible it may be, but hasn't Israel's governing mindset long distanced itself from the lines of strategic defensibility perceived by Kelly in 1991 and the Joint Chiefs of Staff 25 years earlier? A defensible Israel? There is no "there" there, Ehud Olmert informed us in an IBA-TV Channel 2 interview days prior to Kadima's recent primary election. "Delusional" was his word for what he termed "the vision of a Greater Israel." By that he was referring to an Israel in continued control of Judea, Samaria and the Golan Heights. The Gaza Strip and key portions of the Sinai that the Joint Chiefs urged Israel to retain after the Six-Day War are, of course, long gone.

Whatever differences Mrs. Livni might have with Mr. Olmert, they are one in their disdain of strategic depth as pertinent to Israel's physical well being. In place of defensible borders, Livni would rely on "dialogue," albeit of a highly selective nature, to deal with the nation's security concerns. In a letter to 70,000 Kadima members on the eve of the party's primary, the then Foreign Minister promised to arrive at a permanent rapprochement with the "pragmatic Arabs, while struggling determinedly against the Palestinian extremists." This, she assured them, will "allow the State of Israel to continue to be Jewish and democratic, with a Jewish majority living securely within final borders."

The Knesset, which occasionally rouses from its customary torpor to sound an alarm bell, has responded to the Olmert-Livni redefinition of defensibility by approving an amendment to its "National Referendum Bill" requiring a plebiscite prior to the granting of concessions on any territory "under Israel's legal jurisdiction, including Jerusalem." While that might put a leash on Mahmoud Abbas' demand for riparian rights in the Dead Sea and the Kinneret, the amendment will provide no barrier to his claims on Judea and Samaria, since the State of Israel, in its greater wisdom, never established "legal jurisdiction" over either region.

Unfortunately for Israel, its disdain for "facts on the ground" is not shared by any of the other players in the Middle East. Jordan, in the face of the Jewish state's paralysis in response to Hamas' consolida-

tion of its position in Gaza, has initiated talks with the terrorist entity, reversing a 10-year ban on any dealings with its principals. There is no joy in Amman over this development, but as Jonathan Spyer, a senior Global Research Fellow at the International Affairs Center in Herzliyah notes, "in the zero sum terms of Middle East power brokering, there is no force currently both willing and able to deprive [Hamas] of power. Jordan is therefore adjusting to facts on the ground." Another fact on the ground King Abdullah could hardly ignore is the close link between Hamas and Sheikh Zahi Bani Irsheid, head of the Islamic Action Front, Jordan's main opposition movement.

What Spyer calls "the continued decline into irrelevance of Fatah and the West Bank Palestinian Authority" is another factor propelling Hamas' rising fortunes in the Arab Middle East. From this perspective, he avers, "the desire of the U.S. administration and the Olmert government to reach an

agreement of some kind with the Abbas administration seems detached from reality."

Having re-engineered reality to accommodate its vision of the 2006 debacle in Lebanon as an accomplishment and its planned retreat from Judea, Samaria and major portions of Jerusalem as a guarantor of Israel's survival, the Olmert-Livni government has transmuted detachment into an art form. David B. Rivkin, Jr., a prominent Washington attorney and member of the Reagan administration's brain trust observes of the defeat in Lebanon that "by demonstrating Israel's weakness ...the Olmert government has seriously depleted the reservoir of strategic toughness that generations of Israeli soldiers and statesmen amassed at great cost. A credible deterrent takes decades to build up but moments to squander."

Then again, perhaps a nation that has done little more than shrug at the massive rearming of a terrorist Hezbollah that rained 4,000 rockets down on its citizenry no longer feels the need for the kind of "credible deterrent" to which Rifkin refers. Perhaps, as *Ha'aretz* columnist Yoel Marcus recently averred, we have now reached the point where "the public absolutely must get used to the idea that in any military operation, war or deterioration in Israel's security, the home front will always be the main front...Those who still believe that Israel can be destroyed, therefore, will invest all their energy in attacking the home front... Israel's citizens have turned into soldiers without uniforms. It is their steadfastness and stamina that will determine whether we win or lose."

To which, we might all add: "lots 'a luck."

*William Mehlman represents AFSI in Israel and is co-editor of the Jerusalem-based internet magazine Zion-Net (www.Zionnet.net)



Tzipi Livni

Brandeis: School For Terrorists?

H. Peter Metzger

Snatching a loaded M4 carbine, the diminutive mother of three fired on her FBI questioners, and was swiftly injured by return fire. She is now in federal court awaiting charges of attempted murder. The FBI had placed her near the top of its most wanted list of fugitive terror subjects. A CIA spokesman said, "I don't think we've captured anybody more important and well connected as she since 2003."

Her name is Aafia Siddiqui, and she is charged with being an important Al-Qaeda "fixer," a person who coordinates terror plots between various other terrorists within this very secret organization. In 2004, the FBI called her an "Al-Qaeda operative and facilitator who posed a clear and present danger to America." When arrested in August just before the shoot-out, she was carrying plans to bomb various U.S. landmarks and to kill former Presidents Carter, Bush and Clinton.

But nowhere in the extensive news coverage of this event was her tie to Brandeis University explored, nor was it mentioned that she was only the latest in a long series of terrorists coming out of that university. Now, I don't mean kids protesting the Vietnam War, which was common in the 1970's. I mean real terrorists.

One might ask "So what's new?" As a long ago graduate of that place, I remember when a terrorist coming out of a Brandeis education was not an extraordinary event. In fact, Brandeis, a university of less than 5,000 students, has provided a sanctuary for more extreme radicals than any other university in America.

From its earliest days, Brandeis attracted not only leftist liberals, but many far-left radicals. Most of the people I cite below were arrested and spent time in prison for violent crimes done in the name of far-left extremist politics.

It all began around 1970, when Brandeis saw three of its women students posted to the FBI's Ten Most Wanted List (Angela Davis, Susan Saxe and Katherine Power), no small feat since only seven women were put on that FBI list in its entire history.

Those Brandeis girls were famous leftist revolutionary America-haters, but they were only the "stars" of the then Hate-America movement. There were many other lesser lights. For example, another Brandeis student was Jennifer Casolo, a revolutionary who was found to have an arsenal of weapons and

explosives buried in her backyard--"tons" of the stuff according to White House Press Secretary Marlin Fitzwater. Then there were other minor players like Brandeis students Laura Whitehorn and Naomi Jaffe. Curiously, all these violence-prone misfits were women.

So what has Brandeis been hosting up there anyway? Well, it would appear that Brandeis has been providing a friendly intellectual climate for kids wanting to become violent domestic revolutionaries, all under the guise of elevating "social consciousness." For example, several of the so-called Brandeis terrorists trace their intellectual development back to classes taught there by Marxist professors like Herbert Marcuse and other America haters.

Not surprisingly, as domestic terrorism finally fell out of fashion and international terrorism took over, Brandeis changed too, and it now provides a sanctuary for Islamic Jihadism.

What? A Jewish-sponsored university teaching Muslim-based Jew-killing? That's right, and it wouldn't be the first time that under the guise of "scholarship" Jews themselves have supported causes that harm them first; Soviet history springs to mind. So it shouldn't be surprising that Brandeis has kept up with the times and is now a big-time enabler of international Palestinian terror organizations. Here's how:

Today Brandeis hosts the influential pro-Palestinian Crown Center for Middle East Studies, run by a Jew (who else?). The Crown Center recently hired Arab scholar Khalil Shikaki. Testimony from a trial of another Arab professor, Sami Al-Arian from the University of South Florida, shows that Shikaki, while no terrorist himself, was a key distributor of funds and information between terrorists from the Palestinian Authority area and other Arab professors here in America who themselves were raising money for Palestinian Islamic Jihad. So at the very least, Shikaki is simply another "fixer."

Additionally, Khalil Shikaki's brother was the founder of Palestinian Islamic Jihad (founded as a branch of Egyptian Islamic Jihad which is now headed by al Qaeda's Ayman al-Zawahiri). The Brandeis professor has recently been linked to other notorious groups such as the Islamic Committee for Palestine and the World & Islam Studies Institute, both of which government investigators claim to be front organizations for the more radical



Aafia Siddiqui



Angela Davis



Susan Saxe



Katherine Power



Natana Delong Bas



Khalil Shikaki

Palestinian Islamic Jihad.

Another Brandeis professor who has acted as an apologist for Jihadists is Natana DeLong Bas, defender of the 9/11 suicide squads and other Arab extremist organizations such as the Muslim Brotherhood. She is best known today for producing the definitive text, *Wahhabi Islam: From Revival to Global Jihad*, an impassioned defense of the Saudi sect of Islam which serves as the religious basis for most Islamic terrorists today.

So it should come as no surprise that Aafia Siddiqui, the latest "poster woman" for the extremism that flourishes at Brandeis, is a terrorist and Jihadist. Far from being exceptional, she is merely the latest in a 40-year-long tradition. More importantly, Brandeis can't claim that it was all accidental and that these terrorists could have come from any college. The fact is that on a per capita basis, Brandeis has had far more than its share of terrorists and political extremists have found an unusually sympathetic and protective administration, under the umbrella of academic freedom and "social consciousness."

Thus far, I have concentrated on the influence of the professors upon the students, which caused this remarkable cadre of young terrorists to appear seemingly out of nowhere. What I did not explain is the influence that the students have had on other students, because Brandeis seems to have gone out of its way to recruit students who were already radicalized.

The most outrageous example of choosing students who were already prone to a radical political agenda was when Brandeis recruited convicted felons to join the student body. This action shows how Brandeis's administrative policy fostered the climate for a terrorist factory.

This Brandeis idea was based upon one of the most harebrained schemes in American history, known in Massachusetts as the Student Tutor Education Program (STEP). It was claimed that if lower class people were exposed to the presumably higher-class people in a university, then the lower class people would rise to the same level as the higher-class people. No one ever worried that the process could work in reverse, which of course it did.

Convicted felon and stick-up man Stanley Bond was picked to be thus elevated by STEP and so he got a "get out of jail free" card (literally) from the authorities and went straight to Brandeis. Five years older than the average student, he was soon sexually involved with Brandeis student Kathy Power (an Irish-Catholic) and Susan Saxe, and then got involved in radical campus politics. So it wasn't long before the harebrained Brandeis STEP scheme began to work its

special wonders. The formerly non-political ex-con Bond "rose" and learned how to be a student radical from the girls, while the girls in their turn "sank" and learned how to be stick-up thugs from Bond.

Bond decided that the Black Panthers needed money, so the Bond-Power-Saxe trio torched an armory to get weapons and then robbed a bank. In the bank holdup, they shot a Boston policeman in the back. The Brandeis students were convicted and sent to prison and the Brandeis professors went back to their drawing boards to dream up another road to Utopia. Of course, the policeman's wife and his nine children were simply forgotten.

All this happened more than 20 years after I arrived at Brandeis to put in my four years there. But even then, I learned a lot of pro-communist lies: the Rosenbergs were innocent and their atom-spy trial thinly disguised anti-Semitism; the Korean War was solely the result of

America's provocation; Alger Hiss was not a Communist nor did he transmit secret data to the USSR—though he was guilty of both. It took me 10 years of "attitude adjustment" to unlearn all the lies I learned at Brandeis.

How could Brandeis have departed so far from the intention of its founders?

How could Brandeis have departed so far from the intention of its founders? Brandeis was founded in 1948 by prominent Jews concerned that many Jewish students were unfairly barred from elite universities by a widely enforced quota system, like today's "affirmative action" but in reverse. To make up for this, Brandeis would offer a first-class education and select its students based upon merit alone, and certainly not politics. In 1948, this was still an unusual policy.

Now those "prominent Jews" were self-made men who felt that they owed a great personal debt to America and that it was largely due to American freedoms that they succeeded. Like so many other successful Americans, they believed in "giving something back," a phrase I heard often in those days. They believed that creating Brandeis was one way of giving something back. So it was quite natural for them to not tolerate even a hint of anti-Americanism.

For example, in seeking to give the nascent college a high profile, the founders enlisted Albert Einstein, but he soon parted ways. A major point of conflict: Einstein wanted to offer the presidency of the school to the far-left Harold Laski. But attorney George Alpert, the most prominent of Brandeis' founders, refused, explaining that Laski was "a man utterly alien to American principles of democracy and tarred with the Communist brush... I can compromise on any subject but one: that one is Americanism."

But by the next generation, the children of those self-made men felt no such debt to America and

indeed, even became attracted to the idea of changing America by revolutionary force.

That's because early on, Brandeis got caught up in the intellectual fashion of the day which held that the Cold War was not due to Soviet aggression, but was really because of provocations by America. In 1947, the Truman Doctrine was created to contain Soviet expansionism and it was seen by the American Left as the biggest obstacle to world peace. Leftist feelings against American anti-communism increased and solidified worldwide in the following years, including at Brandeis.

Student radicals all across America demanded change and demonstrations against American foreign policy became the norm. Brandeis had its share of non-violent protests as students occupied an administration building and renamed Brandeis "Malcolm X University", but that wasn't enough for some.

In yearning for political change, some radicals at Brandeis adopted the idea that robbery was a political act, and therefore excusable. Even violence be-

came romantic as Kathy Power once invited a friend to go on a "commando raid" with her, just before the bank job. And so, over a very few years, some students got used to the idea that revolutionary change wasn't so wrong after all, and was even necessary at times.

This all came about because in the years leading up to the violence done by the Brandeis student radicals, love of country was out and hate-America was in, and Brandeis had turned into a platform for extremists, a very far cry from the Brandeis envisioned by its founders in 1948.

Dr. H. Peter Metzger graduated from Brandeis University in 1953, as part of its second graduating class. He received his doctorate in Biochemistry from Columbia University in 1965. In addition to scientific papers, he is the author of The Coercive Utopians: Their Hidden Agenda (Simon & Schuster) and wrote a weekly column for the New York Times Syndicate.

A Saudi Arabia Experience

Norman Jay Landerman-Moore

By profession, I am a strategic planner. In the early summer of 1974 I was contacted by an associate in New York who asked if I would consider accepting a planning assignment with a service organization contracted with ARAMCO in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. I considered the offer and after sorting out the details determined to accept.

I landed in Dhahran at the recently constructed Saudi airport. I was greeted by a Saudi, an ARAMCO representative, and driven to an apartment complex located in Al Khobar on the Persian Gulf coast. The tenants were chiefly American, British and French engineers, construction management personnel and other professionals, most of whom had extensive experience working abroad in Africa, Asia and the Middle East.

After a few weeks, I was called to a meeting at ARAMCO headquarters in Dhahran to discuss infrastructure needs for new housing, community and industrial development. The meeting focused on securing water rights and authorization for pipeline development off the aquifer that extended from the interior mountains eastward to the gulf. Based on political and administrative protocol, the critical discussion was to occur with an Emir (sheikh) from the Saudi government who had jurisdiction over such matters. The meeting was to take place in the ancient citadel city of Al Hofuf located on the northern edge of the Rub Al Khali Desert. Hofuf is an oasis community where the great aquifer surfaces sufficiently to draw water by wells and pumps for irrigating date trees and vegetable crops. I was amazed at the abundance of water in such a desolate region.

We arrived at the appointed time and waited

for the Emir. About an hour later he arrived in his black stretch Mercedes with an entourage of servants and staff following in a small caravan of vehicles. The room we were to meet in was bare except for some exquisite carpets, a large banner with the Saudi National emblem, a picture of the King and a couple of tables and chairs. There were no greetings. The first order of business appeared to be to establish "status." We were instructed to sit on the carpet while a large, ornate high chair was brought in for the Emir. It was clear that he was to be elevated above us during the meeting.

The four of us were served tea from a set of fine silver as a gesture of hospitality. Then the Emir, donning an ornate Arab gown over his pin striped Italian silk suit, began to speak. There was no problem with communication; indeed I was immediately impressed by his "Oxford English." What took me by surprise was that he launched into quotations from the Koran. The one sided dialogue continued for nearly 45 minutes punctuated with the greatness of Allah and the Muslim people, and the "nothingness" of gentiles and infidels. We found ourselves somewhat uncomfortable, socially and physically (I have long legs), but we exercised restraint, waiting for the moment when we could turn to the business agenda.

That moment finally came but only after the Emirs' concluding remarks. Sternly he looked at each of us and said: "The world is created by Allah for Islam to rule. You must face it, you will either be Muslim, or you will be dead!"

David, who was in charge of our group, responded, "Your Excellency, we appreciate your counsel, now may we discuss water?" The Emir smiled, seemingly satisfied that his point had been made. We then got down to business.

In light of that event and all that I have studied and witnessed over these past decades, I would sug-

gest that the West is mistaken in making such a sharp distinction between normative and so-called "radical" Islam. I would suggest that the fundamental ideologies expressed by clerics (Imams, Qadhis or Teachers) and Emirs is rife with the conviction that all humanity will become Muslim and that they are not squeamish about the methods to be employed.

You see it is simple. I have no interest in becoming a follower of Islam. I have seen what Islamic religious ideology does to children, women, communi-

ties, economies and quality of life. I have a keen interest in enjoying life. I wish to engage in the pursuit of happiness which freedom provides, the freedom we enjoy through the sacrifice of countless men and women, including my ancestors.

Norman Landerman-Moore, a descendant of one of America's first families, is president of Landerman-Moore Associates, a professional services firm engaged in strategic planning and economic development.

Self-Sabotage: The Conference of Presidents

David Isaac

You invite two friends to your college graduation party. They don't always get along but you figure they'll put aside their differences for your celebration. When one finds out the other is coming, she promptly cancels her acceptance. Would you then call your second friend and tell her that you have to disinvite her too?

That illogical choice, rejecting one friend because the other friend backs out, is the one that the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations made when it disinvited Vice-Presidential nominee Sarah Palin to a rally it sponsored protesting the U.N. visit of Iran's Ahmadinejad.

The story goes that Sen. Hillary Clinton, who had been invited earlier to the rally, pulled out when she learned that Sarah Palin was also coming. Clinton claimed that she didn't want to participate in a "partisan event". She must have a peculiar definition of the word. We'll go with the Merriam Webster dictionary, which defines partisan as "a firm adherent to a party, faction, cause, or person." According to that definition, the rally could only be defined as partisan before Palin was invited.

Malcolm Hoenlein, the Conference of Presidents executive vice chairman, who apparently doesn't own a dictionary, went with Clinton's definition, which we define loosely here as: "If I'm not coming, nobody's coming." All elected and federal officials were barred from the rally to avoid "partisanship". According to Fox News, the rally organizers said they wanted to avoid a "media feeding frenzy," which is ridiculous as rally organizers the world over would kill for a media feeding frenzy. That's the whole point of holding a rally.

The height of absurdity is not to invite any politicians at all. Politicians are the only ones who can stop Iran. Or do the conference organizers expect Maurice from Brooklyn or Flo from Queens to lead the charge? The point is that Sarah Palin may actually be in a position to *do* something.

As Caroline Glick sums it up, what actually happened was that Democratic American Jewish leaders decided that putting Sen. Barack Obama in the White House is more important than protecting the

lives of the Jewish people in Israel and around the world.

What is needed above all is a united front against Iran's avowed genocidal plan. The situation is dire. Glick reports that Iran has secretly removed enough enriched uranium from its nuclear production facility in Isfahan to make six nuclear bombs. U.S. spy satellites recently discovered what may be heretofore unknown nuclear facilities in the country. And in September, the UN's International Atomic Energy Agency released a report detailing Iranian efforts to enable the Shihab-3 ballistic missile to carry nuclear warheads.

The Republican vice presidential nominee understands the stakes. In the speech the Conference of Presidents prevented her from making, Palin had written: "Never again will we risk another Holocaust. And this is not a wish, a request, or a plea to Israel's enemies. This is a promise that the United States and Israel will honor, against any enemy who cares to test us." Palin planned to say: "Our task is to focus the world on what can be done to stop him."

These are precisely the tough words the Conference of Presidents should have dearly wanted Ahmadinejad to hear from a potential Vice President at their rally. There are already all too many vapid calls for ever more dialogue. Speaking on a panel at George Washington University on September 15, five former Secretaries of State, Colin Powell, Madeline Albright, Warren Christopher, James Baker and Henry Kissinger all agreed that the U.S. should engage Iran through diplomacy. Barack Obama has said on the campaign trail that he's willing to negotiate with Iran without preconditions.

Their statements ignore the fact that the diplomatic option has been exhausted. As former UN Ambassador John Bolton has pointed out, the U.S. has been negotiating with Iran for the last five years, using the Europeans as a surrogate. The result: Iran is five years closer to an atom bomb.

Even as Jewish groups ignored the need for a unified front, mainline churches planned their meeting with Ahmadinejad. The World Council of Churches, the Mennonite Central Committee, and the Quaker group American Friends Service Committee (in the forefront of anti-Israel activity since the 1970s) scheduled a dinner on September 25th to honor the man who said Israel must be destroyed. The Episcopal Church and other mainline denominations also lined

up for the event. Representatives of these churches previously visited Iran and hosted a similar event for the Iranian leader when he visited the UN last year. If many churches foster the image of Ahmadinejad as a reasonable fellow with whom the U.S. can negotiate, Jewish groups can ill afford to subvert their own message that Iran's leader is a dangerous lunatic bent on a second Holocaust.

The culprits behind Palin's disinvitation were the Democratic Party activists who lead the organizations that co-sponsored the rally: the Jewish Community Relations Council of New York, United Jewish Communities, the Jewish Council for Public Affairs and the UJA-Federation of New York. The need to put their man in the White House trumped concern for Jewish survival. If Palin was not dis-invited they threatened to pull their people out. ZOA head Mort Klein says that Hoenlein, fearing people wouldn't come and the Federation would be angry, collapsed.

Especially vociferous in demanding Palin's rejection were the National Jewish Democratic Council and J Street, neither of which are members of the Conference of Presidents. J Street, a leftwing group run by Jeremy Ben Ami (whose courageous father, a prominent figure in the nationalist Irgun Zvai Leumi, must be rolling in his grave) organized a petition to stop Palin from speaking. Empty threats were made that participating nonprofit groups would lose their tax exempt status if a Republican and not a Democrat was represented. This was nonsense. Invitations were extended to members of both political parties. If one side pulled out, the sponsoring groups couldn't be held accountable.

While these two non-members made waves, it appears, incredibly, that the Conference of Presidents' actual members were not even consulted. Many expressed disbelief. Tom Neumann, executive director of the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA), in an open letter to Hoenlein, wrote: "The Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs, as a member organization, was not consulted on the decision, as I'm sure was the case with many other members. I call for those who are responsible for this decision to step forward and speak in their own name and not hide behind the skirts of the Conference of Presidents. In disgracing themselves they disgrace us all."

ZOA's Mort Klein said he too wasn't consulted about Palin's disinvitation. The ZOA issued a statement: "The ZOA deeply regrets that certain Jewish groups and individuals believed the inadvertent benefit that would accrue to Sarah Palin outweighed the enormous benefit that Israel and the United States would receive when a Vice-Presidential candidate and others give visibility and power to this life and death issue."

A disgusted Klein says: "In the 15 years I was a member of the Conference, there were only two sub-

stantive discussions on issues. The first was whether to support the effort to move the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem and the other was whether or not to support the Gaza withdrawal. The vote there was 51-1 in support of evacuation with only ZOA against."

The National Council of Young Israel joined the chorus. According to its press release, "Despite the fact that the National Council of Young Israel is one of the members of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, one of the primary sponsors of the rally, we were not consulted before this decision was made, nor was our opinion ever sought by the rally organizers. We would have never acquiesced to withdrawing Governor Palin's invitation and we think that doing so was a serious mistake."

It appears that the Conference of Presidents is run in a manner similar to Israel's government, where a few people make all the decisions and everybody else finds out later. The controversy highlights a simple truth that AFSI has pointed out for some time. The Conference of Presidents serves no useful purpose.

In 1993, when the Conference of Presidents decided to include Americans for Peace Now, AFSI Chairman Herbert Zweibon wrote presciently in *Outpost*: "Whether the Conference of Presidents ever really represented American Jewry is debatable, since the leaders of its member-organizations are not democratically elected. The fact that Peace Now was admitted in contravention of several of the Conference's own by-laws is further testimony to the absence of democracy and fair play among the Conference's top brass....[The Conference] can no longer pretend to speak for American Jewry, nor can it be relied upon to properly defend Israel in this hour of desperate crisis for the Jewish State."

At the time of Peace Now's entry, the Conference of Presidents also asked AFSI to join so as to allow the organization to enjoy an appearance of balance. AFSI rejected the offer, understanding full well the undemocratic nature of the organization. It's a lesson groups like JINSA, ZOA and Young Israel are now learning the hard way.

JINSA'S Tom Neumann remarked in his letter to Hoenlein that his first instinct was to pull out of the rally but he thought better of it as the importance of the rally's message—stopping a nuclear Iran—was too important. That's well and good. Neumann is thinking about the larger picture in a way Hoenlein and the Conference of Presidents had not.

However, after the rally is over we urge JINSA and all the other organizations which were not consulted to resign their membership in the Conference of Presidents. As the saying goes, fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice...

David Isaac is a freelance writer in Los Angeles.



Malcolm Hoenlein



Mort Klein

House, Divided - Larry Loebell and David Isaac—An Exchange

In the September *Outpost* David Isaac criticized various plays dealing with the Arab-Israel conflict. The author of one of these plays, *House, Divided* responded. An excerpt from his lengthy response is below, with David's answer:

Larry Loebell:

David describes a moment in my play--which he gleaned from a review and not from having been in the theater--in which an Israeli soldier who wants to desert the IDF confronts his father about his moral duty. What Mr. Isaac does not know and could not know, having not seen the play, is that the father of that soldier slaps his son across the face in the next moment. And there is a context for that action. Drama is based on conflict. Putting conflict on stage is the work of the dramatist. My play was lauded by virtually every reviewer for creating intense conflict. It features staunchly pro-Israel characters speaking their minds, winning their arguments, making strong decisions. . .(Mr. Isaac could hardly know that I have Orthodox family who lives on the West Bank, or that I have visited Israel.)

In my play various arguments and points of view are presented, but the play is not propaganda. It is family drama. It is about the difficulties members of one extended family have coming to terms with their ideals in the world of political reality. If Mr. Isaac wants to write commentary about theater--particularly if he wants to say "*basta--enough*" to it, perhaps he ought to actually read or see the plays he comments upon. He got it dead wrong about mine.

David Isaac

In the September issue of *Outpost*, I wrote a piece about the anti-Israel bias of plays dealing with the Arab-Israel conflict. These plays are usually one-sided hit pieces or wishy-washy attempts to show the humanity of both sides. One of the plays I mentioned was *House, Divided* by Larry Loebell.

He is right in that I had not seen his play. The essential point of my article, however – that most plays on the Arab-Israel conflict are propagandistic folderol – is correct. Loebell himself admits this in an interview: "I found plenty of what seemed to me to be pro-Palestinian plays, but I could not find a single contemporary English language political play that included a

positive view of Israel or that contained a more complex view than a binary one: Palestinians-oppressed/Israelis-oppressors."

Yet in the same interview, he reveals his own not dissimilar attitudes: "I read in the *New York Times* recently that there is a new lobbying group called J Street that is trying to counter the monolithic view represented by the lobbying group AIPAC (American Israel Public Affairs Committee) and others that 'to oppose any Israeli policy is to be anti-Israel.' This is certainly an indication that there are divergent views within the American Jewish community. It's hardly a secret that many American Jews think there are other approaches to the issue of Israeli security than aggressive military action, walling out your neighbors, or expanding settlements."

The fact that Loebell views J Street as an encouraging sign speaks volumes. J Street is a leftwing "peace" group which boasts of its role in "disinviting" Sarah Palin from the rally against Ahmadinejad. It supports a two-state solution, dialogue with Syria and Iran, and wants to "stop the settlements and stop the occupation," according to its executive director, Jeremy Ben-Ami. The very idea that AIPAC is some rightwing monolith is itself ludicrous. AIPAC, which rushed to support the Oslo Accords, couldn't be more soft-headed on matters dealing with Israel's security. In fact, AIPAC's former head, Thomas Dine, now leads a group seeking rapprochement between the U.S. and Syria.

Loebell gives himself away at the end when he speaks scornfully of military actions, construction of a wall and expanding settlements. The first two are simply defensive measures Israel takes to foil attacks upon it. As for expanding settlements, that was at one time Israeli government policy. No more. Or was Loebell too busy working on his play to switch on the television during the evacuation of Gush Katif? He says he has religious Zionist family living in the territories. They must have explained to him their reasons for being there. They're exercising Jewish rights to live in the historic Land of Israel. Does he believe they do not have that right?

The problem is that the plays written about Israel are so terrible that Loebell sees himself as an improvement. It may be his play is not as bad as some of the others. But it's a miserably low bar to hurdle.

Camp David Accords: The Key Arab Victory Over Israel

Ruth King

One often encounters supporters of Israel who finally(!) are prepared to acknowledge that Oslo and

the "disengagement" from Gaza were disastrous. Yet they continue to applaud the "achievements" of Camp David and the treaty with Egypt. In fact the Camp David Accord was the first major Arab victory over Israel, paving the way for Israel's downward path over the last thirty years.

In 1965 (when Israel was still in the 1949 borders) Tunisian President Habib Bourguiba first promul-

gated an alternative plan for Israel's destruction. Since the Arabs could not defeat Israel in war, Bourguiba suggested a step by step method. The Arabs should offer Israel peace if she would give up all territory except what had been included in the original partition plan (which would have put Israel into three non-contiguous parts) and allow the return of Arab refugees from the 1948 war. Bourguiba explained that this would create a "win-win" situation for the Arabs. If Israel (as could be expected) refused, such an Arab "peace" proposal would elicit world approval (this was at a time when world sympathy was largely with Israel) and if Israel agreed, geographically truncated and under the weight of returning refugees, the Jewish state would shortly disappear.

The Arab world was not then prepared to listen. It was committed to vindicating Arab "honor" through overcoming Israel in battle. It took two more wars--the total Arab defeat in 1967 and the 1973 war at the end of which Egypt found itself with Israeli troops on the Egyptian side of the Suez Canal--before a major Arab leader saw the wisdom of Bourguiba's approach. In 1977 Anwar Sadat finally bit the bullet: he actually went to Israel to make his version of Bourguiba's pitch directly to the Knesset and to a watching, wondering world.

Sadat, a devout Muslim, combined Bourguiba's secular proposal with Muslim doctrine that permits temporary truces with an enemy that cannot be defeated (temporarily) by force of arms. Although in his speech to the Knesset he made his position clear on both counts, his listeners there and worldwide were too dazzled by Sadat's mere presence to listen to what he said.

In his superb documentary *Farewell Israel* Joel Gilbert does listen carefully. He notes that Sadat invokes "peace with justice" fifteen times. And for Sadat "justice" means that Israel ceases to exist as a Jewish state. Here is what Sadat said: "I shall not indulge in past events such as the Balfour Declaration 60 years ago....If you have found the moral and legal justification to set up a national home on a land that did not at all belong to you, it is incumbent upon you to show understanding of the insistence of the people of Palestine for establishment once again of a state on their land..." (Sadat was in accordance with the 1956 *fatwa* signed by leading members of Al Azhar, the center of theological thought and jurisprudence in Egypt, which declared of Israel's existence "It is required of every Muslim to cleanse the land of this injustice.")

But hardly anyone was listening. Nor were they listening when Al Azhar explained the meaning of Camp David although it was trumpeted on the front page of Egypt's leading newspaper *al-Ahram* on May 10, 1979. "Since the period of prophecy Islam has given clear examples concerning treaties signed between Muslims and their enemies. The Quran com-

manded us to make peace with the enemy when the imam sees that there is some advantage for the Muslims in it. As evidence for this, all legal traditions adduced the Agreement of *Al-Hudaybiyah* in which Muhammad made an accommodation with the enemy." That accommodation was brief--it lasted only until Mohammed saw an opportunity to overcome the enemy.

Americans for a Safe Israel was the only Israel oriented organization which understood what was happening. In our 1979 pamphlet *Sadat's Strategy* Paul Eidelberg presciently noted: "There is the same unwillingness to believe in the reality of an adversary's goals even when they are openly stated. Islamic attitudes toward territory--i.e. that Islamic territory, and most especially the Islamic heartland (which is the way Palestine is viewed by the Arabs) cannot pass into the hands of unbelievers--are simply not given credence. The failure to understand the power of resurgent Islamic feeling has most recently been demonstrated of course in the case of Iran....Islamic fundamentalism is on the rise with consequences that may soon once again take the West by unpleasant surprise."

Sadat's success vindicated Bourguiba's vision. Israel gave in to each of Sadat's demands. It surrendered strategic depth, the oil fields of Abu Rodeis and state of the art military air fields, as well as thriving Jewish communities. (Sharon oversaw their destruction in an eerie foreshadowing of his role decades later in destroying the communities of Gush Katif.) Furthermore, by accepting "autonomy" for the Arabs of Gaza and Judea and Samaria (with final status talks supposed to start within a few years) Camp David in effect abrogated Israel's legal, religious and historical claims to the area and provided the legal groundwork for Palestinian Arab statehood.

Israel gave up everything for nothing: Egypt signed a treaty and flouted virtually every one of its provisions before the ink had dried. (For a detailed examination see Rael Jean Isaac's "The Real Lessons of Camp David" *Commentary* December 1993.) Egypt remains a confrontation state; its media and mosques preach the most violent anti-Semitism; and it is in the forefront of every effort on the international scene to isolate, demonize and ultimately destroy the Jewish state.

The Oslo accords are simply the logical extension of Camp David, with its fixed principle that Arabs must get everything while Israel gets nothing. True there has been no military war with Egypt since Camp David. But the propaganda war of attrition waged by Egypt and the rest of the Arab world has been ongoing and the Arabs have won hands down. Israel and world Jewry have learned nothing--indeed, with incredible folly, they "celebrate" the thirtieth anniversary of this major Arab victory.

•



Anwar Sadat and Menachem Begin

(Continued from page 2)

Gaza, have overnight become such a fool? The other alternative—that he was sacrificing national security to protect himself and his family from corruption charges—seems more plausible. What is certain is that not a single part of that sentence has shown a glimmer of reality: Israel has been radically weakened and its hold on areas crucial to its existence, including East Jerusalem, has been undermined. As for “the blessings and esteem of those near and far,” the notion of Israel as a pariah state, once confined to the Arab world, has spread through much of Europe. As for ending boycotts and blockades, new boycott efforts by the supposed progressive forces of the world, like churches and universities, mount by the day. As for forward movement on the “road to peace,” sure, if your language is Orwellian Newspeak.

Who Was Behind 9/11?

Surveying 16,000 people in 17 countries, a recent Reuter’s poll found that seven years after 9/11, only a minority—46%—believed that al Qaeda was behind the attacks (this despite the organization’s repeated proud assertions of responsibility). Among those dismissing al Qaeda, the U.S. (15%) and Israel (7%) were most often cited as the real culprit. The percentages fingering the latter two go up radically in Moslem countries. In Egypt 43% said Israel was behind the attacks, followed by Jordan (31%). In Turkey 36% blamed the U.S. government and in the PA territories blaming the U.S. was even more popular than blaming Israel: 27% subscribed to the idea the U.S. attacked itself compared to “only” 19% who said Israel was the culprit. (Incidentally, the responses were given

spontaneously to an open-ended question that did not offer response options.)

Apart from providing additional evidence (if such were needed) of how irrational is the belief that human beings are rational creatures, the survey is primarily significant for revealing the extent of anti-Americanism in some unlikely places. Thirty percent of respondents in Mexico (second only to U.S. “ally” Turkey) cited the U.S. as the “true” perpetrator of 9/11.

IDF Unprepared

Haaretz reports that Major General Moshe Ivri-Sukenik, who resigned as commander of the Israel Defense Forces’ Northern Corps this year, has sharply criticized the army’s battle readiness. He blames Israel’s failure in the Lebanon War (whose results he calls “embarrassing”) on the senior officers. “I say with authority: 70 to 80 percent of responsibility for the results lie with the command and the General Staff.” He says the army has “rusted.” Describing one division, he said: “Would you believe they did not have maps of the Golan Heights? They had no operational plans on a critical front. Their plans were for an entirely different front.” Judging from Ivri-Sukenik not much has changed: he says the army’s current training program is inadequate and plans to cut the defense budget means even worse training, because this is the easiest part of the budget to cut.

While we have no desire to let the senior commanders off the hook, the rot starts in the political sector and there can be little surprise (though much concern) that the army is not immune to the demoralization and disintegration so obvious for so long in Israel’s ruling echelon.

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

Non-Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage