

OUTPOST

October 2009—Issue #225

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

A Trip Too Far

Herbert Zweibon

Prime Minister Netanyahu should have stayed home. By coming to the United States he merely strengthened Obama, easily the most hostile-to-Israel President to inhabit the White House (yes, Carter is unbeatable, but much of his animus became manifest after he left office). And, his experience outside political office largely confined to community organizing, Obama employs the arsenal of bullying tactics learned from Alinsky manuals to achieve his arrogant aim “It’s absolutely critical that we get the issue [the Arab-Israel conflict] resolved.”

Caroline Glick points out that Obama needed to stage a photo-op at the UN with Abbas and Netanyahu to be seen as doing something productive, after a series of unilateral concessions harmful to U.S. allies. (He was so eager he was even ready to scrap, if only momentarily, the demand for a total Israeli settlement freeze as a precondition for talks.)

What happened was wholly predictable. Netanyahu was berated by an irate and impatient Obama, and like a chastened and frightened school-boy hastened to say being beaten up was a salutary experience. Asked by Charles Gibson on ABC news to comment on reports that the meeting was “testy,” Netanyahu insisted it was “very good.”

The entire interview was appalling. Netanyahu had an opportunity to underline (what is never heard on mainstream media)—that the Palestinian Authority was no different from Hamas in its commitment to destroy Israel. He could have reported on the results of the sixth general assembly of Fatah (which controls the PA) this August in Bethlehem in which the 2200 delegates reelected Abbas and decreed handing over the entire city of Jerusalem—both East and West Jerusalem—to Palestinian control was a non-negotiable “red line,” that the right to return would not be compromised and Israel would not be recognized as a Jewish state. Netanyahu could have asked, “What is there to negotiate?” “And why, Mr. Gibson, have you and your fellows in the media not reported on the Fatah conference?”

Instead Netanyahu babbled absurdly about “peace.” “I want to move on to peace. And I think the sooner we put this [Obama’s demand for a total freeze on settlements] to the side, the quicker we can move forward toward peace.” He was glad, he told Gibson, “we can get on with the business of forging a lasting and secure peace between us.”

Netanyahu went on to hear Obama—as former UN ambassador John Bolton phrased it—put Israel on the chopping block. Israel, said Obama, must be prepared to go back to what even super-dove Abba Eban called the Auschwitz lines of 1949 or American support would come to an end.

Like his June speech at Bar Ilan, delivered after his first drubbing by Obama, Netanyahu’s own speech at the UN has been fulsomely praised by friends of Israel. Why? Because he said the Holocaust happened? It was demeaning to do so before an assemblage thick with thugs who are not in doubt the Holocaust happened but look forward to another. Because he said “the jury is still out on the United Nations?” The jury came in decades ago. The bottom line, both at Bar Ilan and at the UN, is that Netanyahu endorsed “the two state solution” although over the years he has said and written innumerable times that this would mean the death of Israel. As for “demilitarization,” which he again invoked, no one has been more eloquent than Netanyahu in explaining that a Palestinian state would soon assume all the powers denied it. The world, he said, will stand by and do nothing but it *will* stop us from trying to stop them.

Yair Shamir, son of former Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, recently urged Netanyahu to withstand U.S. pressure the way his father did: “Just say no.”

Table of Contents

Obama At The UN: Take Israel Please by Ruth King	...3
Tit For Tat by David Wilder	...4
The Center of the War on Terror by Hugh Fitzgerald	...5
Geert Wilders Talks To The Dutch Parliament	...7
A Landmark Work by William Mehlman	...8
Arabs Are Not Ready For Peace by Sami Alrabaa	...10
Fatahistic In The Middle East by Ruth King	...11

From the Editor

Honduras, Obama's Disgrace

We spoke too soon last month, with our headline "Honduras Wins." We were deceived by our government's two-faced policy. It's single-ugly-face has now become obvious. The State Department told Richard Lugar of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the U.S. would no longer threaten sanctions on Honduras or insist on Zelaya's return to power. In direct contradiction to these assurances, the administration has now cut off military and economic aid to Honduras, ruled that the fourteen justices of the Honduras Supreme Court cannot enter the U.S. (treating them as pariahs on a par with Mugabe's brutal henchmen) and announced it would not accept the results of the planned election in November. Obama stands rigidly at the side of Chavez, Nicaragua's Ortega and the brothers Castro.

Encouraged by the U.S. effort to impose Chavez-style rule on Honduras, Zelaya managed to slip into the country and, at this writing, has taken refuge in the Brazilian embassy, which he is using as a platform from which to rally his lumpenproletariat supporters to violent revolution. Interviewed in the embassy, Zelaya (who belongs in an asylum) told the *Miami Herald* (September 24) that Israeli mercenaries were torturing him with high frequency radiation and preparing to assassinate him.

How Not to Wage War

Thanks to Diana West for unearthing a story not covered in this country. The UK *Guardian* reports that in August Marine Commandant James T. Conway told a conference in a Washington hotel of Marine efforts to reduce their carbon footprint in Afghanistan. Writes West: "Gen. Conway's ostensibly running a war, with men in the field of battle under rotten conditions, and he's worried about...going green?"

West has also attacked the rules of engagement under which U.S. forces operate, costing them their lives. That theme was taken up by Ralph Peters in the *New York Post* (September 24) who denounces what he calls the "Obama Way of War" in Afghanistan. Unless our troops are absolutely certain no civilians are present, they're denied artillery or air support. If any civilians appear where we meet the Taliban, our troops are ordered to "break contact." The result says Peters, is that the Taliban make sure civilians are present for all their operations and after they attack, we quit, "lugging our dead and wounded back to base."

Veni, Vidi, Vici

Much is made of Obama's popularity (in contrast to George Bush) outside the United States, especially in Russia. But not with everyone. Here is Valeria Novodvorskaya, a pro-democracy activist and founder and chairwoman of the Democratic Union, referring to

Obama's visit to Russia: "Yes, *veni, vidi, vici* didn't work out for Obama. He came, saw nothing, and lost this basketball game to the Chekists. God grant the world and America survive Obama, with his cheap show business, for which he traded in the eternal ideals of freedom. I hope the Americans will see, hear and not forgive." In Russian parlance Novodvorskaya is a "liberal," a term meaning the opposite of what it does here, for a Russian liberal is *anti-leftist*, for free markets, *against* centralization of power.

Toronto Film Boycott Fizzles

Hard times seem to have blunted the calls for a boycott of the Toronto Film Festival by 50 morally challenged Hollywood types who accused the festival of being a pawn in the hands of the Israeli government because of its inaugural "City to City" event featuring ten films about Tel Aviv by Israeli directors. In the end the would-be boycotters simmered down after a plethora of news conferences, letters, articles and blogs. The Toronto festival rivals Venice and Cannes in importance, and this year, it was generally agreed, was the most difficult ever for selling films.

Here is a list of some of the best known of the infamous 50 whose films supporters of Israel might in their turn like to avoid: Julie Christie, Harry Belafonte, Danny Glover, Viggo Mortensen, musician David Byrne and British filmmaker Ken Loach.

A stand-out for her support of Israel is Madonna. She visited Israel and dined with Netanyahu—if she can face down Hollywood, perhaps she can give Netanyahu the spine to confront the lesser venom of the world's politicians.

Trees from ACORNs Grow

Twenty-five years ago, we (my husband Erich Isaac and I) wrote *The Coercive Utopians* (Regnery, 1983). In it we described ACORN, then still small beer, as one of the Alinsky-inspired organizations that had just begun to obtain government funds. Comprising a handful of radicals (it's still led by its founder Wade Rathke), ACORN grandiosely claimed to represent most of the country's (then) 200 million people. (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>

Obama At The UN: Take Israel, Please

Ruth King

As I sit down to write this, I just had the great displeasure of reading and rereading President Obama's speech to the United Nations General Assembly.

At the outset he stated to the assembly of America's staunch enemies: "No longer do we have the luxury of indulging our differences to the exclusion of the work that we must do together."

Must we really work with thugs and serial human rights oppressors? For what common purpose? And which ones? Mugabe perhaps. Or maybe we can figure things out with the butcher of Darfur, Omar al Bashir. Then there's Qaddafi who in his 90 minute speech repeatedly called Obama "our son" while urging a reinvestigation of the Kennedy assassination (the work of the Jews, according to Qaddafi). We have no differences with Canada or Australia or Belize--at least none that we cannot indulge. But what about Honduras? Here Obama is indulging his differences to the full, making every effort to bring down its democratic government and install a Chavez-clone.

Obama also reiterated a commitment to work closely with the United Nations: "We've re-engaged the United Nations. We have paid our bills. We have joined the Human Rights Council." Now that's comforting. Obama can bond with Richard Goldstone, the South African judge who was appointed by the UN Human Rights Council to wrong Israel by investigating alleged "war crimes" in Gaza. And that he did with relish, accusing Israel of possible "crimes against humanity" and recommending that if Israel fails to "properly" investigate its own behavior in Gaza it should be summoned before the International Criminal Court in The Hague. Even the ADL and the rest of the comatose Presidents' Conference were ruffled by that report.

But no matter, Obama quickly segued into the Middle East, his current passion (outside domestic affairs). He evoked his "special czar for Middle East Peace" George Mitchell who will midwife a settlement based on: "security for Israelis and Palestinians, borders, refugees, and Jerusalem.....Two states living side by side in peace and security--a Jewish state of Israel, with true security for all Israelis; and a viable, independent Palestinian state with contiguous territory that ends the occupation that began in 1967, and realizes the potential of the Palestinian people."

Got that? Contiguous territory. That means Israel is cut in two since that's the only way Judea, Samaria and Gaza can be contiguous and Obama speaks of one Palestinian state, not two. Refugees. To the Arabs that means "right to return." And in all his rhetoric about peace-making, never once has Obama

said a word about resettling Arab refugees in Arab lands. Jerusalem, borders, refugees, occupation--back to the 1967 lines—all the code words are there and his Arab audience knows what they mean.

Applause, applause...the man works his audience.

And then: "The United States does Israel no favors when we fail to couple an unwavering commitment to its security with an insistence that Israel respect the legitimate claims and rights of the Palestinians."

Applause and more applause.

Why should unwavering commitment to our most reliable ally be "coupled" with anything at all, particularly since the other party to the couple has not, can not and will not renounce its goal of destroying the Jewish state? That's its definition of the "legitimate claims" and "rights of the Palestinians." Does the President never read a word

of what his new best friends say and write and preach?

Israel is clearly expendable to this administration despite the sappy message sent from the White House on the Jewish New Year that was the equivalent of a Hallmark greeting card "wishing you and yours," with blanks to be filled in. The Ramadan greeting was lavish with praise for the Religion of Peace and its many contributions to justice, apple pie, and global well being. Just so they know he means it, he threw in his "unyielding" support for--you guessed it.

The President has signaled his intention to join the kangaroo court known as the United Nations in their unrelenting pressure and resolutions against Israel. His handlers Emanuel and Axelrod have leaked memos that he is "impatient" with Israel and, just as soon as he gets a moment after pummeling the American public with health care nationalization and a vast new system of energy taxation, he will turn full attention to exacting a suicide pact from Israel.

At the United Nations there was no mention of the terrorism and barbaric violations of human rights in the Arab/Moslem world. This is what Obama did say: "Extremists sowing terror in pockets of the world....Protracted conflicts that grind on and on; genocide; mass atrocities; more nations with nuclear weapons; melting ice caps and ravaged populations; persistent poverty and pandemic disease."

Applause, applause.

The irony is that he was addressing and appeasing and being applauded by a handsome collection of those very "extremists" and their enablers who perpetuate poverty and disease within their own populations and who sow terror and atrocities in pockets of the world including the United States. As for "melting



icecaps"—I guess that's "honor killing" of our environment.

Oh yes, he did give perfunctory warnings about North Korea and Iran and nukes. He threatened them with a "time out" to be followed by threats. You know, we have to set aside our differences and work together, one despot at a time.

So, why do Jews turn out for a rally against Ahmedinejad? What a waste of energy and good people with good intentions. Ahmadinejad threatens Israel and denies the Holocaust? So does Mahmoud Abu Mazen Abbas, the Palarab thug that Mitchell and Imamobama flaunt as their messenger for peace. Where is the rally against him? Furthermore, what cause for Jews does this rally advance? Giving Ahme-

dinejad a piece of their minds?

Jews and supporters of Israel should be rallying against the present administration. We are Americans and Obama is our elected leader with a Congress that has no notion that they work for us, and not the other way around.

Why don't supporters of Israel join the "tea parties" and meld support for Israel and the betrayal of allies to the overwhelming opposition to the President's domestic policies?

Why weren't we part of the September 12th rally in Washington? That rally was heard around the world.

But only silence greets the abandonment of Israel and its ugly twin international anti-Semitism. •

Tit For Tat

David Wilder

At first glance, it seems ironic that the author of the scathing report dealing with Israeli 'war crimes' during the Gaza war is a Jew. And not just any Jew. According to Goldstone's daughter, in an interview published by *The Jerusalem Post*, Richard Goldstone "is a Zionist and loves Israel."

As the proverbial saying goes, 'with friends like that, who needs enemies?'

Goldstone reportedly slept during accounts of rocket attacks on Sderot, in south Israel. So related Sderot resident and media expert Noam Bedein on Israel radio. However such accounts ignore the fact that there is only one bottom line for Goldstone and his sponsors: Jews may be attacked in any manner the attacker deems fit but may not defend themselves.

The state of Israel serves as a wonderful target for continued Jew-bashing. Perhaps one of the best examples, today especially relevant, was Israel's attack destroying Saddam's nuclear missile facilities in June, 1981. The United States blasted Israel for this attack. The United Nations Security council unanimously passed UN Resolution 487 which "strongly condemns the military attack by Israel in clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international conduct."

This same pattern of behavior continues, as international policy demands 'negotiations' and 'sanctions' prior to any attempts to destroy Ahmadinejad's weapons of mass destruction. By that time, of course, it may be too late, but then, it's only Israel's existence that seems to be at stake.

The Goldstone Report is merely another manifestation of an international principle which allows Is-

rael to be attacked and refuses to accept Israel's right to self defense.

But....And here is a big but.

I believe that the drama unfolding before our eyes, including the Goldstone report, is not only the fault of the international community. It is our fault, the direct responsibility of the state of Israel and a direct result of Israeli policies.

How so?

Nine years ago what is known as the "Second Intifada" began here in Hebron. Just after midnight Arab terrorists started shooting at the Jewish neighborhoods in the city. The gunfire came from the hills 'transferred'/abandoned to the Palestinian authority in January, 1997 with implementation of the 'Hebron Accords.' Shooting also started in other areas of Judea and Samaria. Jerusalem's southern neighborhood, Gilo, came under attack from Bethlehem and

Beit Jala.

The shooting continued for over two years, with the Barak/Sharon administrations refusing properly to defend its citizens against sustained, incessant attacks. Had the government ordered the army back into the areas and cities handed over to the PA the attacks would have ended immediately. Instead, the state's leaders watched as almost 1,500 Jews were murdered by Arab terrorists.

But it should be remembered that, prior to this war, Gush Katif communities were under mortar fire day and night for years. Thousands of mortars were shot at civilian and military populations with no effective answer from those who were elected to keep Israelis safe. The missile attacks against Kiryat Shmona and cities in the Israeli north should also not be forgotten, attacks which remained unanswered for years.

And finally, how many rockets were shot into Sderot following the catastrophic expulsion and destruction of the communities of Gush Katif. Thousands

and thousands and thousands.

And let it not be said that the government didn't know, that it wasn't warned. Recently, at a lecture in Netanya, retired Major-General Yaakov Amidror said: "A secret IDF Intelligence assessment warned as early as 1993 that the Oslo Accords would likely end with rocket attacks on Ashkelon." The politicians were not interested. According to Amidror, who headed the IDF's Research and Assessment Division responsible for preparing the National Intelligence Assessment, the decision to go ahead with the Oslo agreements between Israel and the PLO was made without taking into account the military implications. Amidror claims the Rabin government "completely ignored" IDF assessments.

Writers, myself included, warned, year after year, of the deadly implications of Oslo, Hebron, Wye, Gush Katif. To no avail. The government knew, and did nothing. In other words, Israel allowed itself to be attacked, without any true attempt to stop the terror. That being the case, when, at long last, Israel finally decided to take action, our enemies, enemies from without and enemies from within, raised a red flag imprinted with a huge question mark: What happened—why now? The state of Israel had restrained itself for

so long, had decided not to protect itself, its citizens and its cities, that any such action was viewed as bizarre and uncharacteristic. And with this, a great international outcry--How dare you!!!

In this High Holy Day season we try to take stock of the events of the past year, to determine how to correct our errors in the future. We are taught that one of the ways G-d deals with us human beings is, in Hebrew, *mida c'neged mida*. Translated this means something like tit for tat. You get back what you gave.

Ehud Barak, presently Defense Minister, nine years ago Prime Minister, fled from Lebanon and offered Arafat almost all of Judea and Samaria, including Jerusalem. Now he claims that the Goldstone report encourages terror. Tit for tat, Mr. Barak. You did nothing to stop terror. You encouraged it by doing nothing about it; you tried to appease the terrorists by offering to abandon more of Eretz Yisrael. Now you're getting it back in the form of another Jew blaming you for trying (and, by the way, not succeeding) to stop the terror, much too little, much too late. *Mida c'neged mida*.

David Wilder is spokesman for Hebron's Jewish community of Hebron.

Where In the World is the "Center" of the "War On Terrorism"?

Hugh Fitzgerald

"Somalia is the next challenge in efforts to stem Islamic terrorism, a report said Sunday" (from a news article in Agence-France Presse).

Let's see. For many years, until just the day before yesterday, Iraq was "the central front" in the "war on terror."

But now the theatre of war has mysteriously moved more than a thousand miles eastward, and the theatergoers—chiefly American soldiers and civilians—have packed up and moved over to Afghanistan, which with neighboring Pakistan, constitutes Af-Pak. And it is Af-Pak that is now "the central front" in the "war on terror."

But for how long? If the Shi'a Zaidis in northern Yemen defeat the government forces, and that would worry the Saudi government, won't the Saudis then tell the Americans that they have to take care of Yemen? Then Yemen may very well come to constitute, after Af-Pak, or perhaps substituted for it, the "central front" in the "war on terror."

And Libya, don't forget Libya, which thanks to the whims of Muammar Qaddafi can become at a moment's notice a candidate for being the "central front" of the "war on terror." Qaddafi has for decades supplied money to all sorts of terrorist groups, and he

could take it into his head to do so again.

And what about the Islamic Republic of Iran? Remember that Iran has been involved in all sorts of attacks abroad, including the blowing up of a Jewish center in Buenos Aires. And Iran has supported Hizballah with money and weaponry so that it, in turn, can terrorize the Christians, the Druse, even the Sunnis of Lebanon. As a consequence, Lebanon appears now to be in a state of permanent political paralysis. Would Iran, especially if it acquires nuclear weapons, not become, not almost certainly come to be recognized, as "the new center" in the "war on terror"?

And then there is Syria. The country is ruled of, by, and for Alawites, who rule in the armed forces but who constitute only 12% of the population. So far Bashar al-Assad appears to think he can continue in power by placating the Shi'a of Iran (acting as a conduit for Iranian weapons and money to Hezbollah, and standing by Iran diplomatically). Part of his strategy also involves placating the Sunnis of Syria by allowing other Sunnis--particularly the exiled Ba'athists of Iraq--to enter Iraq to conduct attacks to destabilize the Shi'a-controlled government. Why should not Syria become at some point part of the "central front" in the "war on terrorism," possibly along with Iran?

And then there's Saudi Arabia, with a regime of those Al-Saud princes and princelings who, all daggers and *dishdashas* and sneers of cold command, toy with the Americans, even as they hire an army of

We seek it here, we seek it there, we seek the center of the war on terrorism everywhere.

propagandists to write Op/Ed articles on the bestial behavior of those quite unreasonable Israelis (when the Arabs have cried Peace! Peace! for so long, but because of Israel, there is no peace). These princes and princelings continue with their promotion of Islam, and of the most uncompromising and therefore most sinister and malevolent form of Islam--their own home-grown Wahhabi version. The Al-Saud, with a regime that gets good press for its ballyhooed ability to "turn terrorists around," in fact does nothing more than persuade some Muslims who were attacking the Saudi government for being in bed with Infidels. They convince them that the Saudis, with their sly ways, have managed to do far more for Islam than those terrorists did, in their obvious way, on the eleventh of September, 2001.

And it's true. Despite appearances -- or despite what American officials continue to pretend to believe because it is easier than recognizing the grim truth--those Saudi princes are doing everything they can, through deployment of the Money Weapon, to further the cause of Islam.

All the mosques and madrassas and campaigns of *Da'wa* that the Saudis pay for in the West create more and more and more Muslims. The more Muslims there are, the greater the pool of potential terrorists, and the larger the number of those who believe in *Jihad* and will support or pursue it by other means. This in turn leads to a greater expense and a more nightmarish problem (see Great Britain, see France) for the security services of the Infidel nation-states that have allowed this problem to build and build.

So even if you right now want to join the American government in pretending, or even believing (it's hard to decide which is worse) that Saudi Arabia is a "staunch ally" in the "war on terrorism" because, you see, "it too is threatened," won't you at least agree that Saudi Arabia, too, might someday be recognized as a "center" in the "war on terrorism"?

And what about a member of NATO, Turkey? In Turkey, once seen as thoroughly, permanently secular in its orientation, Islam is back with a vengeance, as Erdogan step by systematic step undoes the secularists. The university rectors, and the journalists, and the lawyers, and the professors, and the curators at Topkapi, and the art gallery and bookstore owners and habitues, and a dozen Orhan Pamuks, cannot prevent Turkey from becoming more and more like the Arab states and the Islamic Republic of Iran. Could it be that in a future not far away, Turkey, stout provider of troops to NATO during the Korean War, listening post and provider of airbases during the Cold War, might become—whether or not Erdogan succeeds in consolidating power, and whether or not Turkey be-

comes part of the EU— a "center" of the "war on terrorism"?

And what about—oh, go around the world and ask what is going on in Chechnya, or Bosnia, and whether you have heard of Chechens or Bosnian Muslims being picked up in the most distant, seemingly oddest places, for participating in terror attacks.

And while we are at it, are there no recruits? Has no one been plotting, scheming, training, and then taking part, enough to make the countries that they now live in possible future "centers" in the "war on terrorism"? This is happening not in Iraq and Afghanistan, not in Pakistan and Syria and Iran, but in NATO countries that possess arsenals of the most advanced weaponry, and civilisationally are part of, and the heart

of, the West. Wherever immigrants may come from, America remains, in its political and legal institutions, its language, its literature, its art, its science, a child of Europe, and its fate is tied to that of Europe. America would suffer terribly were it to see those who gave it birth succumb to Islam.

We seek it here, we seek it there, we seek that "center" of the "war on terrorism"

everywhere. But we need not, because there is no "center." Muslim terrorism will take place wherever there are a sufficient number of Muslims ready and able to participate in violent *Jihad*. Those who are willing only to promote *Jihad* through non-violent means could, at any time, and for any number of reasons, metamorphose into those who are willing to use violent means—that is, *qitaal* (combat), including what we have no trouble identifying as terrorism but that Muslims see merely as a form of *qitaal* that is justified because Infidels are militarily superior, and that isn't fair.

How long will it be before enough plots are hatched in such unlikely-sounding places as England and France and Denmark and the Netherlands and Belgium and Germany and Italy, that they become "centers" in the "war on terrorism"? And long before they become those "centers," they are already places where the *Jihad*, rightly defined, is underway. Now it's a question of having this most obvious of observations becoming recognized, and understood, in those corridors of power all over the Western world—the ones that have those banana-peels strewn about, and on which policymakers keep slipping and taking their falls, and their pratfalls. *La commedia è finita*, however. At this point, no one should be laughing.

Hugh Fitzgerald is a vice president of Jihadwatch to which he contributes regular articles. This is a briefer version of an article that appeared on Jihadwatch on September 20.

How long will it be before enough plots are hatched in such unlikely-sounding places as England and France and Denmark, that they become centers in the war on terrorism?

Speech By Geert Wilders On The First Day Of The General Debate in The Dutch Parliament

Editors Note: The following is excerpted from a speech by Geert Wilders, the fearless and outspoken leader of the PPV (Dutch Freedom Party). Wilders goes on trial on January 20, accused by the Dutch government of "racism and hate mongering" for speaking out about Islam. The largest Dutch paper calls it "the trial of the century." (It is interesting that the public prosecutor wanted to dismiss the case on the grounds that Wilders had contributed to the debate on Islam in Dutch society and was guilty of no criminal offense but was overruled by the Amsterdam appeals court.) Like Churchill in the 1930s, Wilders is a political voice in the wilderness, warning willfully blind elites of the dangers that are closing in. And as this speech shows, like Churchill, he will not be silenced.

It is over. This government has run aground, like an old car that got stuck in loose sand. It still squeaks a little, it cracks. The battery is dead. It's all over. Madam Chairman, it would be laughable if it were not for the future of the Netherlands. Then you could make fun of that little club of helpless people who stare out through the misty windscreen, hoping there is someone who can tell them which way to go.

There is just one reason the [coalition government] continues stumbling: that is out of fear of elections.

For when the Netherlands gets to vote, it will show that the crisis mainly is happening in one specific place—and that is in the government. How dare the government go after ordinary citizens while they simultaneously spend billions on banks and leftist hobbies, and hundreds of millions for the 19,000 asylum seekers that await us next year, about double the number of last year!

But, fair is fair; there is also a lot being achieved by this government. For instance, integration goes very well—at least, the integration of the Netherlands into *Dar-al-Islam*, the Islamic world. This government is enthusiastically co-operating with the Islamization of the Netherlands. In all of Europe the elite opens the floodgates wide. In only a little while, one in five people in the European Union will be Muslim. Good news for this multiculti-government that views bowing to the horrors of Allah as its most important task. Good news for the CDA [Christian Democratic Appeal, the party of the Prime Minister]: C-D-A, in the meanwhile stands for Christians Serve Allah [Christenen Diene Allah].

Madam Chairman, this government, this elite does not have even the slightest will to oppose Islamization. No, it looks to it as a great enrichment of the Dutch landscape. All those snug mosques, those cute headscarves, those cozy burkas. Yes, the Netherlands really becomes more beautiful with that. Here and there from time to time some are left dead, or some are raped, and eventually our country will go bankrupt. But all that may not spoil the fun. Only a grumbler would pay attention to that. Just have patience for a little while, because we await the Islamic Utopia.

Those headscarves are a true sign of oppres-

sion of women, of subjugation, of conquest. It is a symbol of an ideology that is out there to colonize us. Therefore: it is time for a big spring-cleaning of our streets. If our new Dutch citizens want so badly to show their love for that seventh-century desert ideology, then they should rather comfortably do that in a Muslim country, but not here, not in our country.

Madam Chairman, the government refuses to tell the citizen what mass immigration and the presence of non-western immigrants costs us. The government refused to answer our questions on this. Fortunately we know approximately

what this joke costs us. The Dutch weekly *Elsevier* did a calculation and came up with over two hundred billion euros. To be precise: 216 billion euros [\$318 billion]. For this year alone that already means nearly 13 billion

euros [\$20 billion].

But, Madam Chairman, this government does not want to know it. "For we aren't going to calculate how much the elderly cost us, either," the government says. How is it we do not know how much an elderly person costs? Someone in a nursing home costs €165 a day, a prisoner €192 and a TBSers [criminally mentally ill offenders] €476 euros. But when it comes to the electoral cattle of the Socialist Party then the truth has to remain under the hood. When it comes to immigration, that information suddenly almost seems a state secret. And this while immigration is the result of government policy, the result of the decision to open the locks wide.

Madam Chairman, the Netherlands has approximately one million Muslims. Many of them are immigrants. And none of those really came over here out of love for the Netherlands. What did they come over for then? Well, for state benefits, for instance. And before you attack me on this, I am not the only one who says this. Green/Left MP Tofik Dibi recently said that young people in Morocco view the Netherlands as a utopia where you can get free benefits. A takeaway counter for free money, as I understand it. In short, they come here out of an economic calculation. Over there penniless, here a fat benefit.

Madam Chairman, is it such a surprise then, that we start to wonder how much that leftist hobby costs us? That we carry out an economic calculation?

**All those snug mosques,
those cute headscarves,
those cozy burkas.**

If they do it, why can't we?

We stand at a crossroads: do we opt for more mass immigration or do we choose for our own elderly? The Party for Freedom chooses for our elderly.

Madam Chairman, sound economic policy starts with lower taxes. These are necessary for the first steps on the road to a better Netherlands, and that can already be done next year. Therefore we created a counter-budget proposal. In 2010 we start with a cut of seven billion on leftist hobbies and subsidies. With this we lower the income tax in the second level [tax on income and property and for social security "insurances", now circa 42%] by 3%. This means not a few euros less [like in the government budget], but a few hundred euros more for an average family.

And, apart from tax reduction, we have other plans to slightly soften where possible the economic crisis. Two plans to boost the economy. First: we cut the property transfer tax in half [tax on house sales, circa 6-8% of the sale price]. That will make the housing market slowly start up again, because buying a house becomes cheaper.

Second: we boost job creation by temporarily making labor cheaper. The PVV budgets 320 million euros to help people who lost their jobs get on a faster track to a job in the private sector. We scrap the social security charges for one year for employers who take on people from unemployment. This enables 100,000 people who could no longer have jobs because of the crisis to get back to work faster! 100,000 people!

Madam Chairman, crime must be taken on much harder. The Netherlands should be reconquered, street by street, neighborhood by neighborhood. With officers who act rock-hard against criminals instead of issuing speeding fines for driving a few

miles too fast. Never again a community service or a low prison sentence for rape. Moroccan street terrorists we must pick up. We must take them on rock-hard.

Madam Chairman, in our new Netherlands, the heaviest punishment will be imprisonment—not living in our nursing homes. They [criminals] have it much better in prison. The PVV proposal is crystal clear. Give our elderly in the nursing homes more rights than prisoners, and take away the luxuries for those villains in prison. No game computers, no TVs anymore, no *halal* food, no sport and recreation. Let them feel they are criminals. And spoil our elderly. It does not seem too much to ask that the people who had to eat tulip bulbs in the famine winter [1944-45], who worked on the rebuilding of the Netherlands after the war—that these people may have a better deal than burglars, rapists, and murderers.

Madam Chairman, I conclude. The Netherlands would look so much better without this government. Richer. Safer. More social. And above all: more Dutch. The elite is dreaming their sweet pink dreams, but the people are not crazy. The people, who have been betrayed for decades, will no longer take it. Change is in the air. Hope glimmers on the horizon. You can taste it everywhere. There is no stopping it. Everybody sees it. Except the people in that little car, in the dead of night, somewhere in the middle of the woods. Stuck in the loose sand. The battery is dead.

It is pitch dark and dead quiet. They are all lost. Nobody cares for them anymore. The silence is only disturbed by the little GPS that says to this government "You have arrived at your destination".

It is time for elections!

A Landmark Work

Reviewed by William Mehlman

With *The Legal Foundation and Borders of Israel under International Law* (Mazo Publishers, Jerusalem) Canadian-born Israeli constitutional scholar and lawyer Howard Grief has given us a book that shatters every myth, lie, misrepresentation and distortion employed over the 61 years of Israel's existence to negate the sovereign rights of the Jewish People to their national home.

It is a lengthy treatise—660 pages plus a 50-page appendix—but the Jewish people's long and tortuous struggle to retrieve their stolen patrimony deserves nothing less than full disclosure. Anyone who has ever been at a loss to counter the slanders and calumnies that are the stock in trade of the Israel-bashers and anti-Semites on both the Left and Right will treasure every one of its 20 illuminating chapters.

Rooted in the premise that the best antidote to a myriad of small and medium sized fabrications is the exposure of the whole cloth from which they've been

woven, *The Legal Foundation* lays bare two dominant myths that have shaped popular perspectives on Israel. The first is the fallacy that Jewish sovereignty over the land of Israel was the joint product of the 1947 United Nations Partition and the May 15th, 1948 termination of the British Mandate for Palestine. In fact, as Grief points out, Jewish sovereignty in Palestine had been validated under international law 28 years earlier. "The legal title of the Jewish People to the mandated territory of Palestine in all of its historical parts," he informs us, was first recognized on April 24, 1920 when the post-World War I Allied Supreme Council (Britain, France, Italy and Japan), meeting in San Remo, Italy, "converted the 1917 'Balfour Declaration' into a binding legal document."

How "binding" may be construed from the fact that its wording gave effect to the provisions of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations and became incorporated into the Mandate for Palestine. Indeed, the "San Remo Resolution," within which the Allied Supreme Council's decision is contained, constitutes what the author terms "the foundation document of the State of Israel, the legal existence of which is

directly traceable from that document.”

That the Jewish People were unable to exercise their sovereignty in Palestine for 28 years—it being assigned to the British Mandatory power as their *de facto* agent—did in no way detract from their *de jure* rights to the land under international law during that interregnum. In this thesis, Grief is ironically supported by both a passionate Zionist, U.S. Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis and one of Zionism’s most implacable opponents, post World War I British Foreign Secretary Lord George Nathaniel Curzon. Brandeis believed that with the passage of the San Remo Resolution, the debate over who owned Palestine was effectively over. Curzon called the Resolution the “Magna Carta” of the Jewish People.

From the initial misattribution of Jewish sovereignty in Palestine to the 1947 Partition Plan rather than the 1920 San Remo Resolution, it was just a hop and a skip to a second major misrepresentation of Israel’s international legal status—the erroneous assumption that the Partition Plan and the May 1948 termination of the British Mandate somehow erased the Jewish People’s rights to Palestine in all its historical parts and dimensions enunciated at San Remo, and implemented under the terms of the League of Nations Covenant. Those “parts and dimensions” were defined *inter alia*, as including the northwestern portions of the Golan and most of present day Jordan by the “Franco-British Boundary Convention” in Paris.

The presumptive cancellation of those rights, Grief submits, is thoroughly discredited by “the principle of acquired rights,” codified in the 1969 Vienna Convention on the “Law of Treaties,” and the “doctrine of *estoppel*.” The first, he asserts, insures that “the fundamental rights of the Jewish people did not lapse with the international process [the San Remo Resolution] which brought them into existence. The second further guarantees that these rights cannot “simply be abrogated or denied by those states which previously recognized their existence.” Taken together, they provide what the author terms a “definitive answer [to] anyone who claims that Jewish legal rights and title of sovereignty over all of Palestine and the land of Israel did not continue after the end of the Mandate for Palestine...except in the allotted boundaries of the UN Partition Plan...”

Noteworthy among the states that wholeheartedly endorsed Jewish sovereignty over Palestine in all its “historical parts and dimensions” was the United States of America—the same U.S.A that today regards Israel’s presence in Judea and Samaria as an illegal “occupation” of lands upon which it favors the creation of a Palestinian State. The Obama administration and the Bush administration that preceded it are either unaware or have chosen to be unaware of the fact that the 1924 Anglo-American Convention on Palestine

made the U.S. a “contracting party” to the Mandate, further reinforcing a unanimously passed Joint Resolution of the 67th Congress two years earlier, signed by President Warren G. Harding, recognizing a future Jewish State in “the whole of Palestine.”

It needs to be borne in mind, Grief notes, that the Mandate for Palestine that was ceremoniously incorporated into U.S. law in 1924 “was a constitution for the projected Jewish state that made no provision for an Arab state and which especially prohibited the partition of the country.” Thus, he concludes, the fierce exception the U.S. has taken to Jewish communities in Judea and Samaria and its unremitting pressure for creation of a “Palestinian State” amount to a repudiation of its signature to the Anglo-American Convention on Palestine. It is in violation of American law and America’s obligations under international law.



Menachem Begin

The Legal Foundation and Borders of Israel under International Law is the product of 25 years of independent research by Grief, a former adviser on international law to the late Professor Yuval Ne’eman, Minister of Energy and Infrastructure in the Shamir government and the father of Israel’s nuclear energy program. It is the kind of seminal work that seems destined to become both an indispensable source for defenders of Israel’s rights under international law and a mirror on the events and personalities that transformed a November 2, 1917 letter from British Foreign Secretary Lord Arthur James Balfour to Lord Lionel Walter Rothschild into the trumpet call that awakened Jewish nationhood from a 1,900-year coma.

The author’s unsparing portrayal of France’s opposition to the creation of a Jewish state at San Remo and, when thwarted, its efforts at the Franco-British Boundary Convention to confine it to the narrowest geographical limits, should dismiss any notion that French anti-Zionism began with De Gaulle. By the same token, the Zionist sympathies attributed to Winston Churchill by Martin Gilbert and other historians withers in the face of the 1922 “White Paper” attached to his name as then Colonial Secretary. Grief offers irrefutable evidence of its having not only “negated” the Jewish state in Palestine that the Mandate “required” of Britain, but of having elevated “Arab pretensions and aspirations to such an extent that everything thereafter became muddled...subject to continuous disputes as to what was really intended in the Mandate for Palestine.”

For the actual authorship of that document and the wreckage it made of the original plan for the establishment of a Jewish state in all its “historic parts and dimensions” under British tutelage, we have Herbert Samuel to thank—the same Herbert Samuel who worked closely with Chaim Weizmann in the Zionist

Organization and was later to pack it in for a "Lordship" and an appointment as British High Commissioner to Palestine. In ironic contrast, Lord Curzon, Balfour's successor as Foreign Secretary, who "detested" the idea of a Jewish state, put loyalty above personal feelings at San Remo and Paris in arguing manfully for the realization of Prime Minister David Lloyd George's vision of a Jewish state comprised of all its ancient Biblical territories.

On the Jewish side, nobody comes off better in this saga than Brandeis, who Grief portrays as "the only Zionist leader...who properly understood the natural consequences of the legal recognition of the Balfour Declaration embodied in the San Remo Resolution." Had Brandeis headed the Zionist Organization, the author believes, "there is little doubt that he would have successfully halted Britain's gross violation of its [Mandatory] obligation ...to rebuild the Jewish state."

At the end of the day, it was Menachem Begin who provided the most heartbreaking counterpoint to Lloyd George's vision of a Jewish state reconstituted

in most, if not all of its Biblical parts, Grief submits. Begin, national Zionism's anointed champion, bearer of the torch lit by Herzl and passed to Jabotinsky, not only failed to make Israel constitutionally whole by annexing Judea, Samaria and Gaza (as he was expected to do), but in what the author describes as an act of "unimaginable folly," brought to the Knesset in 1977 a plan to establish Arab "self-rule" over those critical portions of the Jewish estate. In so doing, he opened the portals wide for their identification as "unallotted," "disputed" and finally "occupied" territories.

Nine months later, in September 1978, Begin crowned his "achievement" by injecting the "self-rule" proposal into the negotiations with Egypt at Camp David, offering to leave the final determination of sovereignty over Judea, Samaria and Gaza to their inhabitants and "local representatives." Thirty one years later, Israel remains bedeviled by that fateful decision.

William Mehlman is AFSI's representative in Israel. Grief's book is sold on Amazon and Barnes & Noble.

Arabs Are Not Ready for Peace

Dr. Sami Alrabaa

What has Tony Blair, former British prime minister, achieved since his appointment, in July 2007, as special envoy of the Middle East Peace "Quartet"? Nothing.

What has George Mitchell achieved since assuming his job as the United States Special envoy for the Middle East in January 22, 2009? Nothing.

What have all those Western officials, including Xavier Solana, the Foreign Relations of European Union Coordinator, achieved through their shuttle diplomacy to the Middle East? Again, nothing.

In the meantime, while the European Union injects billions of dollars in a corrupt Palestinian Authority, the oil Gulf states, led by Saudi Arabia and Libya, support Muslim terrorists with their petrodollars across the globe.

Nevertheless, the West still believes that it can help the Israelis and Arabs strike a peace deal.

Arabs are demagogues. They hail the man who threw his shoes at President Bush, who rid the Iraqis from one of the worst dictators in the history of mankind, as a hero. But none of them would dare do the same with an Arab dictator.

Even if Israel withdrew completely from the West Bank, as it did in Gaza, would the Arab regimes normalize their relations with Israel? Of course not. Although Israel signed peace treaties with Egypt and Jordan, these Arab countries have not yet normalized their relations with the Jewish state. Egyptians hardy enough to visit Israel can expect heavy penalties.

If peace were attained in the Middle East, Arabs would ask, "What then?" They would start demanding political and social reforms. This implies, of course, the end of Arab regimes.

Unfortunately, peace in the Middle East has to wait 50-100 years. By then the current Arab dictators are dead, and both oil and petrodollar have dwindled and radical Muslims are dead or at least tired.

The West must change its foreign policy toward the Arab regimes. It must unequivocally tell these regimes: change or perish! Only then will peace prevail in the Middle East. Anything else is like talking to the wall. Enough is enough.

This is excerpted from an article in FamilySecurityMatters.org on Sept. 24. Dr. Alrabaa, an ex-Muslim, is a professor of Sociology who has taught at Kuwait University, King Saud University, and Michigan State University. He also writes for The Jerusalem Post.

Come With AFSI On Our November Trip To Israel

On November 8-15, AFSI will celebrate Parshat Chaye Sarah in Hebron.

In addition to being in Hebron on Nov. 13 and 14, we will visit the threatened communities of Judea, Samaria, and eastern Jerusalem. We also visit the displaced and dispersed Jews from Gush Katif.

Don't miss this opportunity to experience an extraordinary, up-close look at what is happening in Israel today.

Contact Helen Freedman, 212-828-2424; afsi@rcn.com to make your reservation.

Fatahistic In The Middle East

Ruth King

Given the current obsession with health care reform, here are medical questions. If your doctor prescribed a medication with no therapeutic effects but with side effects which almost killed you several times, how would you respond if he wanted you to try it again? Suppose you had a critical but curable disorder and instead of dealing with it your doctor insisted on amputation? What would you do?

Okay, I know the answers, but that is exactly what Dr. Obama and his "death panel" for Israel are doing, pushing prescriptions which bring Israel closer to extinction.

Smug George Mitchell and cheerleaders like Zbigniew Brzezinski, Rahm Emanuel, Dennis Ross, Martin Indyk (and assorted Jewish shills) are bending every effort to extract living wills

from a stressed and desperate Israeli population. It's routine by now. The more Israel concedes, the more the Arabs ratchet up their demands and terrorism against Israeli civilians. Follow the dots from Camp David to Oslo to the "Road Map" to the Gaza withdrawal to Obama's "settlement freeze"--what journalist Cal Thomas has aptly called "Quid but no Quo."

Once, dividing Jerusalem and creating what George Will once called "Arafatville" in Judea and Samaria raised hackles among Israel's supporters, but now they are "acceptable" concessions. Soon to follow are the so called "right of return", read, a flooding of Israel with Arab population, then a binational state, then *dhimmitude* for the Jews of Israel, and finally end of life counseling. Each disastrous move by Israel produces a new poster boy for Arab "moderation"--from Sadat to Arafat to the new golden boy, Mahmoud Abu Mazen Abbas.

Fatah, we are reassured, unlike Hezbollah and Hamas, is ready to cut a deal with Israel. In fact Fatah is ready to cut Israel's throat, and its leader, "moderate" terrorist Abu Mazen, holds the knife. Why is Israel asked to trust a man whose college thesis published by Moscow University denies the Holocaust; a man who masterminded the Munich Massacre in 1972; whose ties with rogue regimes and international terrorist networks is documented; whose "education ministry" produces the identical anti-Israel incitement that is the trademark of Hamas/Hezbollah; and who, for good measure, still refuses to recognize Israel as a Jewish state and routinely promises a return to all-out violence if his demands are not met.

Why? Because so many of Israel's supporters, including Alan Dershowitz and the grandees of the Presidents' Conference, and the media and the think tankers and the same-old-same old State Department are hell bent on implementing the two state [dis] solution. By their reasoning, if Israel amputates itself

deeply enough, Arab swords will turn to plowshares. But no. They will turn to shovels for burial.

Hello? Does anyone remember Gaza? Since the beginning of 2009 about 715 Qassam rockets, mortars and Grad missiles have been fired into Israel. What has been the response of the world? An increase in fulminations about the "settlements" and the "occupation" and more calls for boycotts of Israel in every sphere--the academies, the churches, financial institutions and the media.

And the peace loving Arabs of Judea and Samaria? They had a holiday greeting on Rosh Hashana. They set fire to Givat Gilad, a town in Samaria, which resulted in panic, evacuation, severe damage and several wounded and homeless residents. And that's just a small

taste of what Fatah would do if they gain total control of the area.

The Mideast is on the brink of conflagration. Iran steadily and surely is obtaining nuclear arms; Lebanon is a tinderbox, hostage to Hezbollah; Syria and Iraq, Iran and Libya are bonding over hatred of Israel and desire to humiliate the West; radical Islam is emboldened in its goal of a world-wide caliphate; the Taliban grows stronger and more defiant; and the sugar daddies of *jihad*, namely the Saudis and the Emirates continue to fund the spread of the ideologies that foment terror.

Fiddling while the Moslem world burns with hatred, the Obama administration exercises all its foreign policy muscle against Israel. What is behind this Fatahistic approach? Why has our government gone beyond any previous administration in its antipathy to Israel?

Israeli diplomat Yoram Ettinger asks:

"What's in it for the United States?"

What has transformed Israel into an American liability? It is the largest U.S. aircraft carrier, which requires no U.S. personnel, which can't be sunk, which is the most battle-tested and cost effective, which is located in a most critical area for vital U.S. national security interests and which is sparing the U.S. megabillion dollars annually and the stationing of additional real aircraft carriers in the Middle East?

Why would the U.S. Administration punish the Jewish State for fulfilling its security requirements, thus cutting off its (U.S.) nose to spite its (U.S.) face?"

The answer, I fear, lies in the President's outreach to Moslems. The President understands what Bat Ye'or and Moshe Sharon and Raphael Israeli and Robert Spencer and Andrew Bostom know. Islam's price for a temporary and tenuous accommodation with the West is Israel.

And our President is willing to cut the deal. •

Soon to follow is the so called "right of return."

(Continued from page 2)

Successive governments, Republican as well as Democratic, state and local as well as national, kept upping the funding and ACORN's activities burgeoned. ACORN became so convinced of its invulnerability that its offices were successfully scammed by two enterprising youngsters, Hannah Giles and James O'Keefe—ACORN employees freely offered tax evasion advice (on videotape) for their supposed brothel, including passing off their 13 year old sex slaves imported from San Salvador as dependents.

Still cocky—now stupidly so—ACORN is suing O'Keefe, Giles and Breitbart.com (it posted the videos) for violating Maryland law which prohibits audiotaping without consent (a felony punishable up to five years). This opens up ACORN to discovery, and the can of worms the defendants will uncover should be sufficient to deplete the oceans of fish.

J Street in New York Times

On September 13 the *New York Times Magazine* published a lengthy puff piece on J Street, the newest in the string of anti-Israel "Jewish" organizations that go back decades—think Breira, New Jewish Agenda, Americans for Peace Now, to name a few. J Street is only unusual in its heavy funding by Arabs (who seem to have finally realized how useful these outfits can be). Where J Street very much resembles its predecessors is in how the mainstream media has fallen in love with it. How many new, small, untested-for-staying power groups get full scale treatment in the "paper of record"? Breira did, in its day, in the mid-1970s. Not only in the *New York Times*, but in *The Washington Post*, even *The London Times*.

What AFSI's 1977 pamphlet on Breira said of that organization is every bit as applicable to J Street: "Breira invites criticism of Israel, makes indeed a virtuous and courageous act of it....Israel has 'behaved badly,' 'oppressed Palestinians,' 'ignored the prophetic mission it was her task to fulfill,' 'has not really sought peace'....It is the basic dishonesty of Breira, which abandons Israel in the name of commitment to her future, that has made it such an attractive tool for those hostile to the state."

And that's the attraction of all these groups for the anti-Israel media.

Negotiating with Ahmadinejad

Political analyst Barry Rubin calls Obama's negotiating with Iran the most important—and worst—of his foreign policy decisions. Here's why:

"By letting its own strategy [raised sanctions] be derailed it [the U.S.] looks ineffective.

By accepting an insulting proposal obviously meant to change the agenda it will be perceived as being humiliated.

By ignoring the recent behavior of the Iranian regime it will invite more of the same.

By letting Russia and China veto a U.S. policy it seems to have abandoned American leadership in the world. Or at least of the West.

By allowing the Iranian regime to stall for time it has apparently moved a long way toward acceding to Iran's having nuclear weapons, and not just the weapons but weapons in the hands of the country's most extreme faction.

A big price will be paid in future for this mistake."

•