

Copyright 2010
David Horowitz Freedom Center
PO BOX 55089
Sherman Oaks, CA 91499-1964
Elizabeth@horowitzfreedomcenter.org

www.frontpagemag.com
ISBN: 1-886442-75-4
Printed in the United States of America

\$3.00 Each
\$1.00 each for orders of 25 or more

Obama and the War Against the Jews

By David Horowitz and Jacob Laksin

No other country in the world faces an array of existential threats such as the nation of Israel confronts daily. The world's only Jewish state is also its most precarious. Geographically tiny, Israel is surrounded by theocracies that reject its very existence as a "*nakba*" – a catastrophe – and call for its destruction. To carry out these malignant ambitions, anti-Israel Islamists have mobilized three rocket-wielding armies, sworn to wipe Israel from the face of the earth.

First and most aggressive among them is the Gaza-based Hamas, a fanatical religious party committed in its official charter to obliterating Israel and killing its Jews. Hamas is the creation of the Muslim Brotherhood, the inspirer of al-Qaeda and the global Islamic *jihād*, whose official motto declares: "Death in the service of Allah is our highest aspiration." In Gaza, Hamas has created a terrorist state and

a national death cult whose path is martyrdom and whose goal is openly proclaimed: “O, our children: The Jews – brothers of the apes, assassins of the prophets, bloodsuckers, warmongers – are murdering you, depriving you of life after having plundered your homeland and your homes. Only Islam can break the Jews and destroy their dream.¹”

Given that hatred for Jews is the animating passion of the Hamas militants, their response to Israel’s unilateral withdrawal from Gaza in 2005 was not surprising. Far from greeting this as a gesture of peace, Hamas regarded the Israeli withdrawal as a surrender to its terrorist attacks and an opportunity to escalate them. In the days and months following the withdrawal, Hamas launched 6,500 unprovoked rocket strikes on towns and schoolyards in Israel until the Israelis decided to strike back.

Israel’s western border is home to the al-Aqsa Martyrs’ Brigade, the Palestine Liberation Organization and other terrorist groups, armed and protected by the Palestinian Authority, the

1 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/may/15/hamasandantisemitism>

so-called “moderate” wing of the Palestinian *jihad*. Like Hamas, the Palestinian Authority officially rejects Israel’s existence and the right of its Jews to self-determination. Like Hamas, the Palestinian Authority provides a curriculum for Gaza’s school-children, that teaches them to hate Jews and hope to kill them, seeking martyrdom and sainthood in the process. In pursuit of these genocidal goals, all Palestinian schoolchildren are taught from maps of the region from which Israel has been erased.²

On Israel’s northern border, in Lebanon, is Hezbollah, the “Party of God,” which is busily stockpiling tens of thousands of Iranian rockets in anticipation of the war of annihilation it has promised to wage against the Jewish state. Created by Iran’s Republican Guard and supplied by Syria’s (officially) fascist dictatorship, Hezbollah is the largest terrorist army in the world. Like Hamas, it makes explicit its hatred for the Jews and its agenda in regard to them – to “finish the job that Hitler started”. Its fanatical

² <http://www.ict.org.il/Articles/tabid/66/Articlsid/592/currentpage/2/Default.aspx>

leader, Hassan Nasrallah, leads thousands of believers in chants of “Death to Israel, Death to America.” He has said, “If Jews all gather in Israel, it will save us the trouble of going after them worldwide.”³ Under the complicit eye of UN “peacekeepers” Hezbollah continues to amass rockets whose sole purpose is the obliteration of Israel. In May 2006, Nasrallah boasted: “Today all of Israel is in our range... Ports, military bases, factories – everything is in our range.”⁴

But it is Hezbollah’s sponsor, the totalitarian – and soon to be nuclear – state of Iran that presents the most disturbing threat to Israel’s existence. Its blood-soaked dictators have been targeting Israel for destruction since 1979 when Iran became an Islamic republic and its theocratic ruler, the Ayatollah Khomeini, identified Israel and America as “the Little Satan” and “the Great Satan.” Its former president Akbar Hashem Rafsanjani has publicly announced his support for nuclear war

3 <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/05/23/books/the-enemy-within.html?sec=&pagewanted=all>

4 Amos Harel, Avi Issacharoff, *34 Days: Israel, Hezbollah, and the War in Lebanon*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2008, p. 48.

against the Jewish state, reasoning that since Iran is more than 70 *times* the size of Israel it could survive a nuclear holocaust while Israel could not.⁵

Iran's current leader, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, has called for America and Israel to be "wiped from the map" – and there was no dissent from the other 56 Islamic states that make up the Organization of the Islamic Conference. Amateur semanticists insist that Ahmadinejad's words were mistranslated, and that he really meant that both countries should be "erased from the pages of history." But this is a distinction without a difference. For what can that threat possibly mean if Israel or America should continue to exist? Meanwhile, Iran continues to build long-range nuclear missiles that could be used for just such a purpose and no serious effort to check that ambition has been made by the international community or by the United States.

Where, indeed, does the international community stand in the face of this brazen preparation to bring about a second Holocaust of the Jews? Since the creation of the state of

⁵ Mitchell Bard, *Will Israel Survive?* Macmillan, 2008. p.77.

Israel in 1948, the Arab states have conducted three unprovoked, aggressive, conventional wars against it. along with a continuous terrorist war that began in 1949. Yet, between 1948 and 2004 there were 322 resolutions in the UN General Assembly condemning the victim, Israel, and not one that condemned an Arab state.⁶

The United Nations is today dominated by the Organization of the Islamic Conference, a group that was established in 1969 at a summit convened, according to its official website, “as a result of criminal arson of the al-Aqsa Mosque in occupied Jerusalem” – in other words as a result of the criminal Jews. The Organization of the Islamic Conference regularly passes one-sided resolutions that condemn Israel, particularly for its efforts to combat Palestinian terrorism and disrupt Palestinian weapon smuggling into Gaza. The U.N.’s most notorious assault on Israel was the so-called “Goldstone Report,” which was commissioned by the U.N. Human Rights Council in September 2009 and which

6 http://www.jewishworldreview.com/0704/prager_israel_arab_stats.php3

condemned Israel's belated response to the unprovoked Hamas rocket attacks.

Relying on the testimony of Hamas terrorists, the Goldstone report charged that Israel had deliberately targeted Palestinian civilians and had committed war crimes in Gaza. Outside the precincts of the Islamic propaganda machine, however, Israel's record is, in fact, that of a nation more protective of enemy civilians than any other. In testimony ignored by the Goldstone Report, for example, Col. Richard Kemp, the former commander of British forces in Afghanistan, noted that "During Operation Cast Lead [the Israeli response to the Hamas attacks], the Israel Defense Forces did more to safeguard the rights of civilians in a combat zone than any other army in the history of warfare."⁷ Hamas, by contrast, is notorious for building military headquarters under hospitals, for placing its military forces in refugee camps and for using "human shields" provided by women and children to deter attacks. Hamas's rockets are known to be so inaccurate they cannot be directed against military targets; they can

⁷ <http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/55622>

only be used effectively against civilians. In addition, since Hamas's war against Israel was a response to Israel's unilateral withdrawal, it was a criminal aggression responsible for all the subsequent casualties, something the Goldstone Report and the U.N. Human Rights Council conveniently overlooked.

The Human Rights Council was created in 2006. In its first year, the council listed only one country in the entire world as violating human rights: Israel. It condemned Israel despite the fact that Israel is the only state in the Middle East that recognizes human rights and protects them. Not one of the world's other 194 countries was even mentioned, including North Korea, Burma, and Iran – the last of which hangs gays from cranes for transgressing the sexual prescriptions of the Koran.⁸ The reason for these oversights is no mystery. The UN Human Rights Council has been presided over by representatives of such brutal human-rights violators as Libya, China, Saudi Arabia and Cuba, and was such a travesty from its inception that it was boycotted by the United

⁸ <http://www.unwatch.org/site/c.bdKKISNqEmG/b.3820041/#1st>

States until Barack Obama decided this year to join its ranks. This decision by the Obama administration, along with its overtures to Syria, Iran, and other noxious regimes, lent a stamp of legitimacy to the hypocrisy of the council and encouraged its malice.

In these sinister developments, which have now stretched over a decade, the world is witnessing a reprise of the 1930s, when the Nazis devised a “final solution” to the “Jewish problem,” and the civilized world did nothing to halt its implementation. This time, the solution is being proposed in front of the entire international community, which appears unruffled by the prospect. It has turned its collective back on the Jews, and refuses to recognize the gravity of the threat. Moreover, by enforcing the fiction that there is a “peace process” that needs to be brokered between the sides, and ignoring the overt preparation for Israel’s destruction by the Palestinian side, the “peacemakers” lend their support to its deadly agenda.

For decades now, Israel has been isolated and alone in the community of nations with

one crucial exception. That exception has been the United States, a country on which it has relied for its survival throughout its 60-year history. Every would-be aggressor has understood that the world's most powerful nation was behind Israel and would not let her be destroyed. Every government harboring ill-will toward the Jewish state has had to reckon with the fact that the United States was in Israel's corner. Every vote of condemnation in the United Nations, had to confront a veto by the nation that provides its chief financial support.

Until now.

In the words of a recent Reuters dispatch, “Under President Barack Obama, the United States no longer provides Israel with automatic support at the United Nations where the Jewish state faces a constant barrage of criticism and condemnation. The subtle but noticeable shift in the U.S. approach to its Middle East ally comes amid what some analysts describe as one of the most serious crises in U.S.-Israel relations in years.”⁹

⁹ <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE6570SP20100608>

The Relationship Fractures

This change first became apparent during an official visit to Jerusalem visit by Vice President Biden earlier this year. On March 9, The Vice President arrived for a dinner at the home of the Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu nearly two hours late. His tardiness was not accidental but a calculated diplomatic slight – specifically, a punishment for Israel’s announcement of plans to build 1,600 new homes in a predominantly Jewish section of Jerusalem.¹⁰ The vice president was embarrassed by the announcement.’s being made during his visit.

In fact, the announcement was a routine step, the fourth in a seven-stage bureaucratic approval process for new construction. While its timing might be construed as inopportune, the building of homes in a Jewish neighborhood in Israel’s capital city was hardly an issue to create any sort of problem, let alone to cause a rupture between allies. Nonetheless, Israeli officials, conscious of their dependence on their

¹⁰ <http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/Flash.aspx/182263>

American partners, immediately apologized for any perceived offense.

But the Obama administration would have none of it. As severe reproaches of Israel from top U.S. officials followed, the crisis escalated. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton berated Netanyahu, calling Israel's announcement a "deeply negative signal" for U.S.-Israel ties.¹¹ Senior presidential advisor David Axelrod delivered the same scolding message to an American audience, going on cable news shows to vent the administration's displeasure. Branding Israel's announcement an "affront" and an "insult," Axelrod claimed that Israel had made the "peace process" with the Palestinians much more "difficult."¹²

Unlike Israel's housing announcement, which was made without Netanyahu's knowledge, Washington's response was dictated by President Obama. When the Israeli prime minister arrived in the United States for a meeting with the president that same

11 <http://www.reuters.com/articleidUSN1213959520100312>

12 <http://blogs.abcnews.com/politicalpunch/2010/03/axelrod-israel-settlement-approval-an-affront-insult.html>

month, there was no ceremony in the White House Rose Garden and no posing before press cameras – the usual good-will gestures afforded visiting heads of friendly nations, not to mention long-time allies.

The reception was at least as cold in private. When Netanyahu arrived at the White House for what he thought was going to be a dinner with the president, Obama unceremoniously presented him with a list of demands – including that Israel cease all housing construction in East Jerusalem – and curtly abandoned his guest to have dinner with his wife and daughters in the White House residential wing.¹³ As Obama left the meeting room, he informed his stunned ally that he would “be around” should the Israeli leader change his mind. As the Israeli press reported afterwards, “There is no humiliation exercise that the Americans did not try on the prime minister and his entourage.”¹⁴ *Washington Post* columnist and Middle East

13 <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/barackobama/7521391/Obama-snubbed-Netanyahu-for-dinner-with-Michelle-and-the-girls-Israelis-claim.html>

14 <http://tinyurl.com/3xxz5wq>

expert Jackson Diehl was even more blunt, writing that “Netanyahu is being treated [by Obama] as if he were an unsavory Third World dictator.”¹⁵

Contrary to the administration’s insistence that Israel was jeopardizing peace by encroaching on negotiable terrain, the construction site in Jerusalem was anything but disputed territory. Jerusalem is Israel’s capital and the construction site is in Ramat Shlomo a Jewish neighborhood. Housing construction had been underway in Ramat Shlomo since the early 1990s, and it would remain part of Israel in any conceivable peace settlement.¹⁶ Consequently, when Netanyahu had agreed under pressure to a partial ten month freeze on settlements in the disputed territories, he specifically *excluded* Jerusalem. By its insistence that Israel cease all building in East Jerusalem, it was the Obama administration, not Israel that was breaking with precedent, and opening up the political center of Israel itself to Palestinian claims.

15 http://voices.washingtonpost.com/postpartisan/2010/03/obama_and_netanyahu_pointless.html

16 <http://www.jpost.com/Israel/Article.aspx?id=170707>

In opposing Israeli construction in a Jewish neighborhood in Jerusalem, the Obama administration embraced a version of Middle Eastern history that directly lent itself to the Arab war against the Jewish state. In the Arab narrative justifying that war, Jerusalem is alleged to occupy a central place in the history of Muslims and Arabs. In the same narrative Jerusalem is claimed as the capital of a future Palestinian state. But the spiritual centrality of Jerusalem for Muslims is in fact a relatively recent claim and dubious on its face, while the religious claims are by-products of Muslim military conquests.

The Prophet Mohammed never visited Jerusalem and consequently Jerusalem is never mentioned in the Koran. Today even Islamists regard it as only the third holiest city in Islam, after Mecca and Medina. It was never the capital of any Arab state. Indeed, for centuries, Jerusalem was a forgotten city to most Arabs, and it was allowed to fall into ruin under Ottoman rule, which lasted until the creation of Israel and Jordan in the aftermath of the First World War. On a trip to Jerusalem in 1867, Mark Twain despaired that the city “has lost all

its grandeur, and is become a pauper village.”¹⁷ When Jordan occupied Jerusalem between 1948 and 1967, it was treated like a backwater. Only one Arab leader, Morocco’s King Hassan, cared enough to pay a visit to the city Muslims involved in the *jihad* against Israel now suggest is an essential part of their history.¹⁸

Origins of the U.S. Turn Against Israel

The sudden fracture in the U.S-Israel relationship in March caught the Israeli government off-guard. But close observers of the Obama administration would have recognized it as the logical endpoint of a series of markers that had been laid down since Obama emerged as a leading presidential contender in 2008. With these markers Obama was signaling a major shift in U.S. policy moving toward the Muslim world and America’s traditional enemies, and away from allies like Israel.

17 Mark Twain, *The Innocents Abroad*, p. 393

18 Dennis Prager, Joseph Telushkin, *Why the Jews? The Reason for Anti-Semitism*, (Simon & Schuster, 2003), p. 168.

The first sign of this shift was visible during a February 2008 presidential debate when Obama sought to differentiate himself from Hillary Clinton, his then opponent and future secretary of state, by announcing that unlike her he would be willing to meet with hostile governments “without preconditions.” It was a position he justified by asserting that it was critical for the United States to “talk to its enemies.” This was a rare example of a campaign promise Obama has kept.¹⁹

On entering the White House, Obama quickly moved to set a new tone toward the Arab and Muslim world. His very first call to a foreign leader from the Oval Office was to Palestinian president Mahmoud Abbas, and it was not an effort to dissuade Abbas from his support for terrorism or his opposition to the existence of a Jewish state.²⁰ One of the first interviews Obama gave, in January 2009, was to the Dubai-based television network al-Arabiya. In it, Obama effectively offered an apology to the Arab world for alleged American misdeeds.

19 <http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/front/5561241.html>

20 http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/us_and_americas/us_elections/article5563280.ece

He assured his interviewer that with him in charge Arab states could look to America as a friend. “My job to the Muslim world is to communicate that the Americans are not your enemy,” Obama said, adding that the United States “sometimes makes mistakes. We have not been perfect.”²¹

It was the first leg of what would become an extensive “apology tour” for America’s sins around the world. In April 2009, he visited Turkey, a NATO ally, which was rapidly –and alarmingly – becoming an Islamist state. addressing its parliament he hailed Turkey as a “true partner,” and suggested that it was the United States that had been the faithless friend. In a not so oblique attack on President Bush, Obama expressed his regret for the “difficulties of these last few years” referring to a strain in relations caused by Turkey’s refusal to allow American troops to deploy from Turkish soil during the war in Iraq. Obama lamented that the “trust that binds us has been strained, and I know that strain is shared in many places where the Muslim faith is practiced.” In

21 <http://edition.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/01/27/obama.arabia/index.html>

other words, Turkey's refusal to help America support the Muslim citizens of Iraq and topple a hated tyranny was a response to America's prejudice *against* Muslims.

In his review of past grievances, Obama did not mention the millions of Muslims –including Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza – who had cheered the 9/11 attacks on U.S. soil by Islamic fanatics. Nor did he complain about the spread of anti-American and anti-Israeli conspiracy theories concerning those attacks in the Muslim world, including Turkey. As recently as 2008, polls found that as many Turks (39 percent) believed the United States or Israel was behind the 9/11 attacks as believed Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda were the culprits.²²

Even more worrisome, Obama used the occasion of his Turkish visit to break with the U.S. policy of treating countries that harbor terrorists as hostile nations. President Bush had declared that there would be no room for neutrality in the war against terror – “You are

22 http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/pdf/sep08/WPO_911_Sep08_quaire.pdf

either with us or against us.” But Obama now assured his listeners in Turkey and throughout the Muslim world that their governments no longer had to choose between America and al-Qaeda. “America’s relationship – with the Muslim world,” Obama said, “cannot and will not be based on opposition to al-Qaeda.”²³

Obama’s pandering to Arab and Muslim sensibilities has already been embarrassingly on display a few days earlier, when he took the step, unprecedented for an American president, of making an elaborate bow to Saudi Arabia’s King Abdullah, ruler of a nation in which it is illegal to carry a Bible or build a church or for women to drive automobiles. The incident took place when President Obama attended the G-20 economic summit in London. When critics decried the president’s subservient gesture to the Arab despot, the administration was caught by surprise and attempted to deny that it had ever taken place. Inconveniently for White House damage control, a video had captured Obama in full obeisant mode.²⁴

23 <http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2009/04/06/obamas-remarks-to-turkish-parliament/tab/article/>

24 <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1077463.html>

Faulty History Fuels the Arab Cause

The shift in Washington's policy toward the Arab world reached a new level in Obama's speech in Cairo two months later. On the one hand, the president defended the U.S. military campaigns in the Middle East as driven by "necessity", condemned the Holocaust denial and Jew hatred that are rife in the Arab world and promoted by its governments; and called on Palestinians to abandon violence against Israel. But these statements were accompanied by others that appear particularly troubling in the light of subsequent administration moves.

While Obama rightly condemned Holocaust denial, he left the impression that Israel's legitimacy derived solely from the legacy of European anti-Semitism and the Nazis' extermination of six million Jews. This echoed the Arab propaganda claim that Israel is a problem created by Europeans and unfairly imposed on the Arab world. Once again Obama was bolstering an Arab myth that served to delegitimize the Jewish state.

The Holocaust is not merely a European

legacy. Arab states such as Iraq and Iran actively sided with Hitler's armies, Arab generals served with Rommel, Hitler's commander in North Africa, and Arab leaders applauded and actively promoted the extermination of the Jews. The founder of the Muslim Brotherhood, Hassan al-Banna, was an admirer of Hitler and had *Mein Kampf* translated into Arabic in the 1930s as a text to guide his followers. The Grand Mufti of Jerusalem and founder of Palestinian nationalism, Haj Amin al-Husseini, was an active and vocal supporter of Hitler's "final solution," and spent the war years in Berlin recruiting Arabs to the Nazi cause. Al-Husseini, a man revered to this day on the West Bank and in Gaza as the George Washington of a Palestinian state, organized anti-Jewish pogroms in the 1920s and 1930s, actively planned to build his own Auschwitz in the Middle East and was thwarted only when Rommel was defeated at El-Alamein.

The Arab canard that Israel is Europe's attempt to unload its problem onto the backs of the Arabs ignores – as did Obama – the fact that Jerusalem has been the spiritual capital of the Jewish people for nearly 3,000 years and

that Jews have lived in their historic homeland continuously for all that time. Jerusalem is at the center of the Jewish spiritual tradition, and Jews have been its largest religious community since 1864. Prime Minister Netanyahu was historically accurate when he admonished Obama, saying that “the Jewish people were building Jerusalem 3,000 years ago, and the Jewish people are building Jerusalem today. Jerusalem is not a settlement. It is our capital.”

In his Cairo speech, Obama also showed little appreciation of the modern history of Israel, a nation that was not built on Arab – let alone “Palestinian” – land. The state of Israel was created out of the ruins of the Turkish Empire.

In 1922, Great Britain created the state of Jordan out of 80 percent of the Palestine Mandate – a geographical, not an ethnic, designation. The territory in the Mandate had been part of the *Turkish* (not Arab) empire for the previous four hundred years. Then in 1948, a U.N. “partition plan” provided equal parts of the remaining Turkish land to Arabs and to

Jews living on the banks of the Jordan River. In this plan, the Jews were assigned 10 percent of the original Palestine Mandate, while the Arabs received 90 percent. None of this land had belonged to a “Palestinian” nation or a Palestinian entity. In the previous 400 years there had never been a province of the Turkish empire called “Palestine.” The entire region out of which Jordan, Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, Israel, Gaza and the West Bank were created was known as “Ottoman Syria.”

In what would prove to be a continuing pattern, the Jews accepted the partition’s grossly unequal terms – their portion consisted of three unconnected slivers of land, of which 60 percent was arid desert. The Arabs, who had already received 80 percent of the Mandate land, rejected their additional portion as they would continue to reject any arrangement that would allow for a Jewish state.

Immediately, five Arab nations launched a war against the Jews, who repelled the Arab attacks and established a Jewish state.²⁵ When

²⁵ Martin Gilbert, *The Routledge Atlas of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, Routledge 2005, 187pp., pp. 36 – 37.

the fighting ended, the parts of the partition that had been earmarked for the Arabs – namely, the West Bank and Gaza– were annexed by Jordan and Egypt, respectively and disappeared from the map.²⁶ There was no protest from the Arab world at the disappearance of “Palestine” into Jordan and Egypt, no Palestine Liberation Organization, no complaint to the U.N. The reason for the silence was that there was no Palestinian identity at the time, no movement for “self-determination,” no “Palestinian” people to make a claim. There were Arabs who lived in the region of the Jordan. But they considered themselves inhabitants of Jordan or of the Syrian province of the former Ottoman Empire. The disappearance of the West Bank and Gaza was an annexation of Arab land by Arab states.

Arab and Western revisionists have turned this history on its head to portray the Jewish war of survival as a racist, imperialist plot to expel “Palestinians” from “Palestine.” This is an utter distortion of the historical record. The term “Palestine Mandate” is a European reference to a geographical section of the

²⁶ Ibid.

defeated Turkish empire. The claim that there was a Palestinian nation from which ethnic Palestinians were expelled and which Israel now “occupies” illegally is a political lie.

In 1967, the Arab states attacked Israel again with the express aim of “pushing the Jews into the sea.” Again they were defeated. And once again defeat did not prompt the Arab states to make peace or to abandon their efforts to destroy Israel. At an August 1967 summit in Khartoum, Arab leaders declared that they would accept “no peace, no recognition, and no negotiations” with Israel. This is the permanent Arab war against Israel. It is a war driven by religious and ethnic hate, which is the only durable cause of the conflict in the Middle East.

It is hardly surprising given this historical reality that Israel should regard with skepticism the Arab demands that Israel surrender territory it captured in defending itself against Arab aggression. As Prime Minister Netanyahu has said, “What kind of moral position is it to say that the failed aggressor should be given back all the territory

from which he launched his attack?” In fact, of no other nation that has been victimized – and victimized repeatedly – by aggressors is such a concession demanded.

Yet Israeli concession—including an agreement not to build houses for its own people in its own capital – are precisely what the Obama administration is demanding a precondition of peace. It is ostensibly doing so on the dubious assumption that if only Israel would make further concessions to the Palestinians, peace would be possible. But this assumption flies in the face of 60 years of continuous Arab aggression, including unrelenting terror attacks against Israeli civilians and explicit commitments to wipe out the Jewish state.

The very idea that Israeli settlements (let alone Jewish houses in Jewish neighborhoods) are an obstacle to peace perpetuates the mythical claims of the Arab cause. There are a million Arabs settled in Israel, and they enjoy more rights as Israeli citizens than do the Arab citizens of any Arab Muslim state. So why are the settlements of a few hundred

thousand Jews on the West Bank a problem? The only possible answer is Jew hatred, the desire to make the West Bank *Judenrein*, and ultimately the 60-year Arab campaign to push the Jews into the sea.

The Obama administration's pressure on Israel to give up its settlements – or to concede that its capital is disputed terrain – feeds the inherent racism of the Arab cause and undermines Israel's ability to resist the genocidal campaign against it. Such pressure cannot promote peace negotiations when the other party is openly dedicated to Israel's destruction and has already shown that it will derail even the most generous offers of peace (as when Arafat rejected the Clinton-Barak 2000 plan). Its immediate consequences are to reinforce Palestinian intransigence, escalate Palestinian demands, incite Palestinian violence, and accelerate the drift toward a Middle East war.

Directly following the Obama administration's attacks on Israel's building project in Jerusalem, the Palestinians invoked Israeli intransigence as a pretext for pulling out of

the indirect peace talks that had been taking place. Palestinian president Mahmoud Abbas further went on record as refusing to enter into direct talks with Israel unless it instituted an immediate construction freeze in its own capital city. Palestinians had previously participated in talks without that condition, but, as one observer noted, “How could the Palestinian position be softer on Israel than the American position? Of course the Palestinians would have to hold Israel to the newly raised standards of the Obama administration.”²⁷ In this way, did the Obama administration further the efforts of the Arabs to dismantle the Jewish state.

Observers of this ominous development warned that by attacking Israel over settlements the administration was encouraging a violent buildup that could eventually erupt into a third *Intifada*. A Hebrew-speaking Arab protester interviewed on Israeli radio called for armed resistance against Israel’s “assault on Jerusalem,” declaring that the time had come

27 <http://www.jewishpolicycenter.org/1628/obama-effect-in-muslim-world>

for a new *Intifada*.²⁸ The call was taken up by Hamas, which declared a “day of rage” to lash out against Israel. Arab rioters protested in the streets, hurled stones at buses, cars and police, and clashed with Israeli security forces. On Israel’s Highway 443, connecting Jerusalem with the city of Modi’in, Israeli Arabs firebombed passing motorists, with one attack wounding a father and his nine-month old infant.²⁹ Arab parliamentarians in the Israeli Knesset further fueled the violence echoing the Obama administration, one of them said, “Anyone who builds settlements in Jerusalem is digging a grave for peace.”³⁰

Emboldening Iran

Even as the new Obama policies were igniting tinderboxes in the Palestinian territories, their most dangerous effects were being felt in Iran. From the beginning of his presidency, Obama had made “reaching out”

28 <http://danielgordis.org/2010/03/26/obama-intifada/>

29 <http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/136490>

30 <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1156775.html>

to the Iranian police state a major part of his approach to the Middle East. In March 2009, Obama addressed a special Persian New Year message to the Iranian people and the leaders of what he called the “Islamic Republic of Iran,” itself an ingratiating reference that served to legitimize the totalitarian rule imposed on the country by the 1979 overthrow of the shah. Doubly shameful were Obama’s direct appeals to the *mullahs*, whom he urged to move the “Islamic Republic of Iran to take its rightful place in the community of nations.” At the time, Iran’s rulers were engaging in surrogate wars against the United States in Iraq and Afghanistan, supplying al-Qaeda and the Taliban with IEDs, which were the principal cause of the American deaths there. The contrast between Obama’s appeasement of this enemy and his aggressive displeasure toward a democratic ally could not have been more striking. It sent a dangerous message to the many other dictatorships and hostile forces in the Middle East.

Obama’s apologists insist that his message was no different from those that President Bush had previously delivered on the

Persian New Year. But an actual reading of Bush's messages reveals the absurdity of the comparison.³¹ Unlike Obama, Bush addressed his words directly to the Iranian people, not to the oppressive Iranian regime, which he condemned for pursuing nuclear weapons and depriving its citizens of the right to "live in a free society." The word freedom appeared three times in one of Bush's messages. It did not appear once in Obama's. Confronting Iran's defiance of the world community, its determination to build nuclear weapons and its brutal suppression of its own people, would have interfered with the overtures Obama was making towards a criminal regime.

In May 2009, Obama sent a personal letter to Iran's "supreme leader," the Ayatollah Khameni, again disregarding his oppressed subjects. The president's letter appealed for better "co-operation in regional and bilateral relations."³² Khameni ignored the letter. Then, in mid-June, he mentioned it scornfully

31 http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/03/20/AR2009032003512_pf.html

32 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/jun/24/khamenei-obama-letter>

in a sermon in which he inveighed against alleged American interference in Iran's rigged elections that month.³³

Obama's acquiescence in the Iranian regime's brutal suppression of the opposition during its presidential elections demonstrated how far the White House was willing to compromise its values in the interests of an elusive "dialogue" that it had come to value above all else. As pro-democracy protesters shouting, "Death to the dictator!" were being brutally crushed on the streets of Tehran, the Obama administration maintained a deafening silence. There was no official message of solidarity with the demonstrators, no serious admonition to the regime about the right of free assembly, no support for changing a regime that was killing its own citizens while threatening its neighbors. There was no stern warning to an aggressive power that was brazenly defying the international community in racing to acquire nuclear weapons.

After a week of bloodshed and arrests, the

³³ <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/jun/24/khamenei-obama-letter>

closest the administration would come to an official reproach was when Vice President Biden suggested that there was “some real doubt” about Iran’s official elections results – in itself a generous understatement.³⁴ Prior to the election, the victor had run close to his opponent in the polls but when the ballots were counted, Ahmadinejad won in a landslide, claiming more votes than any politician in Iran’s history. However, so that Iran’s thugs would not mistake Biden’s remark for a policy statement, the vice president made it clear that neither the fraudulent election results nor the continuing repression would sway the Obama administration from its single-minded wooing of the regime. “We are ready to talk,” Biden said. Without conditions.³⁵

But the Iranian mullahs were in no mood to compromise. And why should they be? A year of defiance had cost them nothing while gaining them precious time to carry out their designs. Ahmadinejad responded to

34 <http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5j1SSLTi28ydxkun0zvJWLBeNmV0A>

35 <http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5j1SSLTi28ydxkun0zvJWLBeNmV0A>

Biden's wrist slap by attacking America as a "crippled creature" but asserting that it was still an "oppressive system ruling the world." Spurning Washington's outstretched "hand of friendship," he baited Obama with an invitation to take part in a debate about "the injustice done by world arrogance to Muslim nations." Speaking at a staged "victory" rally, Ahmadinejad vowed that he would never negotiate with the United States or any foreign power over his country's nuclear ambitions: "That file is shut, forever."³⁶

Although it was not clear when Iran would finally be able to produce enough enriched uranium for an operational nuclear weapon, the U.S. military warned in April 2010 that the time frame could be as short as a year. Besides its illicit work on a nuclear weapon, Iran continued to develop a range of missiles that made it a regional and even a global threat. For instance, an unclassified Defense Department report released in April estimated that by 2015 Iran could have a missile capable of striking the United States. With a nuclear

³⁶ <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB124502114089613711.html>

arsenal, Iran at last will have a chance to realize its apocalyptic dream of a holy war that will destroy the two countries it calls the source of evil in the world, “the Great Satan and the Little Satan.”

Confronted with fresh evidence of Iran’s defiance, the Obama administration did not so much stick to its guns as offer to lay them down. In April, Obama announced that the United States was no longer going to develop new nuclear weapons and would not use nuclear weapons to retaliate against countries that attacked the U.S. – even if they had used biological or chemical weapons.³⁷ The president’s policy of unilateral nuclear disarmament did include an exception for rogue states like Iran, but given the administration’s track record of backing down in the face of Iranian intransigence, it is difficult to imagine that the warning struck fear in the hearts of the *mullahs*.

With Obama’s charm offensive failing, Washington was left without a strategy, a fact Obama’s own secretary of defense conceded. In April, the press leaked the contents of a

³⁷ <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/06/world/06arms.html>

memorandum written by Defense Secretary Robert Gates to the White House four months earlier. According to the press reports, the memorandum conceded that the U.S. possessed no effective policy to stop Iran from building a nuclear bomb.

Appeasement and the Gathering Clouds of War

Obama's multiple overtures, his apologies for America's actions in the past and his deference to her enemies in the present have not made the world a safer place. His attempts to make Israel – America's most loyal ally in the Middle East and the region's only democratic state – the culprit in the dramas engulfing the region have encouraged the *jihadist* cause both at home and abroad.

It is hardly coincidental, therefore, that Obama's tenure in office has been accompanied by a rash of terrorist assaults. In September 2009, the FBI foiled a plot by three American al-Qaeda recruits to plant homemade bombs on the busiest subway stops in Manhattan during

rush hour. According to Attorney General Eric Holder, the attacks would have been the “most serious” since 9/11. In November, army psychiatrist and *jihadist* Major Nidal Malik Hasan went on a shooting rampage at the army base in Ford Hood, Texas, killing 13 people and wounding 32 others. In December, a 23-year *jihadist* from Nigeria was disarmed by passengers as he tried to blow up Northwest flight 253 over Detroit using explosives he had snuck aboard the plane in his underwear. In May, a Pakistani-born naturalized American citizen, *jihadist* Faisal Shahzad almost succeeded in turning New York’s Times Square into a fiery inferno when he abandoned an SUV rigged to explode there.³⁸

In the midst of these attacks by Islamic fanatics, the Obama administration refuses even to recognize the religious nature of the enemy we face. In testimony before Congress, Attorney General Holder repeatedly refused to make a connection between those terrorist acts and any religious belief, although the

38 <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/7696765/Did-hard-times-create-the-Times-Square-bomber.html>

perpetrators themselves proclaimed their fealty to Islam and the Koran. On a separate occasion, Obama's deputy national security adviser, John Brennan, explained the administration's political correctness: "Nor do we describe our enemy as '*jihadists*' or '*Islamists*' because *jihad* is a holy struggle, a legitimate tenet of Islam, meaning to purify oneself for one's community, and there is nothing holy or legitimate or Islamic about murdering innocent men, women and children"³⁹ – even though many Islamic imams are on record as proclaiming that there is.

Obama insists that the U.S. is not at war with Islam. But it is clear that many Muslims, including the leaders of al-Qaeda, Hezbollah, Hamas and Iran, believe that Islam is at war with the United States and Israel. The name of the ruling party in Gaza, with much innocent blood on its hands, is "Hamas," which stands for "Islamic Resistance Movement." While the Obama administration maintains that Israel's enemies are not engaged in a religious war, the Hamas charter declares in the clearest

³⁹ <http://townhall.com/blog/g/a3d154df-ad054552-b838-8c067247dd81>

possible terms that it is engaged in one mandated by the Prophet Mohammed whose goal is the destruction of Israel and a genocide of its Jews:

The Islamic Resistance Movement aspires to the realization of Allah's promise, no matter how long that should take. The Prophet, Allah bless him and grant him salvation, has said: "The Day of Judgment will not come until Muslims fight the Jews and kill them. When the Jew hides behind the stones and the trees, the stones and trees will say, O Muslim, there is a Jew hiding behind me, come and kill him."⁴⁰

And further: "Israel will exist and will continue to exist until Islam will obliterate it, just as it obliterated others before it."⁴¹

And: "There is no solution for the Palestine

40 <http://www.mideastweb.org/hamas.htm>

41 Ibid.

question except through *jihad*.”⁴²

Because of its diminutive size, Israel is a country with little margin for error. Confronted by 300 million hostile Muslim neighbors, its security depends in no small measure on the perception that it has the inalienable support of the world’s lone superpower. It is this perception that has been gravely undermined by the Obama administration with consequences that are already apparent. It is hardly coincidental, for example, that the United Kingdom chose the precise moment of the row over housing in Jerusalem to expel unnamed Israelis from its territory for an alleged connection to the death of a notorious Hamas arms dealer in Dubai. But it is the regional ramifications of this suddenly weakened U.S.-Israel alliance that are truly worrisome.

It is only because Israel has had an American security umbrella that there has been no conventional war against Israel since 1973. If its enemies perceive Israel to have been cast adrift by America, they will be

⁴² Ibid.

emboldened to try once more the methods that have failed to destroy Israel in the past. Hezbollah is now operating bases and arms depots on Syrian territory, where it is stockpiling long-range Syrian-supplied Scud missiles capable of striking Israeli cities like Jerusalem and Tel Aviv.⁴³ Egypt has begun staging war games in the Sinai Peninsula using large numbers of infantry and artillery units as well as warplanes.⁴⁴ While Egypt has justified the maneuvers as essential to maintain the readiness of its armed forces, many observers see them as a dress rehearsal for war.

The shift toward Islamic militancy and war preparations on Obama's watch is even more pronounced in Turkey. Turkey was once a staunch NATO ally, and a friend to Israel but it has been moving for several years in a radical direction under its Islamist prime minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan. Ignoring this development, Obama chose Turkey as the final stop on his first overseas visit as president, and praised it as a "model for the world." Said

43 <http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3895828,00.html>

44 <http://www.haaretz.com/news/egyptian-army-condu-series-of-war-games-on-sinai-peninsula-1.270380>

Obama: “I’m trying to make a statement about the importance of Turkey, not just to the United States but to the world. I think that where there’s the most promise of building stronger U.S.-Turkish relations is in the recognition that Turkey and the United States can build a model partnership in which a predominantly Christian nation, a predominantly Muslim nation – a Western nation and a nation which straddles two continents, that we can create a model international community that is respectful, that is secure, that is prosperous, that there are not tensions – inevitable tensions between cultures – which I think is extraordinarily important.”⁴⁵

At the very moment Obama was expressing this vapid hope his Turkish host was moving his NATO country closer to the *mullahs* of Iran. While Obama was wooing and being rejected by Iran, the *mullahs* were forming an entente with Turkey that would undermine his efforts to keep them from building a nuclear weapon. Just a year after Obama’s visit, the Turkish prime minister met with his opposite number

⁴⁵ <http://edition.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/04/06/obama.turkey/index.html>

in Brazil to conclude a fuel-swapping deal. The deal effectively allowed Iran to continue enriching uranium for a nuclear weapon. With this newly formed alliance, the *mullahs* would be able to avoid even the ineffective sanctions that the Obama administration had finally come around to considering.⁴⁶

Turkey's embrace of the Middle East's Islamist axis – Syria, Iran, Lebanon, the West Bank and Gaza – occurred simultaneously with an international conference to review the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty. With the United States standing idly by, the conference ignored the chief proliferator, Iran, while singling out Israel as the principal nuclear threat.

These ominous developments were the immediate background to the brazen attempt by Hamas and its new patron, Turkey, to break the arms blockade of Gaza, which was a joint effort by Israel and Egypt to prevent weapons from being smuggled into the

46 <http://www.foxnews.com/world/2010/06/01/brazils-foreign-minister-says-nation-oppose-respect-new-iran-sanctions/>

terrorist state. The six ships that attempted to run the blockade departed from Istanbul and flew under Turkish flags. The flotilla political camouflage – it described its mission as “humanitarian” – was provided by a Turkish non-governmental organization associated with the United Nations and known by the acronym “IHH.” Posing as a humanitarian aid group, the IHH is a well-documented ally of Hamas and al-Qaeda, and was identified in the trial of the “millennium bomber” as playing a key role in the plot to blow up Los Angeles airport. The real mission of the flotilla – to break the weapons blockade – was made transparent when it refused Israel’s offer to unload any humanitarian aid it was carrying at the secure port of Ashdod.

On board one of the vessels, the *Mavi Marmara* were active Turkish terrorists who had been allowed to board without inspection in Istanbul and had vowed on departure to become *jihadist* martyrs.⁴⁷ The terrorist’s armed themselves with steel pipes and knives, and were prepared to attack any Israeli soldiers

47 <http://israelmatzav.blogspot.com/2010/06/idf-names-five-terrorists-on-mavi.html>

who boarded the vessel to enforce the blockade. A principal organizer of the operation was the Free Gaza Movement, which had attempted to break the blockade the previous June. Among its leaders were two close friends and political allies of President Obama, former Weather Underground terrorists, William Ayers and Bernardine Dohrn, who paid a visit to the leader of Hamas after the effort failed.⁴⁸ Also among its company were major Obama donor and supporter Jodie Evans and Saddam Hussein supporter and founder of the pro-Hamas group *Viva Palestine*, British MP George Galloway, along with many other pro-Hamas activists.⁴⁹

Prior to the incident, the Obama White House had exerted serious pressure on Israel to exercise maximum restraint. Consequently, Israeli authorities did not equip the commandos who boarded the ship with riot gear and tear gas, and their side arms were holstered.⁵⁰ They descended from a helicopter armed with paint

48 <http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/blogs/beltway-confidential/ayers-dohrn-helped-organize-flotilla-group-95435639.html>

49 Ibid.

50 <http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2010/06/01/2915586.htm>

ball guns, which proved ineffective against the steel bars and knives. They were quickly overwhelmed by what the media would insist on describing as “peace” activists, who stabbed them, beat them with the steel pipes, threw one of them off the deck and stole two firearms which they began shooting until the other soldiers were able to draw their side arms and fight back. Nine of the belligerents aboard were killed and others wounded; also wounded were six Israeli soldiers, two of whom were in critical condition.⁵¹

An attempt to run a wartime blockade would in other circumstances have resulted in a full armed naval assault. Israel’s restraint was rewarded by international media and governments alike describing the confrontation as a brutal attempt to block a humanitarian aid effort. *Jihadists* immediately seized on the event to further their campaign to de-legitimize the Jewish state. This effort was led by Turkey, the very country behind the provocation and thus responsible for the deaths.

51 <http://www.aipnews.com/talk/forums/thread-view.asp?tid=14674&posts=2>

Prime Minister Erdogan denounced Israel as guilty of “state terrorism” and called the efforts of the Israelis to defend themselves a “bloody massacre.” He then claimed “The heart of humanity has taken one of the heaviest wounds in history.”⁵² (This was from a man who the previous year had defended Sudanese president Omar al-Bashir when he was indicted by the International Criminal Court for killing half a million Sudanese Christians and non-Arab Muslims.) Erdogan called for a *jihad* against Israel, and threatened that the Turkish navy would escort the next attempt to run the blockade. This threat was seconded by Iran, which vowed to send two “humanitarian aid” ships under escort by the Iranian navy. If carried out, this threat would be, in effect, a declaration of war.⁵³

In Hezbollah-controlled Lebanon, a leader of the terrorist organization Fatah, Mounir al-Makdah, said, “The freedom flotilla brings a message of the beginning of the end of Israel.” He announced plans for a mass invasion on Israel’s northern border, using civilians as

52 <http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3899490,00.html>

53 <http://ht.ly/1WdvU>

human shields. “It could be that they will just break through the border, with their children and their elderly;” he explained, “What will Israel be able to do? Even if they kill all those who take part in the march, the number of remaining Palestinians will still be more than all the Jews in the world.”⁵⁴

Far from voicing alarm at the *jihadist* threats or disapproval of Turkey’s aggression, the international community expressed its sympathy for the Islamist runners of the arms blockade. France’s president Nicolas Sarkozy deplored Israel’s “disproportionate use of force,” while Italy’s undersecretary of state for foreign affairs, Stefania Craxi joined the Turks in condemning what she called “the massacre of Gaza.” U.N. secretary general Ban Ki-moon joined in, declaring himself “shocked” at Israel’s actions.⁵⁵

President Obama also failed to condemn Turkey’s role in the incident, and insisted

54 <http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/137992>

55 <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703561604575282740991794622.html>

instead that Israel allow an international body to investigate its actions. Obama then met with Mahmoud Abbas, to promise \$400 million in economic aid to the West Bank and to Gaza -- in other words to shore up the terrorist state and its ruling terrorist party. At the same time, senior officials of the Obama administration began telling foreign governments that the United States would support a U.N. resolution calling for a commission to investigate Israel's (but not Turkey's or Hamas's) role in the incident.⁵⁶

This paved the way for a reprise of the Goldstone report, which had relied on Hamas sources to condemn Israel's defensive war in Gaza the previous year. It was essentially a demand that Israel's right to self-defense be subject to international approval –something no sovereign country could be expected to tolerate.⁵⁷ At the same time, the Obama administration was leaning on Israel to end its naval blockade in favor of some “new approach,” such as an *international* naval

56 <http://www.weeklystandard.com/blogs/sources-obama-administration-support-anti-israel-resolution-un-next-week>

57 <http://www.forbes.com/2010/06/03/israel-gaza-blockade-obama-opinions-contributors-anne-bayefsky.html>

force.⁵⁸ This was an even more direct assault on Israel's right to self-defense. Not only did it challenge Israel's fully justified efforts to keep arms and bomb-making materials out of the hands of the Hamas terrorists, but it shifted responsibility for Israel's security to the same international community that was now savaging the Jewish state for its efforts to stop the flow of arms into the hands of Hamas.

During the year and a half Obama has been in office so far, he has indeed brought change to America and to the world. He has transformed a nation that had been the world's bulwark of democracy and freedom into an enabler of the very forces that are intent on destroying them. He has helped to isolate America's only ally in the Middle East, its sole democracy and most vulnerable people. And he has brought the impending war of annihilation against the "crusaders" and the Jews, which the *jihadists* have promised, measurably closer to its nightmare fruition.

58 <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/04/world/middleeast/04flotilla.html?pagewanted=1&hp>

David Horowitz is the founder of the David Horowitz Freedom Center.

Jacob Laksin is managing editor of Frontpage Magazine. He is co-author, with David Horowitz, of One-Party Classroom: How Radical Professors at America's Top Colleges Indoctrinate Students and Undermine Our Democracy.

