

JINSA and the American Enterprise Institute (AEI), have never remotely supported the creation of an independent state of Palestine. Perle and Bryen have been deeply involved in the various Jewish right-wing and Christian Zionist plots to destroy the Islamic holy sites in Jerusalem on the al-Haram al-Sharif (Temple Mount).

Firestorm of Controversy

Lewin's proposal is so outrageous, that the Israeli government distanced itself from it, through its New York Consulate's media and public affairs officer, Ido Aharoni. But not so, some prominent U.S. Jewish figures, including Harvard Law School's Alan Dershowitz and the Anti-Defamation League's Abe Foxman. Dershowitz argued, according to *Forward*, that the plan represented "a legitimate, if flawed attempt to strike a balance between preventing terrorism and preserving democratic norms." Dershowitz's "counter-proposal": The same level of deterrence could be achieved by levelling the villages of suicide bombers, after residents had been given a chance to evacuate. Foxman "declined to take a stand on the actual proposal," but rejected the notion that Lewin "should be elbowed out of communal life." The chairman of the OU's Institute of Public Affairs, Richard Stone, defended Lewin: "He is not a Kahanist; he is not a nut."

Moderate Jewish intellectuals and leaders disagree. Reform Rabbi Eric Yoffie commented on Lewin's proposal: "The opinion is utterly reprehensible and totally contrary to the most fundamental principles of the Jewish religious tradition, and to everything the state of Israel has been about since its foundation. . . . Don't go down that road, because it is wrong, self-defeating, and dangerous for Israel."

Jeremy Burton, a member of the editorial board of *Sh'ma* itself, argued, according to *Forward*, that Lewin "should now be blackballed from organized Jewish life, just as the late Rabbi Meir Kahane was ostracized for calling for the mass deportation of Arabs from Israel."

Brandeis University's Prof. Arthur Green wrote, "I only wonder how long it will take [Lewin], by the force of this proof-text, to go all the way and suggest that the Palestinian nation as a whole has earned the fate of Amalek."

In the same edition of *Sh'ma* in which Lewin's article appeared, Professor Green wrote a companion essay, also on issue of stopping suicide terrorism. Green advocated doing the one thing that the Israeli government of Prime Minister Ariel Sharon has refused to do: "We need to restore hope." Green said that the fear of terrorism cannot reduce Israel to "becoming a barbaric Middle Eastern superstate. The Jewish tradition's most essential moral teaching, that every human being is the image of God, must not fall victim to the bleak times through which we are living."

Green is on the mark. Where are the American calls for Nathan Lewin to be blackballed and ostracized? Or has the United States already become that "barbaric superstate"?

Plans to Attack Iraq Make Saudis Target, Too

by Suzanne Rose

As the Washington climate grows closer and closer to a near-term attack on Iraq, there is a more operational quality to the plans of the "Clash of Civilizations" faction both inside and outside the Bush Administration, to bring down the Saudi monarchy. Saudi-bashing has become as common in Democratic circles, as it has been among Republican hawks. The remarks by Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle (D-S.D.) on the "Fox News Sunday" broadcast, urging President Bush to get tough on the Saudis and dispense with Palestinian Authority President Yasser Arafat, earned headlines in the neo-conservative *Washington Times* on June 17.

There were saner voices at a Capitol Hill forum sponsored by the Middle East Policy Council on June 14. Coming just after President Bush had rebuffed Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak's Washington peace mission, the forum's speakers warned that the drift of U.S. policy could force the Arab League to withdraw its support for Saudi Crown Prince Abdullah's peace plan. The experts, some of them former State Department officials, recognized the revolutionary importance of the Abdullah Plan, which committed the Arab League to recognize the right of Israel to exist as a nation at peace, if it withdraws from territories conquered in 1967.

The Policy Council speakers noted that, in the dangerously escalating crisis in the Middle East, the President is making policy contrary to U.S. national and security interests, in deference to the part of the Republican Party base controlled by the "Christian Right." Mahmoud Fandy, from the National Defense University in Washington, stressed that Saudi Arabia is the center of the Muslim world. with the capability of bringing its co-religionists into support for the peace process. The Abdullah Plan, for example, was fully backed even by Iraq. Fandy called it, "normalization for normalization." "The Arabs are asking Israel to be a normal state with clear borders," he said.

Edward Walker, former Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, said the Abdullah Plan means that, if we can get to peace, it will be accepted in the Arab world. He called it both an offer, and an ultimatum to the rejectionists, the radical movements who see it as in their interest to obstruct any peace with Israel.

Because of U.S. policy and continuous Israeli military action, there is rising pressure in the Arab world to retract support for the plan, said Council president and moderator Charles Freeman. Michael Hudson, professor of Arab Studies and International Relations at Georgetown University, who

had recently returned from the Middle East, underscored the urgency of the peace process, as economic and political conditions are worsening by the day. His remarks were seconded by others. The Arab population is beginning to look at its leaders as toothless, unable to stop Israeli carnage, nor gain any support for their views in Washington.

Freeman concluded, that there really is no rational alternative to the Abdullah Plan, but there are irrational alternatives, and the clock is ticking.

‘Clash of Civilizations’ Warhawks Meet

On the other side, a think-tank base whose drumbeat against Saudi Arabia is crescendoing, is the Hudson Institute in Washington, which held its own forum on June 18, to depict the Saudi Kingdom as a rogue state with no right to exist as a nation. The meeting on “Saudi Arabia and Terrorism,” jointly sponsored by Hudson and the Aspen Institute Berlin, located an attack on Iraq as an “opportunity,” to be followed with the breakup of Saudi Arabia.

Fragmenting and conquering the Arab/Muslim world has been a goal of the geopolitical faction for which Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and Princeton Prof. Bernard Lewis are leading spokesmen, and Saudi Arabia stands in their way. As both a longtime ally of the United States, and the religious center of Islam, it has the capability of becoming a force for peace between the Palestinians and Israelis—and it opposes attacking Iraq. Crown Prince Abdullah’s plan has made his nation a target for destruction by political circles whose theories call for a perpetual religious war, a war which began on Sept. 11.

The Hudson Institute has many tentacles into the Bush Administration and Capitol Hill. It is the base of Sen. John McCain’s (R-Ariz.) former campaign manager, Marshall Whitman, who is promoting a third party “Bull Moose” Presidential candidacy for McCain. Hudson’s rabidly pro-Ariel Sharon Memri Institute is run by Meyrav Wurmser, whose husband, David Wurmser, is the top aide to Assistant Secretary of State for Arms Control John Bolton, and a provocateur of “anti-terrorist wars.”

The “irrational alternatives” warned of by the Middle East Policy Council, were fully on display at the Hudson/Aspen meeting. Sen. Sam Brownback (R-Kan.), who has made a career of bashing Muslims, announced new legislation to deprive Saudi Arabia of military or financial support unless it “renounces terrorism.” Moderator Michael Barone, columnist with *U.S. News & World Report*, pronounced the Saudis evil, and said the Sept. 11 hijackers were motivated by evil Saudi Arabian ideas. The Abdullah Plan was dismissed as a public relations ploy by Dore Gold, a former foreign policy adviser to Likudniks including former Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and current Prime Minister Ariel Sharon.

David Pryce-Jones, senior editor of the *National Review*, portrayed Saudi Arabia and Iraq as tribal conglomerates, which should not be classified as nation-states. Simon Hen-



Saudi Crown Prince Abdullah’s Peace Plan, and his nation, are the immediate targets of Clash of Civilizations factions in Washington, as a result of new doctrines and plans preparing war on Iraq.

derson, author of the book *After King Fahd—Succession in Saudi Arabia*, continued in this vein, proposing a U.S. military intervention in the Saudi Kingdom, to “protect”—this can only mean to grab—its oil supplies.

Chilling Response on Palestinian ‘Transfer’

EIR posed a strategic question to the Hudson Institute’s panel, and got a response with chilling implications for the Middle East. “There are reports circulating,” went the question, “that Sharon intends to forcibly transfer the Palestinians from the West Bank to Jordan under cover of a wider war—most likely an attack on Iraq—and, in collaboration with policy circles who want the upper hand in the U.S., to declare Jordan to be ‘Palestine,’ to extend the Hashemite dynasty (over Iraq). Saudi Arabia would be broken up into religious and ethnic enclaves, and the U.S. would take over the oil fields in the East. People like Bernard Lewis support this. Does anyone on the panel support these imperial policies?”

Henderson replied that he did endorse aspects of this policy. Pryce-Jones said, “This is a plastic hour; there will be an attack. If they go into Iraq, a plastic hour will develop. We are waiting on events. A dramatic outcome is possible. Saudi Arabia may be broken up. The Shi’ites may become an American dependency.”

Then, half-jesting, Pryce-Jones added that Defense Policy Board Chairman “Richard Perle may take over [the administration]. The new order may be coming.”