



JUNE  
23  
2008

## PRIDE, SHAME AND BLAME

This is not about Pastor Wright. Much has already been written and said about him. We will have to wait until

November to see what impact his foolishness and venom will have had on the selection of the most powerful single individual on this planet.

This is about the astonishment and joy I felt looking at a Los Angeles Times article on April 30, 2008 that described the negative reaction of a number of black ministers after Pastor Wright's comedic performance at the National Press conference.

What astounded me was the unprecedented criticism of a black leader by other black leaders for his misrepresentation of the black church and his attacks on America. The article quoted a member of one of the largest Los Angeles churches as saying that he had listened to pastors of hundreds of churches nationwide but had never heard pastors curse America or proclaim that the U.S. government caused

AIDS among blacks. His criticism of Pastor Wright was characterized in the article as typical of the reaction within the black community – by pastors as well as by laymen.

So why was I astonished? Because the black community has been practically unique in overlooking and disregarding the sins and shortcomings of other blacks.

I am a Jew. I admit that I feel a certain pride when Jews are singled out for worthwhile accomplishments - winning Nobel Prizes and Oscars, donating to charity and winning Olympic medals. I realize that I have no part in what they do, still I – and other

Jews as well – feel good about it. By the same token, I feel ashamed when Jews commit crimes, are exposed as dishonest or mendacious, take unfair advantage of others or shamelessly misbehave. A corrupt Jewish politician will not get Jewish support. An immoral rabbi will be shunned by his congregation. A Jewish gangster will not be honored by Jewish organizations. A community leader who embezzles communal funds will be dismissed. And most Jews who learn about these bad Jews will feel ashamed and will be vocally

demanding just punishment for Jewish villains.

I am certain that most of the hyphenated Americans – the Italians, Chinese, Vietnamese, Irish, Japanese and all the rest, feel the same way about *their* heroes and *their* villains. The American blacks are an exception.

Here is a headline from the April 24, 1992 Washington Post: "Cheers as Ex-Mayor of Washington Leaves Prison." And then, "The former Mayor of Washington, Marion S. Barry Jr., emerged from prison today. He was greeted by a large crowd of cheering supporters". In 1990, Mr. Barry was arrested for using cocaine, DUI and assault after being videotaped by the FBI. He spent just 6 months in prison after most charges were dropped. He made news in prison when he had a woman perform fellatio on him during visiting hours in full view of everyone there. After his triumphant release in 1992, he ran and was elected to the D.C. City Council. In 1994 he was re-elected as mayor by a large majority.

There is little doubt that O.J. Simpson murdered his wife and the man who delivered pizza on that tragic night. His disgraceful acquittal was greeted with cheers and he still is a hero within the African-American community.

Reverend Al Sharpton is a revered public figure and acknowledged leader of the black

community. He is also a convicted perjurer, an organizer of lynch mobs against Jews in Brooklyn, a liar who invented fictitious crimes against blacks and has built a small fortune by preaching hatred and eagerly rushing everywhere to inflame racial tensions and get publicity from cooperating media.

Another such reverend is Jesse Jackson who has built a fortune by extorting money from corporations by threatening boycotts by the black community for alleged wrongs that somehow disappear when a large donation

is made. He fathered illegitimate children, fleeced his charitable foundation of millions and, with Sharpton, is always in the limelight where alleged racism and hatred of blacks by whites can be exploited.

Rodney King is seen by most blacks as an innocent victim of white police. But another black man who was in the car with him and cooperated with the cops was not assaulted. In 1992 the acquittal of the four policemen sparked riots that caused deaths and massive destruction of the economy of the black area as pogrom mobs burned and looted Korean businesses. Rodney King was later repeatedly arrested for assault on his girl friend and others. There has never been an apology or regret from the black community for the violence and destruction that are remembered as a proud expression of righteous anger.

Detroit mayor Kwame Kilpatrick. After a recent perjury, drug and sex scandal, the City Council didn't allow him to address it and requested that he be fired by the Michigan governor.

where reverend Wright repeated his entire litany of accusations against America and got a standing ovation.

A Jewish crook, Jack Abramoff, will not be greeted by cheering Jews when he is released from prison. He will not be invited by the B'nai B'rith to speak. He is an embarrassment to me and to the Jews.

I can only hope that American blacks will follow-up this recently acknowledged minuscule evidence of shame about their own crooks, evildoers, confidence men and self-appointed leaders.

But I have my doubts. Two weeks after Barack Obama finally denounced his mentor after twenty years of close friendship, love and respect, his black vote percentage is undiminished. Were my joy and my astonish-



The reverends Jackson and Sharpton



D.C. mayor Barry arrested



Detroit mayor Kwame Kilpatrick. After a recent perjury, drug and sex scandal, the City Council didn't allow him to address it and requested that he be fired by the Michigan governor.

# PEACE WITH FRIENDS

Caroline Glck, Jewish World Review, June 13, 2008,

**A must read! A unique analysis by one of the brightest minds in Israel. I think you will find that her conclusions are so obvious and logical that it is amazing that they are not part of the interminable and naïve discussions about the Middle East that keep going on without any results. I wish both our Presidential contenders, as well as Israeli politicians, would read this and think as clearly as Ms. Glick**

THERE'S ONE THING YOU HAVE TO ADMIRE ABOUT THE IRANIANS - THEY ALWAYS TELL YOU JUST WANT THEY THINK OF YOU. THEY NEVER BEAT AROUND THE BUSH.

Tuesday, the day after Iraqi Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki completed his three-day visit to Iran, his envoy to the Islamic Republic received a care package - delivered to his front door. When Iraqi Ambassador Mohammad Majid al Sheikh's driver opened the package, he discovered it was a bomb.

In their best Farsi imitation of the Godfather, Iranian police spokesmen claimed that the package was not a bomb - but aquarium equipment. And in a way, they were right. The package was supposed to help al Sheikh "sleep with the fishes."

Just as is the case with their Syrian allies, the Iranians view assassination as the easiest

expected him to be clear about the untenable state of affairs where Iran wages war against Iraq through proxies on the one hand, and waxes poetic about its great friendship with Iraq on the other.

Writing in Iraq's Al Dustur newspaper ahead of Maliki's visit, Bassim al Sheikh opined, "Maliki's delegation will be presenting the Iranian side with irrefutable evidence of Iranian interference in Iraqi domestic affairs. In this light, the visit could prove to be a watershed in Iraqi-Iranian relations, especially now that the covert game Iran has been playing in Iraq has become all too overt, with very few hidden cards left in Teheran's hand."

Then too, Iraq's Al-Sabah al-Jadid editorialized, "Maliki's visit to Iran could be the last chance for a rational settlement of any differences and a final dissipation of any misunderstanding that may still exist between us and our big neighbor. There is nothing in the lexicon of political pragmatism that will help us evade the consequences of living next door to this neighbor, as recent history has shown with such clarity."

Media reports of the visit included no details of what Maliki told his Iranian hosts. But given their attempt to assassinate his ambassador the day after he left, it can be assumed that the Iranians were uninterested in "a rational settlement of any differences." And indeed, it can be assumed that Maliki didn't mince any words as he discussed the war Iran is waging against his people.

What the media reports of Maliki's visit did highlight was Iran's apoplectic response to Iraq's current negotiations with the US towards an accord on the modalities of the long-term deployment of US forces in

Iraq. The Iranians - from supreme mullah Ayatollah Ali Khamenei to President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad - were absolutely clear that from their perspective, if the Iraqis sign such an agreement, there will be hell to pay.

**The day after Iraqi Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki completed his three-day visit to Iran, a bomb was delivered to Iraqi Ambassador Mohammad Majid al Sheikh. Iranian police claimed that it was not a bomb—just aquarium equipment!**

But the Iraqis have also been clear that they are interested in signing such an accord. While in its coverage of the negotiations, the Western media has concentrated on statements by Iranian-backed Iraqi lawmakers voicing their staunch opposition to the agreement, most Iraqis support it. They simply want to ensure that the agreement that is eventually signed protects their interests as a country. As Iraqi blogger Mohammed Fadil noted last week in an article published at Pajamas Media website, this is why the Iraqi government has "sent delegations to Germany, Japan and South Korea to listen to what they - and not the mullahs - have to say about their experience with long-term US troop presence on their soil"

The strategic agreement now being negotiated between the US and the Iraqi government is a watershed event. Five years after Saddam Hussein's terror-supporting,

weapons of mass destruction seeking regime was brought down by the US-led coalition, a democratically elected Iraqi government has emerged that views its strategic interests as aligned with the US's. Its forces are fighting side by side with US forces towards the shared goal of routing al Qaida and Iranian-backed terror militias in Iraq. Indeed, in March, Maliki himself led the Iraqi assault on the Iranian controlled militias in Basra. Two



**Former Israeli P.M. Sharon had developed a close friendship with Turkish P.M. Erdogan**

way to "signal" their displeasure with various diplomatic developments. In this case, clearly the Iranians were acting out after what they considered to be a deeply disturbing discourse with Maliki.

Until recently, Maliki was viewed with suspicion by many observers due to his apparently warm relations with Iran. Indeed, ahead of his visit, just to make sure he got the message, US military commanders in Iraq stated clearly that they hoped Maliki would protest the fact that Iran is the central engine of the now waning but still murderous insurgency in Iraq. The Iraqi people too,



**Pro-Israel General Yasir Buyukanit is Turkey's Chief of Staff and Commander of Ground Forces.**

months later, Iran had been routed not only in **(See "PEACE WITH FRIENDS" Pg.3)**

## "PEACE WITH FRIENDS" From Pg.2

Basra, but in Sadr City in Baghdad where Iraqi and American forces fought side by side in street after street.

Although referred to as a security agreement, to all intents and purposes, the agreement that the US and Iraq are now negotiating is a peace agreement. As most political theorists will attest, peace agreements are contracts between countries with shared interests whose representatives sit down and

***There is a basic political fact of life that stands at the heart of this theoretical Iraqi-Israeli alliance. Peace is possible for the first time between Israel and Iraq because for the first time, Iraq perceives its own self-interests as aligned with Israel.***

write out how they will advance their shared interests together. So five years after the fall of Saddam, a multi-ethnic, multi-confessional democracy in Iraq has emerged which views the US as its primary ally.

This is what a strategic victory looks like.

Not surprisingly, just as the meaning of developments in Iraq has escaped the notice of most Americans, so too, it has escaped the notice of most Israelis. And this is a shame for two reasons. **First, it is a shame because Israel is missing out on the most significant development in our neighborhood since the Six Day War. And like the Six Day War, Operation Iraqi Freedom holds great opportunities for Israel.** The second reason that Israel's almost complete ignorance of the significance of events in Iraq is a shame is because as Israel moves towards new elections, developments in Iraq point the way towards a new strategic frame-

mass graves of al Qaida victims in Diyala Province to the death squads of Iranian-backed militias in Basra, the Iraqis know that these countries have acted with malice aforethought in their actions aimed at transforming Iraq into a massive killing field.

For Israeli ears, what is striking about the Iraqi discourse is the near total absence of anti-Israel or anti-Semitic propaganda. Indeed, there is no discussion about Israel at all. From the 1930s through the fall of Saddam's regime, Iraq was one of the central propagators of Arab hatred of Israel of both fascist and jihadist pedigrees. Successive Iraqi regimes have used hatred of Israel as a way of solidifying and justifying their tyranny. And now, for the first time, Israel isn't an issue.

The Iraqis are concerned about their future. Whether US forces remain in place for years to come under a President John McCain or they are summarily withdrawn by a President Barack Obama, the Iraqis know that one day they will be on their own. And they will need allies. They cannot trust their Arab neighbors which treat the Shiite majority country now governed democratically with hostility and suspicion. Obviously Iran and Syria aren't good options. They will both be quick to pounce on a post-US withdrawal Iraq.

And then there is Israel.

There is no reason to doubt that Israel has a potential strategic ally in Iraq today. Indeed, Iraq could become the next decade's version of Turkey in the 1990s or Iran in the 1960s and 1970s. Both in their day were Israel's primary regional allies.

Diplomatic and military discussions may be drawn out and difficult. They may even be exasperating. And depending on developments in Iran in the coming years they may never lead to the signing of a peace treaty on the White House lawn or the exchange of ambassadors. On the other hand, they might.

But what is clear enough is that today Iraq shares vital interests with Israel. It has common enemies. It has common challenges as a democracy. And it doesn't hurt that Palestinians are nearly universally reviled by Iraqis who view them as Saddam Hussein's most stalwart henchmen.

An Israeli-Iraqi alliance would help secure Jordan. It would frighten Syria and perhaps force Damascus to reconsider its alliance with Teheran. It would provide Israel with a new source of natural gas and so end its dependence on fickle Egypt. It would mitigate Israel's political isolation in the region. It would provide Iraq with a safe port in the Mediterranean for its oil exports in the event that the Shaaat al Arab is closed by Iran in a future war. Iraqi Shiite leaders could potentially help draw Lebanese Shiites away from

Iran's Lebanese proxy Hizbullah. Indeed, the potential of an Israeli-Iraqi alliance is seemingly endless.

There is a basic political fact of life that stands at the heart of this theoretical Iraqi-Israeli alliance. Peace is possible for the first time between Israel and Iraq because for the first time, Iraq perceives its own self-interests as aligned with Israel. That is, peace is possible because at a very basic level, Iraqis today, whether they admit or not - are Israel's friends. And they know it.

And this raises the larger point that should inform the next Israeli government. Specifically, unlike what Israel's Left has been preaching for the past twenty years, peace is made with friends and not with enemies. It is impossible to make peace with enemies because enemies perceive their interests as being in competition with one another. And since peace agreements are nothing more than codifications of the modalities for acting on perceived shared interests, no peace treaty with an enemy is worth the paper it's written on.

It is hard today to find an Iraqi leader who overtly states his desire for peace with Israel. Mithal Alousi is the one heroic exception. But that is not important. By signing a peace treaty with the US and confronting Iran head-on, the Iraqis are making it abundantly clear where they believe their interests lie. By way

***The Iraqis are concerned about their future. Whether US forces remain in place for years to come under a President John McCain or they are summarily withdrawn by a President Barack Obama, the Iraqis know that one day they will be on their own. And they will need allies.***

of comparison of course, there are Iran's Palestinian and Syrian allies and proxies who claim that they are desirous of peace with Israel at the same time as their actions - and indeed their other statements - make clear that they perceive their interests as antithetical to Israel's interests. As a result, no matter how hard Israel tries, it will be unable to make peace with them - unless the Palestinian and Syrian perception of their interests changes.

There is little doubt that the Olmert-Livni-Barak-Yishai government — which has ignored Iraq throughout its tenure as it has capitulated to Iranian proxy after Iranian proxy — will fail to recognize this opportunity. But the next government's strategies should be informed by the call: ***Give peace with friends a chance!*** \*

Caroline B. Glick is the senior Middle East Fellow at the Center for Security Policy in Washington, DC and the deputy managing editor of The Jerusalem Post.



**6th division of the Iraqi army on parade**

work for the next Israeli government to base its policymaking on.

For months, US commanders in Iraq have been saying that the Iraqi people cannot abide the Iranians, the Syrians or the Saudis. They know that these countries have been the chief sponsors of the insurgencies that have killed tens of thousands of Iraqi citizens over the past five years. From the



# Graffiti for intellectuals

*Simon says*

Southern California Council for Soviet Jews publication  
 (affiliate member of Union of Councils for Soviet Jews)  
 P.O.Box 1542, Studio City, CA 91614      (web: [www.sifrumkin.com](http://www.sifrumkin.com))

JUNE  
 23  
 2008

NON- PROFIT ORG.  
 U.S.POSTAGE  
 PAID  
 STUDIO CITY CA  
 PERMIT NO.62

RETURN SERVICE REQUESTED

Fax: 818-766-4321  
 Phone: 818-769-8862  
[Esfrumkin@roadrunner.com](mailto:Esfrumkin@roadrunner.com)

**[www.sifrumkin.com](http://www.sifrumkin.com)**

## Some facts that Al Gore has conveniently forgotten.....

## Environmentalists' Wild Predictions By Walter E. Williams, 5/7/08

**Now that** another Earth Day has come and gone, let's look at some environmentalist predictions that they would prefer we forget.

At the first Earth Day celebration, in 1969, environmentalist Nigel Calder warned, "*The threat of a new ice age must now stand alongside nuclear war as a likely source of wholesale death and misery for mankind.*" C.C. Wallen of the World Meteorological Organization said, "*The cooling since 1940 has been large enough and consistent enough so that it will not soon be reversed.*"

In 1968, Professor Paul Ehrlich, Vice President Gore's hero and mentor, predicted there would be a major food shortage in the U.S. and "*in the 1970s ... hundreds of millions of people are going to starve to death.*" Ehrlich forecasted that 65 million Americans would die of starvation between 1980 and 1989, and by 1999 the U.S. population would have declined to 22.6 million. Ehrlich's predictions about England were gloomier: "*I would take even money that England will not exist in the year 2000.*"

In 1972, a report was written for the Club of Rome warning the world would run out of gold by 1981, mercury and silver by 1985, tin by 1987 and petroleum, copper, lead and natural gas by 1992. Gordon Taylor, in his 1970 book "The Doomsday Book," said Americans were using 50 percent of the world's resources and "*by 2000 they [Americans] will, if permitted, be using all of them.*" In 1975, the Environmental Fund took out full-page ads warning, "*The World as we know it will likely be ruined by the year 2000.*"

Harvard University biologist George Wald in 1970 warned, "... Civilization will end within 15 or 30 years unless immediate action is



**Caribou frightened by the pipeline? Not!!**

*animals will be extinct."*

It's not just latter-day doomsayers who have been wrong; doomsayers have always been wrong. In 1885, the U.S. Geological Survey announced there was "little or no chance" of oil being discovered in California, and a few years later they said the same about Kansas and

**Without the greenhouse effect, Earth's average temperature would be zero degrees Fahrenheit.**

Texas. In 1939, the U.S. Department of the Interior said American oil supplies would last only another 13 years. In 1949, the Secretary of the Interior said the end of U.S. oil supplies was in sight. Having learned nothing from its earlier erroneous claims, in 1974 the U.S. Geological Survey advised us that the U.S. had only a 10-year supply of natural gas. The fact of the matter, according to the American

*taken against problems facing mankind.*" That was the same year that Sen. Gaylord Nelson warned, in Look Magazine, that by 1995 "... somewhere between 75 and 85 percent of all the species of living

Gas Association, there's a 1,000 to 2,500 year supply.

Here are my questions: In 1970, when environmentalists were making predictions of manmade global cooling and the threat of an ice age and millions of Americans starving to death, what kind of government policy should we have undertaken to prevent such a calamity? When Ehrlich predicted that England would not exist in the year 2000, what steps should the British Parliament have taken in 1970 to prevent such a dire outcome? In 1939, when the U.S. Department of the Interior warned that we only had oil supplies for another 13 years, what actions should President Roosevelt have taken?

Finally, what makes us think that environmental alarmism is any more correct now that they have switched their tune to man-made global warming?

Here are a few facts: Over 95 percent of the greenhouse effect is the result of water vapor in Earth's atmosphere. Without the greenhouse effect, Earth's average temperature would be zero degrees Fahrenheit. Most climate change is a result of the orbital eccentricities of Earth and variations in the sun's output. On top of that, natural wetlands produce more greenhouse gas contributions annually than all human sources combined. Ω