

**ENDOWMENT FOR MIDDLE EAST TRUTH  
SEPTEMBER 11<sup>TH</sup> MEMORIAL POLICY SEMINAR**

**WELCOME AND MODERATOR:**

SARAH STERN,  
PRESIDENT AND FOUNDER,  
ENDOWMENT FOR MIDDLE EAST TRUTH

**SPEAKERS:**

ALI AL AHMED, DIRECTOR,  
INSTITUTE FOR GULF AFFAIRS

E.J. KIMBALL,  
THE INVESTIGATIVE PROJECT ON TERRORISM

REED RUBINSTEIN,  
ATTORNEY, GREENBERG TRAURIG LAW FIRM

ILAN WEINGLASS,  
EDITOR, TERROR FINANCE BLOG

FRANK GAFFNEY, JR.,  
PRESIDENT, THE CENTER FOR SECURITY POLICY

WINFIELD MYERS,  
DIRECTOR, CAMPUS WATCH

ANDREW COCHRAN,  
CO-CHAIR, THE COUNTERTERRORISM FOUNDATION

SANDRA ALFONSI,  
CHAIR, CURRICULUM WATCH

ANNE KORIN,  
CO-DIRECTOR, INSTITUTE FOR ANALYSIS OF GLOBAL SECURITY

**WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2008**

*Transcript by  
Federal News Service  
Washington, D.C.*

SARAH STERN: I would like to welcome all of you here to the first of the EMET Dr. Miriam and Sheldon G. Adelson Policy Seminar Series on Capitol Hill.

This seminar is dedicated to the memory of the 2,974 Americans who lost their lives on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001. I would like to thank the Adelson Family Foundation for enabling this to happen. As you all know, tomorrow will mark the seventh anniversary of the greatest terrorist attack ever perpetrated on American soil.

We all know that 15 of the 19 hijackers that flew their planes into the Twin Towers and the Pentagon were Saudi nationals. We also know that Osama bin Laden himself was a Saudi national, and was school in the particularly virulent strain of Islam established in the middle 18<sup>th</sup> century by Mohammed Abdel Wahab – Wahhabism, which remains the government-backed and dominantly practiced form of Islam in Saudi Arabia today. We also know that many officials – some from this current administration and some from previous administrations – have described the Saudis as quote, “our moderate allies in the war on terror.” We are here today to examine what exactly the nature of this alliance is.

In December of 2001, a very courageous Saudi woman, Dr. Sahr Muhammad Hatem, wrote a letter that was published in Asharq Alawsat, a British-based Arabic newspaper, where she described quote, “the mentality of each one of us was programmed upon entering school as a child that anyone who is not a Muslim is our enemy, and that the West means enfeeblement, licentiousness, lack of values, and even Jahiliya itself.” Jahiliya is a term used to mean the backward pre-Islamic era. “Anyone who escapes this programming in school encounters it in the mosque, through the media, or from the preachers lurking in every corner,” she wrote.

What is being said, unfortunately, is not just being said in the schools of Riyadh and Mecca, but in Rockville and Memphis. Unfortunately, as we shall soon discover, we have schools here on our very own American soil where this is being taught. And many of us refuse to hear it. The vast Saudi petrol dollar has funded a complicated and intricate educational and public relations empire for the export of Wahhabist ideology throughout the world.

But it is not only some of the Muslim-American schools who preach a Wahhabist curriculum that is of our concern today. Since 1979, Saudi Arabia has poured vast fortunes into the export of Wahhabism throughout the world to the 1.3 billion Muslims making it the dominant expression of Islam. The more we looked, the more we were able to uncover that the vast petrol money machine that funds these Wahhabist schools throughout the world has also successfully encroached upon our American shores, including into many of our most prestigious universities.

To quote the English language daily, Ain al Yaqueen, quote, “the kingdom of Saudi Arabia, under the custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, King Fahd Ibn Abdul Aziz has positively shouldered responsibility and played a promising role in order to raise the banner of Islam all over the globe and raise the Islamic call either inside or outside the kingdom.” As many of you

probably know by now, both Harvard University and Georgetown University have each received a \$20 million gift from Prince Alwaleed bin Talal bin Abdul Aziz al Saud. And millions and millions of Saudi petrol dollars have been showered onto lesser-known universities, including \$20 million to the University of Arkansas, \$11 million to Cornell University, \$5 million to the University of California at Berkeley, and the list goes on and on and on.

One might do very well to ask in a country where the literacy rate is 35 to 50 percent of the population, why are they so concerned with the education of our American young? Well, the answer is simple. The Saudis have grown to realize that this is a very effective means of deflecting attention away from the real root cause of the problems within the Middle East. The real root cause is the fact that the region is replete with tyrannical, autocratic regimes that refuse to develop their nations' educational system and infrastructures. And instead, indoctrinate their children's mind with a hate-filled curriculum condemning their own people to perpetuate lives of poverty and of ignorance.

While doing that, they have successfully managed to indoctrinate many in the West to erroneously believe the fact that the real root cause of the problem is the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. By endowing chairs and departments on campuses all across the nation and by influencing the curriculum at the hearts and minds of the next generation of Americans across this country, they have used their vast wealthy as a means of quote, unquote "changing the subject" of focus away from their abysmal record of human rights and complete tyranny.

And we all know that you get what you pay for. One might also do well to ask how many pieces of serious scholarship have come out of American universities openly and objectively criticizing the Saudi regime? And how many have focused on the Israeli-Palestinian question? Just as the Saudi royal kingdom has kept its own people in ignorance and squalor and have used the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as a smokescreen to deflect attention away from their lack of domestic rights or development of their nation's educational and technological infrastructure, they are using the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as a decoy to focus the nation's young minds away from serious scrutiny of their own, as well as other autocratic regimes throughout the region.

The Saudis have become so successful at their expensive PR campaign that it has almost become axiomatic in certain circles that before we can bring democracy to the Middle East, we have to first resolve the Israeli-Palestinian dispute. This is almost laughable if it weren't so tragic. We all know that Israel withdrew from Lebanon in May of 2000, only for it to have become a launching pad and stronghold for Hezbollah, and withdraw from Gaza in the summer of 2006, only to have become a launching pad and a stronghold for Hamas.

The fact is that we would all like a successful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, but the root of the problem in the Middle East is not the size and shape of the map of Israel, so much as it is the implacable hatred that surrounds the Jewish state. And make no mistake; in the eyes of the radical Islamists that hate both nations, Israel is simply the minor Satan. America is the great Satan and the fate of the two nations are inextricably linked.

And we have all learned through our difficult engagement in Iraq that the contours of the map of Israel have absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with the many internecine wars between Muslims, or their quest for regional hegemony, or their deplorable treatment of one another. The more we investigated, the more we realized that we are dealing with a hydra, a many-headed monster with vast tentacles that extended to many aspects of American society.

These tentacles extend into our taxpayer-funded Title VI university-outreach programs that educate American teachers of American children from kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade. They extend into our financial institutions around the country, some of whom have developed programs to become Sharia-compliant. They extend into our penal system, where inmates are being converted into this particularly radical form of Wahhabism Islam by the droves. Their tentacles are even inhibiting the freedom of expression of our American authors and journalists, who are now fearful of violating some Saudi sensitivities with consequences that, at best, might result in being caught up in a multimillion-dollar lawsuit; and at worst, the fear of the loss of one's very own life.

Ladies and gentlemen, September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001, might have been a wakeup call. But we, Americans, have been asleep at the wheel of history because we have allowed this stealth Saudi soft jihad to encroach upon American soil. It is now my profound pleasure to be able to introduce you to our esteemed panel of experts. As you can see from our program, there have been some last-minute cancellations and changes. And I apologize for that.

On our first panel this morning, you will hear from Ali al Ahmed, the director of the Institute for Gulf Affairs, who will talk about the human rights situation in Saudi Arabia and the manner in which the Saudis have waged a successful PR campaign here in our country. You will then hear from E.J. Kimball, the managing director of the Investigative Project on Terrorism, of Steve Emerson fame, who will address how the quote, "mainstream Muslim-American organizations are connected to the Muslim Brotherhood and the Saudi royal family."

On my left, you will next hear from Reed Rubinstein, an attorney, who has successfully prevented CAIR from waging a defamation lawsuit against Andrew Whitehead. And then, we will then hear from Ilan Weinglass, editor of the Terror Finance Blog, who will talk about how the Saudis have managed to intimidate the freedom of expression of our American authors and journalists by shopping around the globe for a court where it is easy to sue for libel, and when you are quote, "guilty until proven innocent." Thank you very much.

ALI AL AHMED: I want to start by paying tribute to the victims of September 11<sup>th</sup>, and obviously, I can't read the 3,000 names, but what touched me in the past few days when I was trying to come up with points to talk about this is the children that we lost that day. There were two sisters that were lost in the Pentagon. And I happened to be here in Washington when that happened, and I got to see the Pentagon on fire. So that was something that will never be erased from my memory.

I want to just read the name of a few children who died that day because we all love children. And you know, you can't not smile when you see a young child. So these are the names and the ages of these young children who were lost that day. Christine Lee Hanson, two;

David Reed Gamboa-Brandhorst, three; Dana Falkenberg, three, and her sister Zoe Falkenberg, eight; and, finally, Juliana Valentine McCourt. These are the young children we lost on that day. And, obviously, we lost so many people on that horrible day who came from different backgrounds and different cultures and religions and countries. And unlike what some people in the Middle East say all the Jews that day didn't attend work because they knew that that was coming. And I think there was about a few hundred Jewish people who died that day.

We are dealing with an important threat to the world and to this country in particular when we talk about Saudi Arabia because what happened on that day is the responsibility of the Saudi government, and I will tell you why. The product that came about al Qaeda – al Qaeda is a part of the Saudi system. And the 15 hijackers of September 11 are the product of the Saudi system. The network and the operation that has created September 11 and the hijackers and al Qaeda is still in place – the same ideology and the same perspectives are there.

I can talk about the godfather of the September 11 hijackers. I was very fortunate to uncover this man's identity through my work in the past seven, eight years. Even before September 11, I was in D.C. working on this – before people started to pay attention to Saudi Arabia. Let me just start to say that we do have a responsibility toward these victims. We really do. This happened in our lifetime, so we do have a responsibility toward them. And I think they are looking down on us and saying, okay, do something, avenge us, bring justice from those people who caused our horrible death that day.

Some of the things I will say may be uncomfortable and unpopular with some of you or with the larger audience because when we owe this responsibility to the victims, we have to speak truth and we have to say the way it is, even if it makes some people uncomfortable. Well, that is okay. First, let me just tell you a brief description of Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia was founded about 70 years ago by a ruling family that considered the country to be a farm that it owns. It owns everything on it – the oil, the people, the land.

And it is the largest absolute monarchy ruled by a family that named the country after its name. And it continues to exploit the population, the wealth, and the country to expand its influence around the world. Instead of building schools in Saudi Arabia, they spend their money to spread their ideology across the globe – not only in the United States. And that is a big subject to speak about.

That country suffers from the worst type of human rights violation. Saudi Arabia, for example, still witnesses the marriage of an eight-year-old girl to a 55- or a 60-year-old man. And it is pretty legal and allowed. Not only that – under the law, if you are 80, you can marry a one-day-old child. It is allowed. You can go and if the father will sell you that child, you can marry her at the age of one day. And it is still allowed under the Saudi justice system. And if you don't believe me, look at "MEMRI."\* You will see the videotape of one of those clerics talking about it.

Saudi Arabia is the only country in the world that continues to have public executions by the sword just like 1400 years ago. They still cut the heads off of criminals or sometimes

---

\* The Middle East Media Research Institute

opponents of the government in public. Its treatment of women is the worst in the world. It is the only country in the world where a woman cannot vote, cannot drive. And in actuality, in law, women are classified as the property of their male guardian. So if you are a woman, no matter how smart you are, you are still owned – must answer to your male guardian, even if he was 15 years old. And it is the only country in the world where apartheid between men and women is the official policy. So the situation of human rights there is one of the most brutal and abysmal in the world.

There are so many incidents of human rights situations that I can go through until noon. But for example, if you are a non-Muslim and you die in Saudi Arabia, you are not allowed to be buried there because you are considered unclean. So you have to be shipped out back to your own country because – and that is the only country in the world that does that. It is the only country in the world that doesn't have cinema – no theater in Saudi Arabia. Afghanistan has theater. Saudi Arabia doesn't have it because it is against the law.

Americans in Saudi Arabia are not allowed to celebrate their religious and national holidays – Fourth of July, Thanksgiving, or Christmas, obviously. So you are talking about a country that the human rights situation is very, very, very, very bad. It has some of the worst textbooks in history because it teaches the students – the five million students that we are at war with everybody, with our Muslim brothers, with the Jews that we need to annihilate completely out of the face of this earth. And we need to be at war with the Christians until the Day of Judgment.

It teaches slavery, it teaches corruption, it teaches that we are allowed to take over the world and take over all of its wealth. And seven years after September 11<sup>th</sup>, that hasn't changed. That has not changed despite our efforts and our reports on this subject. The Saudi penetration of the United States continues until today despite seven years after September 11. Not only the universities that have been bought and silenced by millions of dollars, but we are talking about think tanks, U.S. politicians, and even security agencies.

Louis Freeh, the former head of the FBI today, is now paid by the Saudi government to defend the \$2 billion corruption case of the former Saudi ambassador, Bandar bin Sultan. So we are talking about a threat that is real that is not imaginable. We are talking about the fact that, for example, U.S. agencies have not done their work in pursuing the source of September 11. Their recruiter of September 11 hijackers, Sheikh Ahmed Awaji (ph) where they came down and gave him an oath to death. That man have never been questioned by the Saudi government, nor sought by the U.S. government for questioning.

Not only that – the supporter of al Qaeda and head of an organization that the U.S. accused of killing Americans who are Saudis came to the United States. This is about three months ago – came to the United States. They knew about them. They came here. And they went back unquestioned. There is a guy, Abd al Aziz al Fawzan, a supporter of al Qaeda. He was not only allowed in the U.S., he came on State Department-funded trip. And who is responsible for that? That is the unpopular thing I want to talk about.

You are seeing a problem that the penetration is so severe people are saying nothing about it. Remember after September 11, the bin Laden family members were allowed to fly when everybody was not. These are foreigners who were allowed to fly out of this country when everybody – even you, as congressmen could not fly that day. So they were allowed. And that tells you the amount of problems that we are facing. So we need to do something about it.

Saudi terrorism after September 11 did not decrease. Everybody talks about 15 Saudi hijackers. We should talk about the 2,000 Saudi suicide bombers and terrorists in Iraq that killed the same number, probably, of American soldiers. Most of the suicide bombers in Iraq are Saudis. Most of the foreign terrorists – members of al Qaeda in Iraq are Saudis. Of course a few days ago, we found out the suicide bomber who drove his truck into the Danish embassy in Pakistan was a Saudi. And who allowed this to happen seven years after September 11? It is the Saudi government.

In 2005, we uncovered a tape of a senior Saudi minister, who was telling Saudis to go to Iraq, raise funds to fight the Americans. We put that tape on NBC during the visit of Crown Prince Abdullah, when he was meeting with President Bush – the famous handholding thing. What happened? Nothing happened. The man who is the head of the Saudi justice system – he admitted to us that it was him on the tape. He is still in his position. You can recruit and raise funds to support al Qaeda and kill Americans, and you could still be in your position because you are a Saudi official.

When I was in college I thought I am going to create – because I studied political science- some theories for the political science world. And the only thing I came up with was that if you befriend a dictator and you are comfortable with him, between two countries, you start to take in his own habits. And I think this is what happened. The United States is not putting Saudi Arabia under scrutiny for its attacks on the U.S., for its murder of U.S. civilians and soldiers. And why is that? That is a danger to the American democracy and American freedom. And they are allowed to silence you after killing your own people. I am not an American, I am a Saudi here in this country.

But when I see that my government is killing American soldiers and civilians on U.S. land and in Iraq and getting away with it, what do I think? I say is America impotent? Where is Congress? Where is the FBI? Where is Homeland Security? Isn't their job to defend the Constitution and the rights of the Americans? Unfortunately, I was disappointed to be honest. And I have said that to many American officials. My blood is boiling every day when I see that happen – when we provide evidence after evidence.

We can't only complain, but we need to have some action. And the first action, I think we can do to stop Saudi Arabia from inflicting them – and not only against its people that they impoverished, but also to protect your country. I don't think Americans have a responsibility to protect the people of Saudi Arabia. They have a responsibility to protect America. And nobody should blame them after that. Protect your own country. You are not in charge of protecting other countries. So the plan I think that will work is first is to – like we did to Saddam, when we had the inspection – the United Nations inspection team, Saudi Arabia should be subjected to the

same inspection on terrorism because what they have done is worse than any country in the world.

They are responsible for September 11 and they are responsible for the death and mayhem in Iraq. And so we hope that people in this country who defend the United States and freedom and democracy will hopefully get the United States government and other governments, too – have the United Nations establish an inspection team to look and investigate Saudi Arabia. So they can go to Saudi Arabia and look at the networks of terrorists and recruitments that have damaged the world.

Secondly, is to push Saudi Arabia to move away from human right abuses regarding women, religious freedom, all kinds of human rights violations. And substantial reform must take place. After September 11, we actually have the situation in Saudi Arabia worse on the front of human rights and women's rights. So this must change. And this should be public. September 11 Commission did not do that when Saudi Arabia – they kept everything secret. All of this information should be public. Thank you.

E.J. KIMBALL: My presentation is going to be broken down in about five parts. I am going to start with an overview of the Muslim Brotherhood, then show how the Muslim Brotherhood has spread into the United States. I will then move and show how the Saudis are connected to these organizations. Then I am going to go through a little bit about the Holy Land Foundation trial, which I am sure a lot of you are familiar with for there were some incredible documents that were revealed for the first time showing these links. And finally, I am going to talk specifically about one of these mainstream organizations, CAIR.\*

So let's start with the Muslim Brotherhood. As you can see their motto, "Allah is our objective, the prophet is our leader, Qur'an is our law, jihad is our way, dying in the way of Allah is our highest hope." As you can see, this motto conveys the radical nature of the brotherhood. Regardless of how current leaders argue it is peaceful and democratic, clearly if this is what is driving you, it is not.

I want to just give you a brief history of the Muslim Brotherhood – who it is, how it formed. It was founded as an Islamic revivalist movement in 1928 by schoolteacher Hassan al Banna. Its goal is the implementation of Sharia, or Islamic law. Early in its history, it focused on education and charity. But then it became heavily involved in politics and remains a major player on the Egyptian political scene today, despite the fact that it is an illegal organization that was banned in 1948.

The movement has grown exponentially. It had merely about 800 people in 1936. It grew to over 2 million by 1948. And today is pervasive throughout the world with covert and overt branches. As you can see here, the Muslim Brotherhood reach is quite extensive. Every significant Sunni terrorist organization has its roots in the Muslim Brotherhood, which claims to be peaceful and democratic. You can see a few highlights on the right. You can see Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and at the bottom, you have al Qaeda.

---

\* Council on American-Islamic Relations

Mohammed Akef, the Muslim Brotherhood leader, was speaking about his views of America in a PBS Frontline video, which I am going to show you right now. It is a short clip.

(Start clip.)

NARRATOR: The leader of the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, Mohammed Mahdi Akef, is direct about his anger towards the U.S. government.

MOHAMMED MAHDI AKEF: (Via translator.) America is a despotic, heathen government, which does not know religion or a god. There is no dealing with the American government until it changes its policies and its agenda towards Islam.

(End clip.)

MR. KIMBALL: I don't think he is a big fan of the United States. But some may ask, well, maybe this is in the past and his views have changed because people's views sometimes do change. But as recently as May of 2008, Mohammed Akef was asked regarding resistance in jihad, do you consider Obama bin Laden a terrorist or an Islamic mujahid, a holy warrior? His answer in all certainty a mujahid. And I have no doubt in his sincerity in resisting the occupation.

He was then asked about his previous denial about the existence of al Qaeda, and said, the name is an American invention. Al Qaeda is a concept and organization – just comes from tyranny and corruption. And when he was asked whether or not he supports al Qaeda and to what extent, his answer, yes, I support its activities against the occupiers.

The Muslim Brotherhood has spread its tentacles throughout the United States and throughout Europe. This list is not comprehensive; although I am sure you recognize some of the names there. There are others that include IIIT, the International Institute for Islamic Thought, the Muslim Public Affairs Council, and there are others. As you can see a few here, you have CAIR, which I will focus specifically on later in this presentation, which was formed as an outgrowth of the IAP\*. You have the Muslim Students Association, ISNA†, the Muslim American Society, which is also located just a few miles from here in Alexandria, Virginia and was founded in 1993 with the help of a Muslim Brotherhood leader.

In 1962 and '63, the Muslim Student Association was founded by members of the Muslim Brotherhood, who came together at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. Their goal was to spread Islam as students in North America. Two of the founders, Ahmad Totonji and Jamal Barzinji have gone on to have other radical ties. Totonji became a key player in the Muslim Brotherhood-dominated SAR network. The SAR network is in Northern Virginia, as you may know, and federal investigators have alleged that they have financial ties to al Qaeda, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and Hamas. The SAR network is composed of over 100 companies, charities, and organizations with interlocking board of directors.

---

\* Islamic Association for Palestine

† Islamic Society of North America

Jamal Barzinji became the director of IIT, which is located in Northern Virginia and has been under federal investigation for over two years. As you see, NAIT was formed in 1971. It owns the deeds to thousands of mosques and Islamic centers throughout the United States. In 1980 and '81, ISNA was formed. And NAIT\*, now, has become a constituent organization of ISNA. ISNA, by the way, was listed as an unindicted coconspirator in the Holy Land Foundation trial, which I will get to shortly. To recontinue here, you see the Islamic Association of Palestine – CAIR grew out of the Islamic Association of Palestine. In an infamous '93 meeting in Philadelphia, Muslim Brotherhood leaders and Hamas sympathizers discussed ways to derail the recent Oslo Accords. But they also discussed the establishment of a new organization in Washington. And the next year, CAIR was formed.

The next part of the presentation is going to show the links between the Saudis and CAIR. CAIR denies receiving any foreign funding from any sources, from governments, or organizations. However, the evidence just does not support their claim. In a Saudi embassy press release in August, 1999, the Islamic Development Bank, a Saudi-based entity, donated a quarter million dollars toward the purchase of land in D.C. of a headquarters of CAIR. Additionally, CAIR received significant financial support from the World Assembly of Muslim Youth, WAMY, a Saudi-supported group that publishes hateful material. For example, it advises Muslims to quote, “teach our children to love taking revenge on the Jews and the oppressors and make jihad for the sake of Allah.”

WAMY is the world’s largest Muslim youth organization founded in Saudi Arabia in 1972. In December of 1999, WAMY announced at a press conference in Riyadh – where Nihad Awad, CAIR’s executive director was in attendance – stating that it was quote, “extending both moral and financial support to CAIR in its effort to construct a \$3.5-million headquarters in Washington, D.C.” But there is still more. In November, 2002, the Muslim World reported that CAIR and WAMY would cooperate on a million-dollar PR campaign. And then, a half-million-dollar donation from Alwaleed bin Talal for putting Islamic materials into library. Now, while this shows that CAIR’s original statement that they don’t receive any funding from foreign sources does not seem to be accurate, their own leadership has contradicted them. Nihad Awad, in 2006, said quote, “we are planning to meet Prince Alwaleed bin Talal for his financial support to our project. He has been generous in the past.”

Now, we are going to move into section four and talk about the Holy Land Foundation trial a little bit. For those of you that don’t know, the Holy Land Foundation was the largest Muslim charity in the United States, and it was shut down by the Treasury Department in 2001. Last year, there was a trial, and it resulted in a hung jury. The retrial of HLF and five of its former officials is set to begin on Monday with jury selection. They are accused of funneling millions of dollars collected in the United States to a web of Palestinian charities controlled by Hamas. Included as unindicted coconspirators in this trial – CAIR, ISNA, and NAIT. If nothing else, what this case has exposed is the depth of the Muslim Brotherhood activity within the United States.

---

\* North American Islamic Trust

There are many exhibits that were made public showing clear connections, affiliations, and relationships between the Muslim Brotherhood and member organizations in the United States. This first document here is an internal document, which was revealed for the first time at the trial. It details the efforts and goals of the Muslim Brotherhood in the United States, and it describes it as a civilization jihadist process. It was authored by Mohamed Akram, and Akram served on the UASR board of directors.

It lists the Occupied Land Fund, which was the previous name of the Holy Land Foundation, IAP, UASR, along with national Muslim organizations such as ISNA and ICNA, the Islamic Circle of North America – under a list of our organizations and organizations of our friends. This document shows how the Muslim Brotherhood wants to sabotage the United States and how they plan to use U.S.-based groups like CAIR and ISNA and other groups to accomplish their goal.

You look at number one, you have ISNA; number two, the Muslim Student Association; NAIT is listed at number eight. And if you look down a little bit at about number 20, you see MAYA – the Muslim Arab Youth Association. Now, what is the significance of MAYA? Well, they are a Saudi group that was founded with a quarter million dollar donation from the Bin Laden Construction Company. Among its founding board members – none other than Osama bin Laden’s brother, Abdullah. Nabil Sadoun, founder of the United Association for Studies and Research – UASR – which is important to note because they have radical connections with the Muslim Brotherhood here in the United States.

Mohammad Salah, a Hamas operative in Chicago, who is now serving jail time, said in a confession, quote, “the political command of Hamas in the United States is at the United Association for Studies and Research in Springfield, Virginia.”

U.S. government exhibit shows a U.S. government list of CAIR as a member of the Muslim Brotherhood Palestine committee. As you see from the next slide, this is an actual internal Muslim Brotherhood document showing CAIR on the Muslim Brotherhood Palestine committee. Now, these documents should be shown again when the trial gets underway.

Is CAIR the Muslim Brotherhood? How do we know? Well, they told us. And not just did they tell us a while ago, they just told us two weeks ago. Mohammed Habib, the second in command of the Muslim Brotherhood, in an interview said, quote, “I would say yes, there are Muslim Brotherhood members there. There are already existing institutions. There are laws and a constitution that they operate under.” And when the interviewer pushed him and asked him specifically is CAIR the Muslim Brotherhood? Is it connected to you? He tried to wiggle his way out of it and then ultimately answers, yes, you can say that.

But in typical fashion, the next day, he backtracked. He put out on the English-language website that that is not what he meant. He meant that those that share the same moderate Islamic ideology are advocates and yadda, yadda, yadda, that same old story. But the truth had come out. So where are some of these leaders now that formed CAIR and others? You have the Islamic Association of Palestine and the UASR. Some of their leadership have become leaders

of Hamas and CAIR. Mousa Abu Marzook, board member and financial backer of the IAP and founder and director of the UASR. Where is he now? Hamas deputy political bureau chief.

Ahmed Benusa (ph), editor of the Palestine Monitor, an IAP publication, and executive director of UASR. He is now senior political advisor to Ismael Hania. Nihad Awad, Omar Ahmad, and Rafiq Jaber – they were senior leaders of IAP and went on to found and become leaders of CAIR. Mohammed Nibber (ph) and Nabil Sadoun of UASR also went on to become leaders of CAIR. Now, CAIR has had a little trouble with U.S. law. As you can see here, their civil rights coordinator, communication specialist – sentenced to 20 years in jail for weapons charges. Ghassan Elashi founding board member of CAIR Texas serving six-plus years in jail.

You have a fundraiser who has been deported. Their director of community relations – sentenced to jail and then deported. Now, if this is the leadership of an organization, I think it tells you what their goals may be, especially in light of the documents that have come out in the Holy Land Foundation trial.

To sum up, while CAIR tries to portray itself as a mainstream Muslim organization, its former leadership are heads of foreign terrorist organizations. They have been arrested. They have been convicted. And they have been deported. The documents from the Holy Land Foundation trial show that CAIR is the Muslim Brotherhood. And in fact, their own second in command admitted the same.

I have shown some of the Saudi support for terror – clearly. The connection between the Saudis, the Muslim Brotherhood, and CAIR is real. The problem that we face is right in front of us. We just need to open our eyes and believe what we are seeing.

REED RUBINSTEIN: I had the great pleasure and honor, frankly, of representing a fellow by the name of Andrew Whitehead. Some of you may know him. He is a retired U.S. Navy sailor, who after losing friends in the Pentagon on 9/11, started a website called Anti-CAIR. And he started this basically because – as he put it, he was offended at seeing the people from CAIR put up in the media and being represented to the public as simply civil rights – concerned American type civil rights citizens.

When he was reading information put out by – among others – Steve Emerson and Daniel Pipes and a whole host of other folks, suggesting that the truth was something very different. Now, the information from my talk today primarily comes from two lawsuits – one, my suit, CAIR v. Whitehead; and the other- the criminal prosecution – U.S. v. Holy Land Foundation.

A little bit of background about Andrew's case – the nexus of the lawsuit – the motive allegedly for the lawsuit were statements that Andrew had posted charging that CAIR was and is a terrorist-supporting front organization that is partially funded by terrorists. It seeks to overthrow constitutional governments in the United States in favor of an Islamic theocracy. Andrew further stated that CAIR had direct ties to Hamas and received quote, "direct funding from Islamic terrorist-supporting countries."

Now, he had had this website up for frankly a very short period of time. And he didn't get a lot of traffic. And if any of you ever had reason to go to his website, you will see it is not the most – shall we say, visually sophisticated website you are ever going to find. Andrew did this, basically, himself. It was a billboard for him, so to speak. And again, he wasn't terribly well-known – certainly not as well-known as Mr. Emerson or Mr. Pipes or anybody else. But CAIR picked him out for special treatment.

In January of 2004, CAIR sent a letter to Mr. Whitehead – a cease-and-desist letter – threatening him with personal ruin unless he immediately turned off his website. They were going to take his house, you see. And in the letter, and CAIR sent a similar letter to a Cornell student newspaper writer shortly after they went after Andrew. And basically, what it says in summary is take down your website or else. And by the way, if you tell anybody that we are threatening you, we are going to sue you. So Andrew, to his everlasting credit, says screw you guys, takes the letter and posts it on the Internet for everybody to see, which is how we found him.

Sure enough though, in April of 2004, CAIR files a complaint claiming that the statements were in fact, false and defamatory. Now, with respect to the Saudi connection, at approximately this period of time, the Saudis had been very active in London bringing defamation lawsuits as a way of shutting up critics. And they have been successful at it. And we know from documents in my case and other documents that the CAIR leadership cadres very often trot off to the Gulf and to Saudi for visits. We are going to talk about some of that in just a second.

And I don't have a document that I can hand to you and show you and prove this, but my supposition is that certainly the litigation jihad was discussed at that time. And CAIR saw Mr. Whitehead as low-hanging fruit. He was poor. He was powerless. And presumably, presumably, easily cowed. One of the things we know about CAIR – and we know this from wiretap transcripts that were introduced into evidence in the Holy Land Foundation case – and which are in full on your disk for you to review later – is that one of the purposes for forming CAIR, according to Omar Ahmad, the CAIR CEO for many years – and really, as far as I can tell, the intellectual driving force behind the organization – was to have CAIR serve as a conduit for lawsuits right from the get-go. And they have been a litigation machine up until relatively recently.

And as I said, they picked out Mr. Whitehead. They did not go after Dr. Pipes; they did not go after Mr. Emerson. They went after Mr. Whitehead, again, because they believed he was poor, powerless, and easily cowed. But there was thing they didn't count on, and that was Greenberg Traurig.

I do want to try and communicate to you the significance of our willingness to take this case on pro bono. By our lights, this was something that any good American would do. This was a free-speech issue in its purest form. And we did it pro bono – not a penny.

And I want to make a comparison, though, to illustrate how significant this was. I am going to ask you to compare and contrast. Now, this is according to the Washington Times and I

just saw this, and I have incorporated it into this presentation. You may have heard about Gitmo – Guantanamo Bay, right? There has been a lot of litigation that has gone up to the Supreme Court and so forth. And there have been a lot of very prominent law firms representing the inmates at Gitmo – allegedly pro bono – allegedly.

As it turns out, a Kuwait-based foundation called the International Council Bureau, which is funded in part by the Kuwaiti government, paid over \$4 million to U.S. law and PR firms to work for the Gitmo detainees pro bono – at least \$4 million. And who are the firms who are involved? Well, I don't know how many lawyers are in the room, but you may recognize some of these names. Shearman and Sterling – more than a million dollars. When the managing partner of Shearman and Sterling was asked, wait a minute, weren't you doing this pro bono? He says, well, of course, it is pro bono. We should get paid more than we did.

Arnold and Porter, Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP, and an outfit called Levick Strategic Communications. Levick represented Dubai – remember Dubai Ports? And according to the article, Levick quote, “reported contacts with the ACLU for possible collaboration on the orange ribbon movement to shut down Gitmo.” So we didn't get \$4 million from anybody.

Okay, lawsuit is filed. And what do we do? Well, we go after them hammer and tong. We filed hundreds of interrogatory requests for documents and requests for admission – wanted to see basically every document they had, every trip they had ever taken. We wanted to crawl around inside of their underwear drawer and really find what was there. Now, I understand that is really just a disgusting visual. I apologize. But that is what we were doing.

After we filed our initial discovery package, CAIR filed an amended motion for judgment. In Virginia, that is what we call a complaint. It dropped – it dropped the allegations that Mr. Whitehead's statements with respect to CAIR's ties to Hamas, Islamists overseas, and foreign financing were false and defamatory. Okay? So all of a sudden, the allegedly false statements may not have been quite so false. At least, some of them. We got some discovery answers, which were very fascinating, as we will see in a minute, and a motion for a protective order – protective order basically saying they can't get as much as they asked for.

The end of the day, as we see up there, the false and defamatory statements that CAIR was litigating about were the following: one, CAIR is a terrorist-supporting front organization, and two, CAIR seeks to overthrow constitutional government in the United States. Well, I saw that and said thank you very much because front organization, to me, is a very broad term. Now, give me all my stuff. So we just continued to fight. We filed a motion to compel. It is – I can tell you with no hesitation – one of the great filings in any court in history of the United States or the common law system. I encourage you to read it.

And we asked the court to order CAIR to give up their information. Shortly before the hearing on this motion, CAIR settled the case. And the complaint was dismissed with prejudice. There was no apology by Mr. Whitehead. There was no retraction. And the false and defamatory statements that CAIR sued – the statements that CAIR alleged entitled them to ruin Mr. Whitehead. They asked for \$1.35 million in damages because of the things Mr. Whitehead said. All of those statements in their original form are still today posted at Anti-CAIR.

Okay. What is CAIR? Well, I like to let people speak for themselves. They call themselves a Muslim civil liberties and advocacy group with three core goals. One, enhancing understand of Islam; two, promoting justice; and three, empowering American Muslims. They have been quoted in the newspaper as saying, “we are similar to a Muslim NAACP,” which, by the way, I think is a good standard to hold them to.

Now, some of you may be familiar with what I call CAIR-isms. And if you have been following CAIR at all over the years or reading any of the things that Dr. Pipes puts out or Mr. Emerson puts out, you may remember some of this. Islam isn't in America to be equal, but to become dominant. That is Mr. Ahmad, the CAIR founder, who I referenced earlier. CAIR asked to have billboards taken down because they featured a picture of Osama bin Laden with the headline, “the sworn enemy.” CAIR's New York director, at a conference actually here in D.C. or a peace rally, said, I bring to you salaams and greetings from the mujahideen at CAIR.

One of the things you will hear at CAIR rallies, frankly, and we have these on tape. NPR even notes this, so it has to be true. You will hear the chant, O Jews, the army of Mohammed is coming for you. You know, a very nice thing for an immigrant community to be saying when they come to a new place I think. Fighting for freedom, fighting for Islam, that is not suicide. They kill themselves for Islam. That is, again, our friend, Mr. Ahmad speaking to young people at an Islamic Association for Palestine conference.

Now, there are some things they did in court that I thought were very interesting. I asked them a whole series of questions just to see what I got back. I asked them to admit, for example, Hamas murders innocent civilians. And the answer back was objection, whether Hamas is responsible for murder turns on an interpretation of law in foreign jurisdictions. I asked them if they had any communications with Mr. Marzook. And they said they would tell me, but only if they won their protective order.

And I asked them to admit that the Hamas charter, in effect, says what it says. And they objected because they said they were without means to obtain a current, accurate, and reliable copy of the charter. That should tell you a little bit about sort of what they are about.

And I give you more things, basically. One of the things – they likened fundamentalist Muslims giving money to CAIR to Christians giving money to Pat Robertson, Jerry Falwell, the Roman Catholic bishop for the Diocese of Richmond passing the collection plate, and Jewish organizations that seek to spread and support Zionism. So you see, it is all the same. Catholics in Richmond, jihadists, all the same.

But they raised money. I mean, CAIR raised money for HLF, Hamas, for Global Relief Foundation, which according to our Treasury Department, were al Qaeda and Taliban. On the the CAIR website, you will note it says donate to the NYBC emergency relief fund. When you click that link, you went right to Holy Land Foundation – it didn't exist. But they fixed it a week later and then you got specific links.

Okay. Now, I have told you kind of what CAIR says in its own words and how it acts. Now, other people, the New York Times – and just like NPR, we all know the New York Times is never ever, ever wrong. They said that CAIR is partially funded by donors closely identified with wealthy Persian Gulf governments. This, by the way, was a front-page article on March 14, 2007. There was a small band of critics that made a determined, but unsuccessful attempt to link it to Hamas. CAIR and its supporters say its accusers are a small band of people who hate Muslims and deal in half truths. And finally, Mr. MacFarquhar says that he heard from more than one unnamed government official who said this is all McCarthyism – guilt by association.

Well, what was interesting to me, at least, is that one of the big players in this band is the United States Department of Justice because, among other things, the Times did not report – it did not report when CAIR was named an unindicted coconspirator in the Holy Land Foundation case. And it did not report what the government said about CAIR in that case, which is up there for you, and which in full is on your disk – the pleadings the government filed. In Holy Land Foundation, the government says that the court has entered into evidence a wide array of testimonial and documentary evidence expressly linking CAIR and its founders to the greater Hamas-affiliated conspiracy described in the government's case in chief.

That is not just one U.S. attorney, by the way, who is out there off the reservation because just a couple of months later at the end of 2007 in a case called United States v. Bencala (ph) that is filed in the fourth circuit, the government said, from its founding by Muslim Brotherhood leaders, quote, "CAIR conspired with other affiliates of the Muslim Brotherhood to support terrorists." Now, you ain't going to find that in the New York Times. You ain't going to find that in the Washington Post. This is a brief schematic of sort of where CAIR's family, where it comes from. You have heard quite a lot about that already.

You heard reference to memorandum. I give you some of these. The wiretaps are particularly interesting, at least to me, because it gives you a real sense for what these people really think and what they believe. And I give you a couple of quotes – most notably to reduce the Jews' influence. You see, part of CAIR's mission is to reduce Jewish influence in the United States. We need organizations, which include media and research, another for media and public relations, and the third is concerned with money and law.

Those are our friends at CAIR. You should get a sense now of what CAIR really is. It is a top-down political cell organization. It is not a grassroots domestic civil rights group. It ain't the NAACP. And Nihad Awad ain't Martin Luther King. But what it is is a paradigm, I suggest, and a vehicle for radical Islamic political action in America. And it has received quite a lot of funding, as you heard, from the Saudi and the Gulf.

So what do we know? We know that their management travels to the Gulf and to Saudi and has been blessed and solicit support from them. There are apparent ideological connections to Saudi groups. And there are obvious financial connections. There is no question about that whatsoever. But you can see a long-term relationship with WAMY. And you can see also a long-term relationship also with the Muslim World League.

And again, none of these are particularly happy kind of organizations. They all have very unpleasant ideological associations. One of the things that they are very good about telling us – and you have heard, you know, about the financing and how CAIR denied receiving foreign financing. And you have also heard that those denials were lies – that the documents established quite clearly CAIR was receiving foreign money pretty much from the get-go.

The Arab press is much more open about what CAIR is and much more open to reporting the truth than is our own for reasons I frankly don't understand. From gulfnews.com, titled Arabs urged to invest in image building in the United States. Up on the right-hand side is a picture actually of a fellow – a former congressman some of you may recognize, Paul Findley. He is CAIR's favorite Christian, and they trot him around.

“CAIR officials yesterday held discussions with businessmen in Dubai. Parvez Ahmad, CAIR's new CEO called on Arab businesses to make contributions and said, ‘do not think about your contributions as donations. Think about it from the perspective of rate of return. The investment of 50 million will give you billions of dollars in return for 50 years.’”\*

So the question I would like to leave you with is why on earth is the Muslim NAACP promising foreign donors in Saudi and the Gulf billions of dollars of return in the United States in exchange for contributions?

ILAN WEINGLASS:

I am here to speak about libel tourism and some of the legal responses to it. Dr. Rachel Ehrenfield was originally scheduled to speak, but she was unable to make it, and she asked me to speak on her behalf. These libel cases are not won on their merits. They are won through a campaign of legal harassment that completely bypasses our first amendment protections.

There have been some legislative successes recently. On March 31<sup>st</sup>, the New York State legislature unanimously passed the Libel Terrorism Protection Act, also known as Rachel's Law– to protect New York-based publishers and authors from overseas defamation. And in May 2008, the national version of Rachel's Law, known as the Free Speech Protection Act of 2008, was introduced by Peter King and Anthony Weiner in the House and Senators Lieberman and Specter in the Senate. And it has also been cosponsored by Senator Schumer. And it is currently pending before both the House and Senate Judiciary Committees.

The Free Speech Protection Act will bar U.S. courts from enforcing foreign libel judgments if the statements are permitted under United States law. And when passed, the act will permit Dr. Ehrenfield to go back to federal court and force Mahfouz to prove libel on the merits, which means the allegations against him, will literally receive their day in court. His only other choice will be to default, which would be a significant victory – not just for Dr. Ehrenfield, but for anyone researching Saudi funding of threats to the United States.

Now, why is this important? It is important because Mahfouz's suits in London have created the desired chilling effect upon everyone researching terror financing in connection to

---

\* Article from 2006, Parvez Ahmad has recently resigned as CAIR's CEO.

the Middle East. Here are some examples. One author of a book on terror financing who asked to remain anonymous and who is not a resident of Britain was sued in British court for statements he made about Mahfouz. After spending over \$1 million, he gave up and issued a public apology. He expressed privately that he did so simply for financial reasons. He did not have the resources of a billionaire, and he would have to go bankrupt to have a chance of prevailing.

The case of Alms for Jihad was mentioned. The issue is not merely that the book was pulped. Cambridge University Press, which is the oldest publishing house in the world – and it also has an office in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia – issued an abject apology. And it included the following text, quote, “we accept and acknowledge that all of these allegations about you and your family, businesses and charities are entirely and manifestly false,” unquote, and more saying that Mahfouz categorically condemns terrorism and that his money never went to a terrorist organization.

Now, I don't believe that anyone at Cambridge actually believes this. The evidence cited in the book certainly suggests the opposite of that statement. But now there is something official on the record exonerating Mahfouz. A researcher who wants to investigate further simply cannot cite the book since it has been sent to the memory hole. The book's other 300 pages about the links between Islamic charities and terrorism is now pulled off the table. And as in the case of Alms for Jihad, the capitulations are not simply where the writer retracts his or her claims. Sometimes an author will state the exact opposite of what he claimed in his book or his writing.

Take Rohan Gunaratna, for example. He is a phenomenal terrorism analyst. He literally wrote the book on al Qaeda. Well, he also apologized to Mahfouz and issued the following statement, quote, “I withdraw any allegations contained in the Book that you were a financial mainstay of Al Qaeda. I am happy to accept that you abhor terrorism and that you had no part or knowledge of any alleged transfer of funds to support terrorism,” unquote. I don't believe for a minute that he believes that. And the publicly available documentation does not support it. But there it is on the record from a leading authority. That is more facts that are brought off the table. There are over 30 cases like this involving Mahfouz alone.

When the facts about Mahfouz are taken off the record, this has a serious effect on counterterrorism efforts. The case of Yassin al Qadi is worthwhile to mention. Yassin al Qadi was essentially Mahfouz's agent. A few days ago, the European Court of Justice invalidated the European Union's freezing of Qadi's funds. The EU now has to make the case against al Qadi again. And since much of the scholarship and reporting pertaining to Mahfouz pertains to Qadi as well, the EU will have to make the case against him with one hand tied behind its back.

The ultimate issue is not only that facts are snuffed out of existence. Even worse, we have been prevented from discovering new facts and studying threats against us. For instance, one author, who also asked to remain anonymous, had a book contract to investigate Saudi Arabia's influence in the United States – basically, a very in-depth careful study of the subject of this conference. Following Mahfouz's successful campaign of lawsuits, the publisher withdrew the contract telling him that it was simply too risky from a legal standpoint to publish the book.

Now, we will never know what he would have uncovered if he had started researching the book. The information that is squelched goes way beyond any of Mahfouz's alleged terror funding.

The monumental issue of Saudi influence in the United States is given a free pass in this case. We are in a war, and we are not able to gather adequate intelligence on our enemy. In short, there is a compelling national interest to fight libel tourism and to pass the Free Speech Protection Act. Even the U.N. Human Rights Council stated last month – and I am paraphrasing that it was a violation of human rights that British libel laws adversely affected the ability of scholars and journalists to publish their work on matters of serious public interest.

And Andrew McCarthy may have put it best when he wrote, “if the libel tourist is not brought to heel, journalists will hesitate to write about the central national-security challenges of our time.” If this intimidation is allowed to continue, soon conferences like this may not be allowed to take place. The Free Speech Protection Act, which grew out of Rachel's Law, is a remedy to such intimidation. As I mentioned earlier, the act, which has bipartisan sponsorship, is now pending before the House and the Senate.

I would maintain that it is every congressman's duty to the first amendment to pass this bill now before Congress adjourns. And I call on everyone in this room to demand that this bill pass. And just one brief note in closing, the name of the organization sponsoring this conference is the Endowment for Middle East Truth. And the word “emet,” itself means truth in Hebrew. The fight against libel tourism is ultimately a battle for truth. And as Rory Lancman, who sponsored Rachel's Law in New York State – in the New York State assembly put it, “the truth is the most important weapon we have in the war on terror.” Thank you.

Sarah Stern: The second half of the Dr. Miriam and Sheldon G. Adelson Policy Seminar Series dedicated to the memory of those 2,974 Americans who lost their lives on September 11<sup>th</sup>.

What we are going to be discussing this afternoon is the Saudi penetration into our nation's educational and financial infrastructures. Of particular interests to me is how the Saudis have managed to penetrate into the American – the minds of American youngsters either Muslim American or just garden-variety American students.

Before we introduce our other panelists, I would like to inform you about an issue that I have become extremely aware of over the last several years. During the Cold War when we faced the threat of the last great struggle against a hostile regime, folks here in Washington rightfully realized that our nation's youngsters were woefully inadequate in their knowledge of foreign languages and cultures. We needed this knowledge to be able to compete against the Soviet threat and within the global marketplace.

In 1958, therefore, the U.S. government passed the National Defense Act, which was later folded into title six of the Higher Education Act. This act allocated a pot of money, which has grown substantially over the years to the quite robust sum of \$120 million of taxpayers' expense to create area studies or regional studies centers within our nation's campuses. These studies centers include African studies, Asian studies, post-Soviet studies, Middle East studies

centers, and the like. As a result of the collective efforts of this federal investment stemming over five decades, the nation has created a quite formidable and robust regional studies industry.

However, the original intent of the legislation has scarcely been advanced. That intention had been to create a cadre of well-educated American professionals to ensure that the national security needs of our nation are being met. The entire industry of regional studies underwent an intellectual revolution in 1978 when the late professor of comparative literature, Edward Said, wrote a book entitled *Orientalism*. This opened up a Pandora's Box for using education as a means of politicization. In it, he held in suspicion the expertise of any scholar who wasn't a native of that region. *Orientalism* quickly became the dominant intellectual prism through which many of our nation's leading academics and their students viewed the world.

The Said paradigm of post-colonial theory argues that the United States has become the successor to the European colonial powers and is victimizing the people of the Middle East through its oppressive exercise of power either directly or through its proxy, Israel. As Stanley Kurtz of National Review Online has written, the Saudis have ingeniously used a loophole in the law to influence the hearts and minds of American youth. The legislation calls for our title six-funded centers to conduct – or the law, which has passed, calls for our title six taxpayer-funded centers to conduct outreach, teacher training workshops for teachers of kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade.

There is a place called Dar al Islam. The epicenter of this educational complex is a beautiful, tranquil 1,375 rural acre campus set against the serene Sierra Nevada mountain ranges of Abiquiu, New Mexico. I would like you to look this website up on your laptops or computers. It is [www.daralislam.org](http://www.daralislam.org). This compound was founded in 1979 by a wealthy Saudi industrialist in Mecca, Saudi Arabia. On this American campus sits a mosque, a summer camp, a madrasah, a teacher training workshop, and a publishing house. It is within this publishing house that some of the most virulent translations of the Qur'an are published. It is also in this publishing house that are published the curriculum guides for the title six-funded teacher training workshops. Stamped on the back of these curriculum guides is the white star set against the green and blue insignia of Aramco, the Saudi-American oil conglomerate.

So let's review now, as Stanley Kurtz has written a National Review Online in one of his articles, the United States taxpayer gives the money and a federal seal of approval to a university Middle Eastern studies center. The center offers a government-approved, but non-vetted kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade Middle East studies curriculum for America's teachers. But, in fact, the curriculum had been bought and paid for by the Saudis, who may even have trained the personnel who operate the university's outreach programs.

Meanwhile, the American government is asleep at the wheel. At a time when our nation's security interests are being threatened by radical Islam, we have unwittingly subcontracted the education of our American youth to a Saudi-funded program. In a time of war, it is simply unacceptable that our country's national security-related educational requirements to American youngsters are being underwritten by the very nation who has been at the heart of the export of Wahabbist Islam to Muslim students around the globe.

Now, it is my pleasure to introduce you to the second panel of experts, who will address the funding and buying of the American mind. Winfield Myers is the director of the campus watch division of the Middle East Forum. And he will address the Saudi funding of the American college campus and how that has an inhibiting effect of objective scholarship.

Andrew Cochran of the Counterterrorism Blog will address the Islamic Saudi Academy of Northern Virginia, and how the Saudi government, which owns the school, has been using it as a homegrown incubator for radical Islamic terrorism for American-Muslim youngsters.

Dr. Sandra Alfonsi of Curriculum Watch has done a thorough study of the American textbooks used in American public schools throughout the country, and is going to address how certain American Islamic establishment organizations have gotten involved in the vetting process. Thank you very much.

Winfield Myers: I want to begin by disabusing you of the notion – should you have it – that Middle East studies before the arrival of Saudi money in considerably quantities was a rigorously researched pristine field populated by disinterested scholars whose only reason for getting out of bed in the morning was to pursue truth wherever it led. The corruption of Middle East studies predates the arrival of Saudi money. And that is important – in a not too circuitous route, I hope, come back around to that in my conclusion to show and answer the question why is the infusion of Saudi money important? It is not important because it corrupted hundreds, if not thousands of heretofore solid scholars.

It didn't do that. I think you couldn't do that. You probably couldn't buy off thousands of people en masse, who had heretofore been honest. It would be – I am not quite that cynical about American higher education. And I am pretty cynical about American higher education. In fact, what happened – if I can, just take you back and mention more familiar fields to you. If you think about all that you have read that has occurred in American history studies, Western civ, what has occurred to the study of Western civilization, to literary studies in the past 30 or so years. And some of you went to school in that. Some of you may have predated it. I doubt many people could do that because it has gone really for decades and decades – the politicization of higher education.

But Middle East studies is, I think, is most benefit to remember it is part of the humanities. It is part of the general liberal arts. And so it would be asking a great deal to assume that it was unaffected by all of the turmoil in the intellectual revolution, really, that has occurred in the humanities since the 1960s, in particular. There are ways you can predate that, and it will take a long time to go into – but particularly since the '60s. So if you just think of the radicalism of the '60s, more popular fields that you probably know more about are in the news much more. American history, again, literature, get all of the press.

Middle East studies has – before September 11<sup>th</sup> – seen mostly as a rather exotic, esoteric field populated by would-be Indiana Jones types or people who are even perhaps mustier and more manuscript-bound than historians of other fields. I know them. I still have must on me, as a matter of fact. So what happened to Middle East studies? What happened basically is that all of higher ed, and in particular, the humanities and the liberal arts, politicized. They also did, but

it didn't really receive a great deal of attention. Most people didn't think about it prior to September 11<sup>th</sup>.

Edward Said as most of you know – he died in 2003. He was a professor at Columbia. But very crucially, he was a professor English literature. He was not a professor of Middle East studies. And that is important because his intellectual ancestors include people like Michel Foucault, Jacques Lucan, and the Nazi apologist, Paul de Man, and Antonio Gramsci and a great deal of others – very radical scholars. And what you see in their work is fundamentally, I think, a denial of the possibility of reaching truth.

Now, of course, they stated this without a hint of irony dogmatically, which is intellectually incoherent, but that never bothered them. It never bothered their supporters. It doesn't bother the supporters now. So to be dogmatically anti-dogmatic is, I would say, a cardinal vice of the academic left. You will not believe anything because I believe you must not believe anything. And again, stated without a hint of irony – though I think you would probably get into Foucault and think that he was probably laughing in his grave at some people who took him as seriously as they did.

One of those people, though, was Edward Said. And Said wrote a book – many books actually. His earlier works were on literary criticism. But in 1978, he published a book called *Orientalism*. And *Orientalism* – I guess you could say it found fertile ground in Middle East studies because the field had by then been so upended by the same kind of intellectual turmoil that you find in other more popular areas of history, political science, literary studies, religious studies. And it became basically the handbook for professors of Middle East studies. Both those who drank the Said Kool-Aid and believed it, and still believe it, and will believe it to their dying day, and those who more cynically in a careerist mode simply ran with Said's thesis because they knew that was where the future was going to be. And they wanted to advance as far as they could.

So you have a field in which it is taken for granted that truth can't be pursued – again, dogmatically taken for granted that it can't be pursued and Stanley Kurtz has done the best work on title six, so bar none, he is the guy to go read.

A corollary to that is the belief or the assertion, again, utterly anti-intellectual, a historical, easy to disprove, yet believed by thousands that non-Arabs or non-Muslims cannot study Islam or the Middle East in a way that is unbiased and that yields anything approaching truth – forgetting for the moment there is no such thing as truth. Just keep that contradiction in your mind. And so in a sarcastic way, you could sum up Said's thesis as it is a Palestinian thing; you wouldn't understand, I think in a sense this is really what he says.

So Said took on and attempted to undermine – delegitimize perhaps is the best word – generations of scholars who had come before him who had really created the field of Middle East studies as it exists today. The tremendous disservice he did to them is obvious, but among those disservices is that these were by and large people who were very sympathetic to the inhabitants of the Middle East. They were anything but what he called them, which was, in effect, racist colonists representing a hegemonic discourse, which means Western scholarship. They weren't

that at all. They weren't that at all. In fact, they went to bat time, after time, after time for the people in the Middle East against the colonial powers stretching back into the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

So he ignored their work, slandered them, libeled them, willingly ignored the work of most Arabic scholars, as well – whether they wrote in Arabic or English made no difference. When you are writing a political tract, you tend to ignore those who inconvenience your argument by disagreeing with it, let alone disproving it, which is what Edward Said did. And so what occurred is that by the 1980s, Middle East studies had become probably unrecognizable to someone who had died in say, 1940, 1950. They would have felt completely lost had they been able to come back and see what had occurred within the field in which they had spent their lives.

It had moved from philology – literally the love of words – the study of the history of language, the study of manuscripts to agitprop in a lot of ways – far less intellectually rigorous than it had been before. Obviously, for any Westerner to learn Arabic and Aramaic and Hebrew and on, and on, and on – enormous expenditure in time and effort regardless of one's giftedness in language skills. That became in some ways unnecessary. And in fact, Said himself, born in Jerusalem because his parents wanted to be there rather than Cairo when he was born – to give birth – is an example of this.

There is a scholar named Robert Irwin, who has written the great book called *Dangerous Knowledge*, which I would encourage you to read. It came out in '06. And Irwin shows – as others have shown, too – that Said really didn't have that great a command of Arabic until he was an adult when he learned classical Arabic. Arabic wasn't spoken in the Said household except to servants apparently because they were Western. He was actually Protestant – or he was raised Protestant – very proudly secular, but his background was not Islamic at all – it was not Muslim.

So enter the Saudis into a field that has been upended this way that has undergone enormous transformation within the period of one generation. What difference does Saudi money make to this is, I think, the key question. Again, I would argue it didn't change the minds of the people who were its original recipients by and large. But by and large what it did was it gave them a much larger megaphone. It increased their stature. It made them much more important among their peers. It increased their voice. And it let everyone in the field know that, as Martin Kramer said, if you wanted to some day a Saudi prince fly in a tap you on the shoulder, if you have any hope of this happening, you had better watch what you say. You had really better watch out. And if you go after the Saudis, if you turn your scholarly guns on them, then you blow off that possibility. Moreover, I think, and probably more importantly, with the advent of large sums of Saudi money – someone in the first session mentioned the \$20 million given to Arkansas by King Fahd. There was \$20 million, of course, most famously to Georgetown in this area, \$20 million to Harvard, another \$5 million to Harvard – it was quite a sum of money overall given to Middle East studies.

And here I am not talking about Saudi donations to medical schools or biology departments and this kind of thing, which is another thing entirely. But that is not what we are talking about here – just to Middle East studies departments. The upshot of this if you are a professor is that your superiors – at least as counted in the academic pecking order – your

intellectual and social superiors are now endowed with large sums of money. And they set the pace of the field. And centers such as the Prince Alwaleed Center here at Georgetown or the Harvard Center for Middle East Studies or others – whether recipients of Saudi largess or not, set the pace for others to follow.

Academic pecking order is a vicious thing, but it is true. And people can buck it, and the best scholars do, I think, whenever it is called for. But many don't. And of course academics are famously herd-like in their instincts. It is just like the news media. I think that is a perfect analogy to think of the elite media and how they move in lockstep, so that you know, the New York Times won't touch the story on CAIR, the Post won't touch the story on CAIR. And similarly, certain questions that would be directed against Saudi Arabia or the Middle East in general aren't touched by most scholars because that is just not what one does.

It is very easy, I think, to underestimate or to ignore the power of peer pressure within academia and the power of social and professional ostracism within academia is extremely powerful among professors. There are a million ways a dean or a department head can take you down. There is 1,000 tricks that they have at their disposal from refusing to give you raises, to – sorry, John, you are going to have to teach the 6:50 class again this semester, I hate to do that to you, to all sorts of stuff – putting your tests at the end of the semester, being cold shoulder, to being turned down by journals, to having a hard time getting an editor to represent your work. There are a million ways you can become on the outs.

Let me say one word about the quantity of this Saudi Money. Twenty million dollars would be a lot for the think tank at which I work. It would be a lot for any think tank. I mean, the biggest ones in town would obviously love to get a \$20 million donation. But in the world of higher education, it doesn't appear that large because it is an industry. And you really should think of it as an industry that spends hundreds of billions of dollars a year. It is untold money – resources that most industries can't command. And it has still an extraordinarily good reputation by and large.

The proposed budget for 2009 for the National Endowment for the Humanities is \$144 million and change. So that is for everything they do. Twenty million dollars is just for we the people – designed to educate people – educate students and Americans in what century the Civil War occurred and things that so many students don't know anymore. But a \$20 million donation to a humanities department is extraordinary. It is just extraordinary. You just don't get that kind of money. The scientists and the law schools and the business schools – they roll in that all the time. That is not anything terribly usual for a business school to get this kind of donation – particular a top-20, top-25 business school.

No one gives this kind of money to history departments. Believe me, it is just unheard of – or literature departments or religious studies departments. So a \$20 million donation takes the people who are in charge – and I think Prince Alwaleed chose very wisely to choose Georgetown, in particular for all the obvious reasons. It is here in town, it is close to the embassies, it has the prestige of an old and venerated institution. It is a Catholic institution in name, at least, and therefore, inoculates him to some degree. What are you talking about – pro-

Muslim? There are a bunch of Jesuits over here. They don't know anything about Islam. I'm just here to hand out some change to my friends.

But what it does – and come back now to the case of John Esposito, who is the head of the center – is that it gave a guy like John Esposito an opportunity to really be somebody. And Martin Kramer, again, a scholar whose work *Ivory Towers on Sand* is just must reading if you want to understand what has occurred in Middle East studies. It points out that Esposito was pretty much in the hinterlands before this and he spent most of his career – a good bit of his career at the College of Holy Cross up in Massachusetts. Comes down to Georgetown and really adopts before the donation from the prince a view that is very soft on Islamism, so that Esposito, John Voll, who is his right-hand man there, and various other scholars were arguing back in the 1990s that Islamism was, in fact, a path to democracy. That Hamas would be one day a democratic movement, and that we really didn't need to worry about Islamism because these people were reformers. That is why the Saudis hate them, after all, right? They were reformers. They were going to upend this old system.

To be sure, they were reformers of a sort if you want to stretch the meaning of the word. They are reformers with bombs, guns, and airplanes and everything else. But that kind of scholarship never cost him. I mean, he's still – Karen Hughes was reading his books and recommending them. You know, Jim Glassman is there now. I know him some from years ago. I don't know if he has had time or the will or the way to do anything about it – if he has got time left to do it. But it never harmed him. It never harmed his reputation. Quite to the contrary, it helped him surely land this enormous Saudi gift.

Let me close with a couple of words about what has happened in Middle East studies at one particular institution that you doubtless know about, which is Columbia. Columbia is now the home of Rashid Khalidi – compare his scholarship to Bernard Lewis if you want to see what has occurred in the past 30 years to Middle East studies. But recently – just last year, Columbia granted tenure – Barnard College did to Nadia Abu El Haj, a lady whose 2001 book, *Facts on the Ground*, denies an ancient Hebrew presence in Jerusalem. It doesn't say that there were no ancient Hebrews here, but they were just one of many passing tribes. And it was basically Canaanite city and on and on and on. And it has been eviscerated by professional archeologists. It has been reviewed very, very harshly again and again. But she was tenured last year. And really I shouldn't say but she was tenured, I should say that is why she was tenured because in Middle East studies today, it is precisely that kind of resume and that kind of pseudo-scholarship that wins you tenure at prestigious universities.

Her project is part of the project of modern Middle East studies, which is very obviously and it is very transparent. They don't really make that much of a secret of it to deny the legitimacy of the modern state of Israel. We can argue that the ancient Hebrews are just one of many passing tribes and just happen to still be around today. And you went back – well, then, you have stolen the land, you see. So we can show scholarly discourse that the land has been stolen. And this is an enterprise. I mean, they are really not very shy about saying that. Coming up for tenure this year is a guy named Joseph Massad who is intellectually – he is – I'm going to go out on a limb – intellectually he is basically a knuckle dragger compared to Nadia Abu El Haj, of which I mean, he is a thug. He is an intellectual thug.

She was very smart. I have never seen a picture of Nadia Abu El Haj. But I understand she is really quite striking, dresses to kill, this kind of thing. Joseph Massad, leaving aside his physical appearance writes for far left magazines like CounterPunch. He regularly refers to Israel as a racist state. He regularly calls for Israel to basically cease to be a Jewish state. And he does this again, and again, and again, and again. The upshot of that has just made him more of a liability for Columbia.

It is one thing to tenure this beautiful young archeologist. It is quite another – she is really an anthropologist, but that is neither here nor there – it is quite another to tenure someone who spouts off his mouth constantly, you would think. Last year, he was actually denied tenure. He has friends in high places all over – people in the big guns in Middle East studies went to bat for him, and he is going to get a second chance. I don't know how it is going to end. We heard a rumor last year he was not going to be given tenure. There was a quid pro quo for Abu El Haj. Now she has gotten tenure. He has been given a second chance. You can't be surprised if he gets tenure this fall. Who knows? I don't know. I don't have any information on that at all.

Let me close quickly with a quote from Bernard Lewis. Most of you probably know who he is. He is now 92 or 93 years old, professor emeritus at Princeton, a man who oversaw the dissertations of an entire generation of superb Middle East scholars, most of them probably in think tanks at this point because they have been sort of chased out of universities, but a man who is really quite an extraordinary scholar by anybody's standard, knows all the languages, an extremely accomplished person. Speaking this past April, he said – and this is from Congressional Quarterly, and I will just read the sentence that the author used to lead up to Lewis. “One of the world's foremost Islamic scholars warned Friday that Middle Eastern studies programs have been distorted by, ‘a degree of thought control and limitations of freedom of expression without parallel in the Western world since the 18<sup>th</sup> century and in some areas, longer than that.’”

This is not a man given to hyperbole, by the way. He is very understated, in fact – and someone who at every opportunity defends Islam and says that moderate Muslims exist. This is not a radical anti-Muslim scholar. This is by no means a man who is Islamophobe, as the word is now – Lewis went on to say, “it seems to me it is a very dangerous situation because it makes any kind of scholarly discussion of Islam, to say the least, dangerous. Islam and Islamic values now have a level of immunity from comment and criticism in the Western world that Christianity has lost and Judaism never had.” That is exactly right.

I think part of the reason that is the truth is the Saudi money that gives such a megaphone to those practitioners of Middle East studies at elite institutions who really set the pace for the rest of the field. So if you take a field that has already been intellectually eviscerated, in which nihilism is dogmatically promulgated, and you suddenly give these people an enormous sum of money by the standards of their contemporaries, then you have a terrible problem on your hands. And this is where we are today in Middle East studies.

ANDREW COCHRAN: I'm Andrew Cochran. I was the senior oversight counsel for three years for the House Financial Services Committee, during which I investigated terrorist

financing, helped draft Title III of the Patriot Act, investigated Saddam Hussein's hidden assets around the world, et cetera. Seven years ago today I was the lead counsel for a hearing on housing fraud in New York City, and I will not forget, at about this hour, coming back across the bridge towards La Guardia, looking over my right shoulder in the cab, and pointing out to my good friend, my Democratic co-counsel that we could see all the way down the beautiful Twin Towers at the end of Manhattan that were lit with the afternoon sun, and in the background you could see the approaching cold front, a dark line of clouds that would sweep the hot, muggy weather away in the afternoon and leave the skies clear and open for the attacks the next day.

And that metaphor, that vision of the approaching storm that has never left over our shores remains a point of inspiration to me. It's one of the points of inspiration for my starting the Counterterrorism Blog after I left the committee and started representing clients in the counterterrorism and homeland security space. I saw the need for a single website, a gateway to the rest of the community, with multiple experts posting on counterterrorism policies and on terrorism events. We opened January 5<sup>th</sup>, 2005. You can find us at [counterterrorismblog.org](http://counterterrorismblog.org). Our contributing experts include Steve Emerson. We are the only site he posted on until he opened his own website last year. Doug Farah, Evan Kohlman, Daveed Gartenstein-Ross, Matt Levitt – before and after he left Treasury, and before and after he served at Treasury – and many others. One of those, by the way, is Walid Phares, who I can tell you approached John Esposito and Georgetown when they got that money and offered a full range of Islamic studies, a number of possible courses. It was turned down flat. And it's the type of courses he's teaching at Catholic and elsewhere.

So we've seen, and I've seen, both in running the blog and in the community, and as a registered lobbyist and consultant, the impact of Saudi money is far and wide and deep.

It's one thing, you know, for the Saudis to affect a think tank in Washington and another thing to affect their business, and then it's another to affect a school that basically is in your home county. And so, when actions started happening on the Islamic Saudi Academy in May, really some real action for the first time in years, I decided to write on it and try and keep up on it. I've written seven posts on the Counterterrorism Blog. Nina Shea is one of the heroes in this effort. She has been chasing this for a long time, first at Freedom House and now at the United States Committee for International Religious Freedom. And she noted in an op-ed two and a half years ago that in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade, the 8<sup>th</sup> grade students were being taught sentences such as, "The apes are Jews, the people of the Sabbath, while the swine are the Christians, the infidels of the Communion of Jesus."

Now let's fast-forward to this year. In early May it was time for the Islamic Saudi Academy to have its lease renewed by the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors. And the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, on May 19<sup>th</sup>, approved that lease – tried to do it quietly. It got picked up in the local press. And they did so while recognizing some kind of report that they had done, which had some problems with the curricula. But, nevertheless, they renewed the lease. Fairfax County is a governmental unit. I don't know this for certain, but if they don't do this, they're completely derelict in all their contracting obligations. Either explicitly or by reference to the Federal Acquisition Regulations, they have, in that lease and in all their contracts, something called a Termination for Convenience clause. It's known in the acquisition business

as T for C. A governmental unit – the federal government, state government unit, can terminate any contract for mere convenience, with minimal penalties. I don't believe that lease lacks that clause.

I used to be for 11 years I ran a division of auditors for the Office of Inspector General of the Commerce Department. I audited federal contracts and the use of that money, and I know a little bit about contracting. So no one is going to tell me that Fairfax County couldn't cut that lease overnight. But on May 19<sup>th</sup> they renewed the lease and didn't release the report. And I started posting on that the next day as the local reports came out.

On June 11<sup>th</sup>, the International Religious Freedom Commission, that Nina Shea is the director of, released their new report, following up on the report two years ago, in which they really called for the State Department to close the school. That phrase, "The Apes are Jews, the people of the Sabbath, while the swine are the Christians," they are still teaching that at the Islamic Saudi Academy in Fairfax County. They're still teaching that. And in spite of all this, Fairfax County and the State Department have done nothing.

On June 23<sup>rd</sup>, Fairfax County punted this issue back to the State Department. They took no leadership action. On June 24<sup>th</sup>, Congressman Frank Wolf wrote the first of his three letters to the State Department, demanding some action, and adding personal notes such as, "The State Department hasn't been doing its duty." June 24<sup>th</sup>, on or about July 15<sup>th</sup>, on or about August 1<sup>st</sup>, Congressman Wolf has written the State Department demanding a review. He finally asked CRS to do a review of the status of the Islamic Saudi Academy, and they found, as he noted in his last letter – the reason he wrote his last letter – that they are really completely a wholly owned subsidiary of the Saudi Embassy. There is no difference whatsoever. And I talked to Congressman Wolf's office yesterday, and just as happened with the first two letters, there's no response from the State Department – none whatsoever.

Now, back on June 23<sup>rd</sup> I wrote a post on the Counterterrorism Blog that got picked up in the press and I ended up getting interviewed by Fox News over it later that analyzed the most famous graduate of the Islamic Saudi Academy, using the criteria established of the New York Police Department in its seminal study on homegrown radicalization. And here's the language from that study that I applied to Ahmed Omar Abu Ali, the 1999 valedictorian – he was the 1999 valedictorian of the Islamic Saudi Academy, convicted of terrorist offenses, convicted of conspiring to kill President Bush. And, I must say, he got around because when he went overseas to Saudi Arabia, he hooked up with some of the best – or worst depending on your point of view – terrorists in the world, some of the al Qaeda leader types, et cetera. But NYPD notes in their report:

"Most of the same indicators and signatures that were common among the five foreign plots were also common to the three U.S. plots." They compare the U.K. and U.S. plots. "Generally the plot members were male Muslims under the age of 35, local residents and citizens who came from varied ethnic backgrounds. Many, but not all, were the children of immigrants from the Middle East or South Asia, the second generation in the U.S. Significant proportions came from middle-class backgrounds. None were economically destitute. Most had some form of higher education, at least high school graduates if not university students." That's Abu Ali.

You can walk through his life and see where he went through the stages of radicalization all the way to attempted militant action. And this is the problem. To be a little precise with your description, the Saudi government doesn't use ISA as an incubator for homegrown radicalization, but it is an incubator. And the Saudi government bought the books and still buys the books, and the Saudi government does nothing about it. So they allow it, they enable it, they condone it, they fund it, they run it. It's a wholly owned subsidiary, in the corporate records, of the Saudi Embassy.

Who are the two people most responsible for this, two Americans, who should be held accountable? One is Secretary of State Rice. There is no reason why two reports in three years from the official U.S. government Commission on International Religious Freedom should be so blatantly ignored. And the second person is Gerry Connolly, the chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, who has wimped out repeatedly on this issue and fails to exercise what I must believe is the standard clause, either explicitly or by reference, in that lease that allows them to terminate that lease at any point. They've never addressed that point.

So that's where we stand with the Islamic Saudi Academy. I'd like to take a couple minutes briefly to address a couple of other threads.

In August – we suffered a big server crash, unfortunately, in August and lost about six weeks of posts. One of those posts – it was physical; it wasn't a cyber attack. That would have been easy, frankly. One of those posts addressed the FBI-CAIR relationship. In July there was a hearing at Senate Homeland, chaired by Senator Lieberman, and if you sat through that and if you have a background on CAIR you saw the – I want to say willful blindness, willful ignorance of senior members of Congress and a lot of members of the community and the executive branch in dealing with CAIR. Now, let's remember something about its status. It's an unindicted co-conspirator in a federal criminal case, investigated by the FBI and brought by the Justice Department. Now, do you know how often there are unindicted co-conspirators in a federal criminal case? Let me tell you: not many. You can count the famous ones on one hand like, you know, Richard Nixon or – I mean, there are not very many of these.

The U.S. Attorney's Manual actively discourages the naming of unindicted co-conspirators. But there are, you know, a couple of dozen in the HLF case. This is one of the reasons why – this is one of the main reasons why, in my humble opinion, the HLF case is one of the most important terrorism cases ever in this country, because we're going to settle once and for all the status of those unindicted co-conspirators. They either are forever if there is a conviction, or they aren't forever if there is an acquittal. And if they aren't, that's going to be about it. It's off, as far as U.S. governmental units. If they are, if they stand forever as unindicted co-conspirators in a conviction, then there's absolutely no reason, as I wrote in the post, for the FBI to continue its relationship using CAIR for training purposes. And, believe me, five minutes after that verdict's out, you're going to see me write that on the Counterterrorism Blog, that the president and the attorney general ought to yank that.

But, you know, my policy on this, and I've stated this as Senator Lieberman's staff director, is very simple. You know, an unindicted co-conspirators in a federal criminal case

brought by the U.S. Department of Justice should never have a relationship with a Justice Department and almost certainly never with any other unit of the executive branch.

FRANK GAFFNEY:

Talking about the Saudis as our enemies is not generally done in Washington, you may have noticed, so it's heartening to have some truth-telling being told by a foundation dedicated to that proposition.

The two themes that I want to address are Sharia and soft jihad. Sharia is not, in the common parlance, what some Muslims – and it must be acknowledged that some Muslims do regard it as the personal pietistic path to God. Rather, the term has been branded over hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of years, and most especially in the recent past under the ministrations of contemporary Islamists, as the body of Islamic law that governs all aspects of a Muslim's life. I think of it as sort of unified field theory for the universe that runs the gamut, of course, from religious practice all the way to the conduct of family relations, business relations, but most especially the responsibilities of Muslims to their community, and in particular their obligation under this authoritative version of the faith, embraced, enunciated, expounded upon and otherwise advanced by, most especially, the House of Saud and its Wahhabi co-conspirators is jihad, aimed at bringing about an end-state that will, in fact, result in the triumph of Islam worldwide under the rule of a theocracy – the Sunnis call it the Caliphates; the Shia think of it as an ayatollah-dom – but whatever they call it, the ultimate objective across all of the schools of the two major sects is the same, and that is the destruction of Western civilization and all other infidel governments that stand in the way of that ideal golden age of Islam.

Interestingly enough, this is largely a post-Koranic concept. The Koran, as I understand it, refers to Sharia once, and it is in context pretty clear that that is this personal pietistic path to God. The rest of it evolved in the period I think roughly 100 years after Mohammad's death and subsequently as a means of the Caliphs and the leading Islamic scholars defining arrangements that would enable the domination of the faith and all who adhere to it – in other words, very much a political program, aimed, as I say, at bringing about a political outcome.

It is being used today – Sharia – as a tool by the Islamists as sort of the classic totalitarian program, namely to dominate, first and foremost, a small community – in this case the Muslims of the world – and then use that population to dominate the rest. The technique by which this is to be accomplished is jihad, a term that many of us have come to know subsequently particularly to 9/11. We, however, are mostly familiar with, have been mostly thinking about, have been mostly trying to defend against what I think of as the hard form of jihad: terrorism, mass destruction, if possible extreme mass destruction, using weapons designed for that purpose.

At least as worrying is what I think is best described as soft jihad, which is to say a variety of techniques used by the Islamists to advance this program of bringing about the imposition of Sharia, the submission of all to it, though a variety of means that recognize that in certain circumstances – a very pragmatic prescription – in various circumstances it is impossible for Muslims to engage in violent jihad. They'd be wiped out. So where that is not possible, the

adherents to Sharia are enjoined to go forth and use these other techniques. Some of them have been touched on already. They involve practices that run the gamut from political influence operations, not unlike CAIR's, aimed at institutions of federal law enforcement like the FBI.

They involve recruitment and indoctrination on campuses, taking over whole departments for the purpose but also using organizations associated with the Muslim Brotherhood, many of them unindicted co-conspirators also, like the Muslim Students Association, to radicalize populations on campus. They involved the insinuation of Sharia into the workplace: footbaths, prayer rooms, holidays – instead of – for example, Labor Day being designated as Eid by Tyson's Foods plant in Shelbyville recently.

The one that I am most worried about and the most insidious and potentially most deadly of all of the forms of soft jihad that I've come across to date, is something called Sharia-compliant finance. Now, the first clue that there's something wrong with this is that it is Sharia-compliant because if, as I have suggested, Sharia is a criminal conspiracy aimed at the destruction of the United States government and Constitution, among other facets of Western civilization, we should not be promoting programs that are compliant with it in Wall Street or, for that matter, anyplace else, and yet we are. Indeed, this is now an \$800 billion industry, which has stretched its tentacles worldwide, principally in the Mid-East, Far East, and European capital markets, but increasingly every day in our own as well. It's growing, by some estimates, at a rate of 15 to 25 percent per year, powered in no small measure by the immense transfer of wealth that is being done, much of it to the benefit of our so-called Saudi friends in the form of petrodollar transfers, some of it coming back in the form of sovereign wealth investments – sovereign of course in this case meaning not the state but the feudal lords who run these various autocratic regimes in the Mid-East.

It is portrayed as nothing more than just another form of socially responsible investing, sort of the Muslim equivalent of Jewish, Baptist, Methodist, Lutheran, Catholic ethical investments. The idea is that it simply won't involve interest transfers or payments. Of course, there's no such thing as investment without some kind of return on investment that takes into account the time value of money and the problem of risk. So, in fact, it isn't about no interest; it's simply a ruse that is used to justify having a separate kind of program. Of course, it also involves no investment in pork or gambling or tobacco or alcohol. But in the end, all of that is to be determined by Sharia advisors who are employed by the major banks and investment houses for the purposes of determining what transactions would be Sharia-compliant and what would not.

Do I need to tell you the kind of people that these Sharia advisors are? Well, quite reasonably, you know that they embrace Sharia. In fact, they are, in many cases, regarded as the world's preeminent authorities and scholars and arbiters of Sharia. They are, in short, the political commissars of the Islamofascist ideology. They are the people who are determining what can be done and what can't be done, and with few, if any exceptions, they bear the hallmarks of the Muslim Brotherhood, if not the Wahhabis or Deobandis or Salafis. In other words, virulently in favor of jihad. Some have even written in English that it is explicitly the obligation of faithful Muslims to practice it, the violent form, in countries like the United States.

These are people who, under Sharia-compliant finance, we are putting at seats of power and influence in our capital markets. As a product of the Cold War, I can tell you, this is roughly as not just absurd but as insane as putting KGB operatives in a similar position to exercise control over the capital and credit flows of the United States during the height of the Cold War. It's unthinkable that we would have done that, and yet that is precisely what we are doing now under the rubric of Sharia-compliant finance.

These Sharia advisors, there are basically about 30 of them that are the preeminent in the field, hired by all of the big firms. That means that they, on average, have something like 20 to 30 companies that they're advising, each of which pays them between \$10 (thousand) and \$100,000 apiece. So each of them are getting rich, but beyond that, they're able to move funds in the name of tithing, zakat, or purification from the investments that they're governing into their favorite charities. And I need not tell you that their favorite charities are not the United Way or the Federation or the American Red Cross.

This is really, I'm afraid, getting down to the point where if we do not appreciate the magnitude of the peril, this form of soft jihad and what it is enabling – just to give you one example, in addition to pork and tobacco and so on, these Sharia advisors apparently feel that investments in Western defense is considered impure – not defense, mind you. If it's Muslim defense in the Middle East, that's fine, but Western defense. And, again, think about what that means to the protection of this country, made possible in part by the defense sector of our economy.

What do we do about this? First of all, I think we have to raise the level of awareness, and I'm delighted to be able to do that here today. Second of all, we have to recognize, speaking to the topic that is, I think, the thrust of much of this panel's efforts, that institutions like Harvard University, which have an Islamic finance program in the law school where people like Noah Feldman, who thinks Sharia is the best thing to come along in a long time – and written to that effect in the New York Times' Sunday Magazine a couple of months ago – are promoting at every turn Sharia-compliant finance as the next big thing. It is the next big thing, by the way, right after subprime, which it bears a striking similarity to in the sense that, like subprime, it was a black box with very smart people telling you, you don't need to worry about what's in the box, it will make lots of money; trust us. And we've seen how well that's worked out.

The difference here is that while that was a scam and this is a scam, this has as its stated purpose financial jihad, the destruction of our country. Those who are engaged in this activity, whether they know it or not, are exposing themselves to both civil and criminal liability. We have a legal memorandum which our friend Senator Jon Kyl has asked the SEC, the Federal Reserve, the Treasury Department, and the Justice Department to respond to, which found exactly that, that there are civil and criminal exposures associated with this practice. To date we've not heard anything back from any of the four.

In the meantime, I think it behooves us not only to raise the alarm to counter the efforts such as Harvard's to promote this activity, but also to recognize that, as I said, Sharia is, at its core, a seditious criminal conspiracy, and it should be treated as such. When one identifies it as sedition, it is susceptible to prosecution, which of course is a government activity, and at the

moment – for reasons that Shelly Berkley, among others, has noted, our government is not much interested in treating it as sedition, anymore than they're interested in identifying the principal promoters of Sharia, the people who have it as their constitution and who have put tens and tens and tens of billions of dollars over 30 years into promoting Sharia worldwide, including into this country, namely the Saudis. But they must recognize it as what it is or we risk our certain destruction.

And I want to leave you with one last thought. In the section of the U.S. Code – I believe it's right underneath the section that defines sedition – there is another section that defines another crime, the crime that is called misprision of treason. And misprision of treason simply means that whether you're an official of the U.S. government or a citizen, if you know of seditious activity and you do nothing to stop it, you are, yourself, guilty of a felony, punishable by up to seven years in prison. I submit to you that it is time that those of us who know what is going on here, those of us who would witness, to our horror, the penetration of our government, the influence operations run against it, the steady, stealthy, creeping, call it what you will, salami-sliced insinuation of Sharia into our country by the Saudis and by others now begin not only to call this what it is, a criminal conspiracy of a seditious purpose, but that we hold those who should be stopping it, first and foremost in our government, accountable, if necessary by charging them with misprision of treason.

SANDRA ALFONSI: I'm very proud to be able to sit here representing Hadassah. This is Hadassah's program called Curriculum Watch; the name "Curriculum" reflecting the fact to have correct curricula you must have correct textbooks. And I have been doing this for 15 years. I have been leading the Academic Advisory Board and I have been leading the program and working on the question of textbooks in this country.

To answer a question, can you trace this back to Saudi money, absolutely yes. Did it happen yesterday? Absolutely no. At the very end or close to the end of the 1970s, the first \$5.7 million came from Saudi Arabia into the Stanford Research Institute for the purpose of developing a five-year plan to figure out how to pour millions – which has become billions – of Saudi dollars into what I have always called the purchasing of American education. Can you trace the result of it? Is today the first result? Absolutely not. If you go back to the very beginning – I spent four years doing research for the Consulate of Israel in New York on the doctoral dissertations done at leading institutions in this country because as an American academic I'm allowed to look at and comment on American education. There were doctoral dissertations at the very beginning of the 1980s charting – coming out of California only – charting the changing of the face of Israel in the elite media. There were other doctoral dissertations charting very simply how to change textbooks from K-12 in the United States.

That is a history that needs to be understood, and with that, if you go fast-forward onto the campuses today, you are looking at professors who were granted Ph.D.s based on such doctoral dissertations, and therefore research which was fallacious, erroneous, with bias and bias agenda has become research quoted from year to year in other doctoral dissertations. So where can you find the money? You find the money very early in California. You can trace it across this country.

Since we are dealing with Islamist trends, this is something which I have found that we are working on: troubling trends in American education which reflect the influence of Islamist revisionism. First of all, very easily, if you ask the question, why are we so blind, why are we so naïve, why do we really believe that history is history, and how do we not understand what Saudi Arabia has done and continues to do? It's very simple. If you start looking at the changes in American history textbooks from 1980 to now – we are in 2008 – and you understand how many generations of young people have been taught revisionist history that has become the truth. It is very, very difficult to change the prism upon which or with which they look at life today. And then when you add to the textbooks the media – the elite media, the not-so-elite media, the television, the radio and everything that goes on – you have an answer to how we have this problem today. And the naiveté of many Americans – we have to understand that you can put it at the foot of the American education system.

And to talk about the Saudi Academy in Virginia, there was a photograph in the Washington Post of all the books used there. I have been trying to get an answer because I found the binding of a Prentice Hall textbook. I would like to know which Prentice Hall textbook is in use there because they use the American textbooks as an example of being an accredited institution. The problem is the most egregious publishing house in this country – anti-Israel, anti-Semitic, and never has changed over all these years – is Prentice Hall.

So we have these trends: presentation of certain tenets of the Judeo-Christian heritage of American society as a source of bias towards a particular group. We have the promotion of the concept of the Judeo-Christian-Islamic tradition of American society, John Esposito's contribution to American history from K-12, primarily from 6-12. The stylization and/or sanitization of the history and tenets of Islam. How do we not know what Sharia is? How do we not know what jihad is? We'll see in a few minutes why we don't know what it is, because it has been sanitized to such a point and stylized to such a point that if we would go back in time, Lawrence of Arabia would come through the school system and would be – that would be the system. That is what is being taught: the de-legitimization of the state of Israel, Holocaust revisionism, and, finally, the elimination of the contributions of American Jews to American history.

The past five years has removed the contribution of American Jews to American history from almost every single publishing house in this country. When we first saw it, we tried to go back and say, is this multiculturalism gone awry? Forget multiculturalism going awry – which it did go awry, but it did start out correctly. If you look at the aim, “to reduce Jewish influence in the United States,” what better way is there to remove us from the history books, starting out with Haym Solomon. The state of Texas is working with me. Why? Because the Jewish community of Texas cannot stand the fact that it has lost the ports of immigration of the Jews, and will I come out and talk to them? Well, I'll talk to anybody that will help me. So that is what we're doing.

Now, we are going to truly fast-forward, and you look at these and understand where we are today. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, these – I have a selection here of major publishing houses: Holt, Rinehart, Winston; McDougal Littell; Prentice Hall, and Glencoe, and then a couple of the

not-so-mainstream but why are they important? Their books cost less than the books from the standard publishing houses.

World history, human legacy. To tell you and to give you an idea so that you know what we do, we are all – you know, I have an academic advisory board of 16 professors, academics, one of whom, Mark Salzberg (sp), is sitting here to give me moral support. We do this as a volunteer organization. It is a volunteer academic advisory board. We are sought after by publishing houses such as Holt, Rinehart to review the manuscripts, the end result of which we deny the use of our name or the name of Hadassah as consultants because the changes that would have to have been made were never made. So if you look at this – “Muslims are told to respect Jews and Christians as People of the Book because they share the tradition of prophets who taught and received revelation from God” – this is a refrain over and over from textbook to textbook to the different publishing houses. The People of the Book, Christians and Jews, are protected species under the Muslims, and therefore what is impossible is the truth that the Koran and the Sharia law imposed rigid second-class status and restrictions on all non-Muslims, and explicitly on Christians and Jews.

So if you look at that – and you have to look at it because this is 2008 and we can go back in time through – almost through to 1989, and you find this indoctrination of tolerance of the Muslims for Jews and Christians, and Christians and Jews, you will find generations of young people who will believe one thing and one thing only: It is Israel’s fault and the Jews have brought it in themselves, because that proved, from 2008 back to 1990, that it can’t be the others; it is our fault. Page 951: “The war also caused a massive refugee problem. By the end of the fighting, more than 700,000 Palestinians had become refugees. They fled from areas that Israel took control of, as well as from the general war and chaos.” Absolutely nothing in the textbooks as to why the Palestinians left and how they were driven out by their own, as well as by the war, as well as the other problem: What about the close to 1 million Jewish refugees from Arab lands? They’re gone. They’re gone from the Arab lands and they have not made it into the textbooks.

“World History,” Glencoe: “The Koran permitted fair defensive warfare jihad, or struggle in the way of God. Mohammed’s successors expanded their territory.” Now, that is brain-washing. That is the definition of jihad, and that explains how we are blind to what we see happening. And Mohammed’s successors expanded, you have jihad which is for the purpose of defensive warfare, and then you have them merely expanding. “In the conquered territories, Arab administrators were tolerant, sometimes even allowing local officials to continue to govern.” There we go back again to the People of the Book, and what it says – “Those who chose not to convert were required to be loyal to Muslim rule and pay taxes.” There you have, again, a fantasy that has become reality. How does it become reality? It’s in a textbook, and it’s in a textbook used across the country because they sell textbooks written to fulfill the agenda of the Council on Islamic Education, the Teachers Curriculum Institute, and the AWIR, Arab World and Islamic Resources Organization.

Those are the three Saudi-funded organizations that dictate what is in the textbooks, and 22 states in this country have the textbook state adoption process. They do not buy books for the

good education of the young people; they buy books in order to be able fulfill the mandate of the Council on Islamic Education.

“World History: Patterns of Interaction,” McDougal Littell: “Because the Koran forbade forced conversion, Muslims allowed conquered peoples to follow their own religion. Tolerance continued after the Muslim state was established.” Where in the Koran did suddenly the concept of forced conversion disappear? Non-Muslims have three choices: conversion; to live in the state of dhimmitude, or second-class status; or extinction. So this idea that the Koran forbade the forced conversion, they allowed everyone to practice their own religion, and the word tolerance – over and over again, they are tolerant. “Persecuted people often welcomed the Muslim invades and chose to accept Islam.” You know, that’s like the Muslim invaders were the Pied Pipers of the Middle East. They went in, everyone said, my, what a beautiful religion; we will convert. “They were attracted by the appeal of the message of Islam, which offered equality and hope in this world.”

Same book. “The land now called Palestine consists of Israel, the West Bank, and the Gaza Strip.” Well, that is exactly what the vocabulary of the Palestinian Authority teaches. That is what is on their maps. That is what is in the textbooks. And that is now in a book – Houghton Mifflin’s “World History: Patterns of Interaction” – “While the United Nations had granted the Palestinians their own homeland, the Israelis had seized much of the land, including the West Bank and the Gaza Strip during various wars. Israel insisted that such a move was vital to its national security.” According to this, the U.N. partition has disappeared completely. According to this, Israel is responsible for the failure of the Arab state to be established, and in addition, the existential threat to the survival of the state of Israel is totally eliminated.

Just to do one more from this because I think that it’s interesting – when you do corrections of textbooks – we are now in a world where there is truth but not all of the truth, and so you have to be very aware of content and omission, innuendo and bias, but the omission, when some of what is there is correct, is often responded to by the editors who come back to me: Did you see how big this book is? We can’t put much in. So our answer is one sentence that would complete the truth would absolutely not make any difference, because where it says here, “On July of 2000 the U.S. President Bill Clinton hosted a 15-day summit meeting at Camp David between Ehud Barak and Yasser Arafat. The two men, however, could not reach a compromise. The peace plan once again stalled.” True, but what was left out is the history – what was left out is the history and the blame, but you have to admit, it’s very nice – it’s very nice. It says, look, you know, this Israeli and this Palestinian just couldn’t compromise. That’s it. This is definitely an agenda-based textbook.

The next one – which I really, truly think is amazing – here is Prentice Hall: “Against the opposition of neighboring Arab states, the Jews formed the state of Israel in 1948.” That is how Israel was born. The Arab states merely opposed. They really didn’t want a Jewish state but the Jews went ahead and made it anyway. Now, can you – if you look at the book, this is, “America: A History of our Nation,” so it means what? You’re not just dealing with the recreation of history in world history books; you’re looking at the “America: A History of our Nation,” – we’re teaching it in American history and we’re teaching it as well in world history.

Prentice Hall, 2007: “Another duty is jihad, or struggle in God’s service. Jihad is usually a personal duty for Muslims who focus on overcoming immorality within themselves. At other times, jihad may be interpreted as holy war to defend Islam and the Muslim community, much like the Crusades to defend Christianity.” One of the things that the Arabs hate and have done their best to change in every shape and form in the history books is the presentation of the Crusades, and here we have jihad equated openly – no problem in understanding. We have it equated. What the Crusades were to the Christians, jihad is to the Muslims.

Okay, well, I want to go to this one. “Similar to Jewish law, the Sharia regulates moral conduct, family life, business practices, government and other aspects of individual and community life. Just as the Koran unifies Muslim beliefs, the Sharia unites Muslims under a common legal framework. What has to be understood is the comparison: Similar to Jewish law, the Sharia regulates. It gives legitimacy, it softens it. And this book is critical. It is critical because in the past four or five years, Prentice Hall, Glencoe, most of the major publishing houses, have removed the name of Shabbir Mansuri, who is the executive director of the Council on Islamic Education, as well as Susan Douglass. This book, for some reason, came out 2007 with them listed. This has become – this book will be what Hadassah will come forward with to be able to make a case for the agenda-based work of the Council on Education and the changing of education.

And finally, small books: “The Middle East and the Cold War,” Performance Education: “In 1948, Israel was created by the United Nations as a home for the Jewish survivors of the Holocaust.” Holocaust revisionism does not necessarily mean, as some of the textbooks have it, that the 6 million Jews were collateral damage of World War II because that is also how it is presented. That is Holocaust revisionism, and that has to be understood as such. So I think you see – to finish with Chelsea House – to finish with Chelsea House, “The Palestinian Authority,” which is part of a 12-volume books on the creation of the modern Middle East, “Unlike their Muslim counterparts, they,” the Christians and Jews, “came to Palestine, not as refugees seeking sanctuary, but as Crusaders, Salvationists, and redeemers.” I would like to end with saying I would love to know when we, who came to Palestine, – how we arrived, certainly not as Crusaders, certainly not as Salvationists, and not as redeemers. This is revisionism of history.

Now, you want to ask how? Indeed, America is naïve. Start from 1990 to 2008. We are miseducated. We are indoctrinated. We are brain-washed. We accept this as history.

ANNE KORIN: You’ve heard about the flow of an enormous amount of funds, and all of you, I’m sure, are well aware where these funds come from. And the fact is that these funds come from petrodollars. If Saudi Arabia and Iran and the rest of the Gulf countries were not sitting on two-thirds of the world oil reserves, we would be in quite a different situation. Where we are today is three-quarters of the world oil reserves are in countries in which radical Islam is on the rise, in the Middle East and beyond. And the fact is that we’re not going to be able to win the war on radical Islam until we stop paying for the other side of the war.

The fundamental problem has not been defined in a good way. It’s been defined as a magnitude of oil that we import or the magnitude of oil that we consume. That’s not the core

issue here. The core issue is the fact that oil is a strategic commodity. Oil is a strategic commodity. It is a commodity that determines world affairs. Why is it a strategic commodity? It's not interchangeable with other commodities in the sector from which it derives its strategic value, and that's the transportation sector.

Oil has a virtual monopoly in the transportation sector. You often hear politicians talking, especially as we approach the elections now, about either drilling more or using oil more efficiently, and all this. Neither of these approaches will address the fundamental problem, which is oil's strategic value. They won't because if you look at the world you'll notice that OPEC sits on three-quarters of the world's oil reserves, and if you look at OPEC versus non-OPEC production, you'll notice something very interesting: Every time non-OPEC drills more, OPEC drills less. It's very simple. It can be emotionally satisfying to drill. There's certainly nothing wrong with it. But let's not delude ourselves that it will do anything to strip oil of its strategic value, unfortunately.

Same with efficiency. Efficiency is the other side of drilling. If we use less, whatever is not made up by an increase in China and India – a third of humanity, right? Fortunately the standard of living is improving in these countries, but that means their energy consumption is growing. So if we use less, whatever gap is not made up by China and India will simply be met by a reduction in production on the part of OPEC. Simple proof: Thirty-five years ago OPEC – which, again I emphasize, sits on three-quarters of world oil reserves – 35 years ago OPEC produced 30 million barrels of oil a day. Thirty-five years later global demand for oil has doubled, non-OPEC production has doubled. Today OPEC produces 32 million barrels of oil a day. So 30 million 35 years ago; 32 million today. There are other details but that certainly gives you an understanding of what we're dealing with. We're dealing with a cartel married to a monopoly.

Now, you'll often hear politicians say nuclear, solar, wind that will get us off of oil. Nonsense. Something we've actually accomplished since the 1970s – and, again, I know talking about nuclear plants or solar panels is very emotionally satisfying, but it has nothing to do with the issue. Something we've done since the '70s is essentially stop using oil to generate electricity. Only 2 percent of U.S. electricity is generated from oil. Only 2 percent of our oil demand is due to electricity generation. You can have all sorts of reasons for supporting alternative power technologies; they have nothing to do with stripping oil of its strategic value. The focus has to be on the transportation sector. Transportation accounts for two-thirds of oil consumption – that's mostly cars and trucks – and it accounts for the bulk of the growth in oil consumption in the developing world, but more importantly, it is oil's monopoly in the transportation sector that gives oil its strategic value.

Now let's look at the history. We will note there were other strategic commodities we had to contend with, and one major one was salt. Salt determined the course of world affairs and the stature of nations because salt was the only way to preserve food. With the advent of canning and electricity and refrigeration, salt lost its strategic value. You now had alternatives to salt. This is what we need to do to oil. We need to turn oil into salt through choice and competition in the transportation sector. I'm going to talk about specific technologies and policies that can accomplish this. You have to understand we need to focus on technologies that

are available today. We cannot afford to wait for pie in the sky research stage things like hydrogen fuel cells because if you buy a car today, someone in this country is going to be driving it for the next 16.8 years. That's how long it takes to turn over the fleet. We have to focus on technologies that are available today.

Two major technologies and the policies that go along with them – this is not an exclusive list; this is meant to show you that the problem here is not – we don't need a Manhattan Project to develop a brand-new technology; we need to focus on deployment. First thing: What is Brazil doing? Every single car sold in Brazil by General Motors is flex-fuel vehicle. Ninety percent of new cars sold in Brazil this year are flex-fuel vehicles. Flex-fuel vehicles are just like regular cars. They have an internal combustion engine and a liquid fuel tank. They can run on gasoline and a variety of alcohol fuels. Alcohol is not just ethanol and ethanol is not just corn, okay? A flex-fuel vehicle that can run gives you a choice between gasoline and a bunch of different alternative fuels. It costs an auto manufacturer just a hundred dollars extra to make – just a hundred dollars extra. In this country we make ethanol from corn; in Brazil ethanol is made from sugar cane. There are many countries in the world with a suitable climate for growing sugar cane. It's much cheaper to make ethanol from sugar cane.

China is focused on another alcohol called methanol that is made very cheaply from coal. China has doubled its coal-to-methanol production over the past year and a half. It's on its way to increasing it many-fold. Chinese auto companies are now coming out with flex-fuel cars that can use methanol. Okay, we can – we need to pass a law called an Open Fuel Standard that requires new cars sold in this country to be flexible-fuel vehicles, just like new cars are required by law to have air bags and seatbelts and even FM radio for national security reasons. This is a feature that costs less than a hundred dollars per car and provides a platform on which fuels can compete. A bipartisan group of members in the House and in the Senate has introduced such a bill. I'm going to give you the bill numbers in the House: Open Fuel Standard is H.R. 6559; in the Senate, Open Fuel Standard S-3303. Once we do that, and only then, it will become politically possible to repeal the tariff on ethanol imports. We don't have a tax on oil imports; we have a tax on ethanol imports.

The next thing we need to do – since we don't generate electricity from oil we need to start using electricity in our cars through plug-in hybrid vehicles. I'm going to give you the website of the Set America Free Coalition, which I chair, which is [setamericafree.org](http://setamericafree.org) There's a great deal of information about these technologies. But I implore you, if you remember only one thing about what I said today, the problem is not the magnitude of oil that we consume or import; the problem is the fact that oil is a strategic commodity, and in order to strip oil of its strategic status, we must have choice and competition in the transportation sector. Anything else, be it simply increasing supply or reducing demand, will maintain the petroleum standard and carry us forward into a world in which most of the world's oil, even more than today, is in the hands of countries that don't like us. And the world's economic well-being, in the words of the International Energy Agency, is in the hands of five or six countries in the Middle East.

So please pick up the phone, send a fax. Those of you who are staffers, get your members on board these bills, and help make a difference. Thank you very much.