



**PRINCES OF DARKNESS:
THE SAUDI ASSAULT ON THE WEST**

A book discussion with the author,
LAURENT MURAWIEC
Hudson Institute Senior Fellow

Featuring a keynote address by
RICHARD PERLE
Hudson Institute Trustee
and
American Enterprise Institute Resident Fellow

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2005

HUDSON INSTITUTE
BETSY AND WALTER STERN CONFERENCE CENTER
1015 15TH ST, NW
SIXTH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

S. ENDERS WIMBUSH: Ladies and gentlemen, good evening. On behalf of Hudson Institute, I'm Enders Wimbush, and I'm pleased to welcome you to what I am sure will be an exciting evening discussing an exciting book by a very exciting author. Our evening with Laurent Murawiec is going to kick off now. We are expecting Richard Perle to join us at some time. He's got a little transportation delay, but when he comes in, he will find his way right up here. And he will be responsible for commentary – the initial commentary on Laurent's presentation.

I think most of you here know Laurent Murawiec, which is good. You know that he is a senior fellow at Hudson Institute, and you know that he was formerly a senior international policy analyst at the Rand Corporation at least until he had the effrontery to suggest that our allies the Saudis might not be holding up their part of the bargain. He has been a consultant to the French Ministry of Defense and taught at the École de Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales in Paris. He is a prodigious author – many books and lots of articles and op-eds. But the books include a French translation of Clausewitz's *On War*, *War in the 21st Century*, which is translated – which is in both French and – go figure – in Chinese, *The Spirit of Nations, Cultures, and Geopolitics*, and forthcoming from Hudson Institute, *The Mind of Jihad*.

The book that we will be discussing tonight is an expanded version of the *La Guerre d'Après*, which was published in Paris last year. *Princes of Darkness* is an expanded and extended version of that. And I am pleased to say that the *Princes of Darkness* has already been picked up by three book clubs. So it pays sometimes to go out on a limb. We all know Laurent as an extremely provocative thinker and an unconventional thinker. He combines in his analysis a great variety of disciplines, and he mixes them and combines them in intriguing ways. His recent works have concentrated heavily through the analytical filters of anthropology, of history, and philosophy. I recommend to each of you to read these books because of the great synthetic and the greatly provocative style of the language and the way that he finds his way through these different disciplines in unique and often challenging ways. I might add that he's an old friend. He's a very fine chef and a new father. So all of that should recommend him to you, and I will now recommend him to you and stand out of the way and ask Laurent Murawiec to discuss *Princes of Darkness*. Laurent?

(Applause.)

LAURENT MURAWIEC: Thank you, Enders. After this presentation I guess I should remain silent not to lower the esteem that you already have for me. But, no, I'm not going to do it. I can't help but talk. A week ago or so, Prince Saud Al-Faisal, the foreign minister of Saudi Arabia, explained. I'll quote him: "We're fighting as hard as we can against terrorism. I would dare anyone to say that there is another country that is fighting terrorism as hard as we are." Luxembourg? Andorra? San Marino? Well, I don't know. Maybe the prince – the prince actually called Colin Powell. No, Colin Powell called the prince three years ago after I gave my infamous briefing at the Defense Policy Board at the Defense Department to assure his highness the prince – these guys are princes – there's thousands of princes – that what I had said had nothing whatsoever to do with American policy and that it was decisively rejected by the administration.

So are the Saudis fighting terrorism or not? Terrorism is not just some killer throwing a bomb or throwing himself as a bomb onto a target. Terrorism is an integrated chain. It comprises the financiers, the logisticians, the intellectuals, the preachers, the books that are written and that serve to indoctrinate and brainwash kids into becoming killers. It's a long chain, and I want to examine with you some aspects – some key aspects of this chain and see if that chain exists in Saudi Arabia, which better than proclamations will tell us whether or not Saudi Arabia is fighting as hard against terrorism as Luxembourg, San Marino, and Andorra are.

Freedom House recently found books with the seal of the Saudi government distributed in mosques throughout the U.S. full of incitement to hate and calling for waging war against the West, Jews, and Christians. This is to the point that the Senate Judiciary Committee – its head inspector sponsored something called the Saudi Arabia Accountability Act of 2005, the purpose of which is to hold Saudi support for institutions that fund, train, incite, encourage, or in any other way aid and abet terrorism and to secure full Saudi cooperation in the investigation of terrorist incidents.

At hearings held by the committee on November 8th a week ago, Nina Shea showed video clips that showed Saudi clerics – prominent ones – inciting over Saudi state television – inciting with words: “in the fight against infidels, throats must be slit, skulls must be shattered,” end quote. On the official Saudi TV, IQRA, prominent cleric Musa Al-Qarni, who's family has a lot of terrorists in it – said: “The uproar and the chaos that we see today in the human race – the killing, the acts of aggression, the rape, the robbery, and the disgrace of honor – what causes this is that the banners which are hoisted high are those of the Jews, the Christians, and other religions and faiths and not the banner of Islam. We ask Allah to strengthen the spirit of the jihad five years in Iraq and to help them against their enemies – the Jews and the Christians. Likewise, I emphasize that the jihad that the Muslims are fighting in Iraq in order to repel the enemy aggressor – the Jews and the Christians – who are attacking land and honor. I emphasize that this jihad is legitimate jihad, jihad for Allah's sake. And it is considered defense of Muslim countries, their lands, and their honor. The doubts that are raised against this jihad are not correct and are out of place.” This is on state television in Saudi Arabia.

In fact, Saudi Arabia continues to fund terror through such organizations as the International Islamic Research Organization, the World Muslim League, the World Association of Muslim Youth, all of which – well, they're not NGOs. They're often called NGOs, but they're not because on their boards you find Saudi cabinet members and princes – leading princes of the royal family. For example, Prince Salman, half-brother of King Abdullah, full brother of late King Fahd, is known to control IIRO distributions with an iron hand.

According to the excellent expert Matthew Levitt of The Washington Institute – I'll quote him – “Saudi officials have exhibited at a minimum a clear pattern of tolerating funds earmarked for extremist purposes. For example, one Saudi official stated that a Saudi organization created to crack down on charities that fund terrorism has been ineffective because its personnel doesn't want to uncover high-ranking Saudis actively financing such charities. The Saudis have taken steps to combat money laundering and freeze accounts related to the September 11th conspirators. I would add that nothing has been done against the September 12th conspirators, the September 13th, 14th, and all the rest of it. Moreover” – this is Matt Levitt speaking again –

“the recently passed new regulations governing private fundraising – Saudis are now encouraged to donate funds only through established groups operating under the direct patronage of the royal family. Aren’t we breathing more freely, but yet unfortunately some of these approved groups feature prominently on the U.S. terrorist lists.”

A week ago, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Dan Glazer said the U.S. is deeply concerned whether the Saudi bans on funding charities overseas has been implemented. And he mentioned specifically IIRO, the World Association of Muslim Youth, the World Muslim League. So as far as funding terror, I’m afraid that the Saudis aren’t quite holding their end of the bargain. In August ’03, President Bush reported that King – then Crown Prince Abdullah had given him strong assurances that the funding would come to an end. This has not occurred.

Now, that’s the money. What about what’s happening in minds because ultimately the money buys the logistics et cetera, but what is important is what’s in the mind of the killers. Well, there have been over last years very numerous fatwas authored by prominent Saudi clerics encouraging jihad against the U.S., notably in Iraq. Actually, you know the sweet man, the new Saudi ambassador to the United States, Prince Turkey? Well, Prince Turkey – Thanksgiving is coming. I think we should do something about that. Prince Turkey, who just presented his credentials to a grateful State Department, which has never seen an Arab – a Sunni tyrant they didn’t love – Prince Turkey called our war in Iraq a colonial war. Now thank goodness for such friends.

Actually he’s a great friend of mine, too. In the fall of 2003, as Enders mentioned, I wrote this book in French. *Princes of Darkness* is the expanded English version of it. A French publisher had asked me to write it. The French title is *The Next War*, meaning after Iraq, where do we go? So the prince, I learned, got the book translated – privately translated from French into Arabic. Two guys worked post haste in London when he was the ambassador then to translate it. And I’m sure the book must have pleased him immensely but not to the point that he would have the gumption to go to Paris and sue either myself or the publisher. In point of fact, he did not.

But French libel laws, though not as favorable to authors and free speech – first amendment as American laws – are sort of balanced. It’s difficult. If you’re a plaintiff, you have to show malicious intent on the part of the author. Fortunately for his highness, Prince Turkey, British laws are far more lenient. In point of fact, these are (less majesty?) laws where basically the plaintiff has to prove that, you know, God himself dictated these words. And even I’m not sure that God hasn’t been indicted and sentenced in British court for libel. If we read the Bible close enough, I’m sure some British court would find it in itself to indict God. So I had given a long five-page interview to the French magazine Paris-Match about this book, and in the interview I said rather unfriendly things concerning Saudi Arabia and the prince, his highness, himself. So as a result, Paris-Match was sued in London.

This is a French magazine sued for libel in London. It cost 1 million pounds just to defend. You’ve got to put down a million quid, as they say, in order to defend a libel suit. And it cost 40 times more in London to defend a libel suit than in Paris, for example. The publisher originally was gung-ho, and then they realized so they gave up. So, as I said, Prince Turkey is very friendly to me. His media advisor is a man called Jamal Khashoggi. You may know the name –

weapons, corruption, blah, blah, blah. So Jamal Khashogi had written some really choice words with a kind of courteous and refined culture that's typical of the Saudi media, and the nicest of all the names he called me was a low class prostitute. So now, you know, soldiers have ribbons for the campaigns. I have my little badges of honor, and this is one of the real nice ones.

So anyway, I said numerous fatwas have been issued by a bunch of prominent Saudi clerics authorizing, legitimizing, recommending jihad against America in Iraq. As a result 100,000 Saudis are presently in jail in Iraq in connection with Al-Qaeda activities. And 60 (percent) to 70 percent of the foreign fighters nabbed in Iraq by the Iraqis and our troops are Saudis. So there must be something amiss there. I just remembered that the dominant tribe in Fallujah happens to be a Wahhabi tribe, which makes certain events that occurred there not entirely coincidental.

Now what's happening inside Saudi Arabia? Are we – are we improving? Is the call for jihad that was coming from the 50,000 mosques of the kingdom – is that call still being heard or has it all changed? Well, last February, the minister of education, who was, as I understand, a fairly decent character, was replaced by now King Abdullah by a hard line Wahhabi. So if there's one direction this is going, it's not the right direction. And I hear this week that a teacher – Saudi teacher – by the name of Mohammed al-Harbi was sentenced to 40 months in jail and 750 lashes. Now go on because nobody in the world could survive 750 lashes for the awful crime of having discussed in class the Bible, Jews, and Christians not unfavorably. So the direction is not terribly good.

The apartheid system, which rules Saudi Arabia internally, is going on. Like very recently, there was a great first done by this great liberalizing King Abdullah. A Shi'ite cleric was going to speak on Saudi television. That was a great first. For 250 years, the Wahhabi have made it a sport – a national sport, a tribal sport rather – to slaughter and trample under foot any Shi'ite they can get their hands on. So Shaykh Hassan al-Saffar was supposed to speak on Saudi television for the first time. And lo and behold, it was canned. He will not appear on Saudi television. And on July 15th, about 100 clerics and judges and university professors and leaders of the Mutawwai'in leaders, the religious police, issued a statement on the world historical problem of women driving. Now with all due respect to the ladies in this room, it says something of the state of the affairs in the kingdom that this should be a major central subject of polemics. So anyway these hundred enlightened individuals wrote, enemies of Islam – I'm quoting them – are seeking to destroy the great roll women have been given in Islam – reproduction – by corrupting them and hence corrupting the Islamic world. And who are these enemies? If you think that it's Jews, Christians, and hypocrites, you are right. But maybe you had forgotten the hypocrites so I'm glad to enlighten you on that account.

Now of course, the Saudi government -- the Saudi state -- has been attacked by terrorists. That has been used extensively to tell us, see? They are good people. They are being attacked by terrorists. Bin Laden doesn't like them, therefore we should like them. Now, one has to say the royals, who are very, very, very, very soft targets, have never been attacked once since one has looked at what's happening in the kingdom or outside the kingdom. And if you want to nab a Saudi prince, what do you do? Go to London to some strip joint – luxury. Go to Marbella. Go to Surrey or Kent. Go to Colorado, to Aspen. Soft targets. Not to speak of the palaces and all the rest of it, none of them ever was attacked, which, you know, good for them. But hint hint,

the victims inside Saudi Arabia, the victims of terror, are Americans, Brits, Lebanese Christians, other Arabs, and low-level Saudis. So there again, there's something wrong in the way this is happening. There has been – there have been terror attacks in Saudi Arabia. All the targets are people that the jihadis usually detest – Saudi jihadis. So there's one form of terror that the Saudi royals disapprove sternly. That's terrorism inside Saudi Arabia against them. There's one type of terror that they love. It's terror in Iraq or in Israel and some other places.

Look, I've been asked – I've done 40 or 45 radio talk shows in the last few weeks, and I've learned to develop certain very quick definitions. And people ask me, so how would you define the Saudi royals? And I always end up saying they are Talibanis without oil, rather Talibanis with oil, whereas the Talibanis are Saudis without oil. There stops the difference. So one type of terror that's approved – it is fun and fine to kill Shi'ite children or Jewish children. That's fun. That's great. Fatwas, fatwas, fatwas. What is bad is to dare touch the Saudi royal family or rather its assets. What I would say therefore is that the disagreement between the Saudi princes and bin Laden is of a tactical order. The aims are essentially the same. The tactical difference is, you've got people who want regulated terrorism – that's the royals. Why? Because they have a country to defend. And then you have the other guy, the lean and mean fanatic. You know, yond Cassius has a mean and hungry look. This is bin Laden. So they don't have the same short-term tactical objectives, but otherwise, it's the same mind. It's not the same body. Some are large. Some others are very lean, but enough of that.

Now what's going to happen in Saudi Arabia? I don't want to attack other think tanks in town -- I think that management of Hudson would not be happy if I did that – but some think tanks in town, which have an abundant literature on the Middle East and especially on Saudi Arabia, explain to us that there's a new king. It's a new dawn of hope in Saudi Arabia. Now, yeah, you bet. He's 83 years old – the new king. And he's been in power for 40 years plus. That's Abdullah, who has been the head of the Saudi National Guard for 42 or 43 years. This is the most xenophobic, the most retrogressive part of Saudi – of Saudi society. This is the deep desert Bedouins, who, you know, who think that, you know, other Sunnis are already dangerous, not to speak of others farther out. So change? I think he's rearranging a number of chairs on the deck. And of course the chorus line of PR firms on K Street are enthusiastic about this new dawn of freedom. Can you hear the tremolos in their voices? Now he's just done one thing. He's created a National Security Council, which he took away from Prince Nayef. Prince Nayef is the guy who said that September 11th had been done by the Jews. Actually Abdullah said it too, and Turkey said it too, and Bandar said it. So you know, they all said it basically. But anyway, the NSC there was taken away from Prince Nayef, the Ministry of the Interior, and now there's an NSC with Prince Sultan, who is only 77, and his son Bandar who graced Washington until a few months ago with his very fat checkbook. So can we expect change? Forget it. In one word, this is not the team that has a mandate for change.

Now the one change that's real is oil at \$60 a barrel. At that price you can buy so many more people that you can buy at 30 (dollars a barrel). Now that's a big difference. So I do think that they dynasty as bought some years of survival in the middle of an extremely precarious situation, where pressures internal and external are converging on the Saudi empire. If you want, it's like the '73 oil crisis bought 10 crucial years to the dying Soviet regime. Likewise, today for the Saudis. Spray more cash, buy more tribes, et cetera. Now of course when the excellent Karen

Hughes states, quote, I salute the kingdom's efforts to work with us to combat terrorism, it is a sad joke. It is a very sad joke. I had said in July '02 when Richard invited me to create a Storm Defense Policy Board, quote, the Saudis are active at every level of the terror chain from planners to financiers, from cavalry to foot soldiers, from ideologists to cheerleaders. I see no reason to retract half a word of this.

So what's to be done? The Saudis got a pass for six decades no matter what they did. Everything was fine. It was fine. You always had Brent Scowcroft to explain that by supporting Sunni dictators, we were buying peace. In his recent *New Yorker* piece he said the Sunni dictators have bought us – have given us 50 years of peace. Now to describe the last 50 years in the Middle East as peace requires an extraordinary imagination. So I think additionally that we are in a slow motion divorce from Saudi Arabia, but it's the kind of divorce where the two parties are not – you know, it's not Richard Burton and Liz Taylor throwing all the dishes on the floor. It's the kind of divorce where both parts are saying, I'm all right, Jack. Everything's fine. Everything's normal. So, you know, the president will even hold the hand of Abdullah in Crawford. But in reality last year, 70 Saudi so-called diplomats – actually jihadis with diplomatic immunity – had their immunity revoked. The FBI probably had to break a few heads at State for State to consent, but it happened. We moved a lot of our military assets out of Prince Khalid Air Base to Qatar because the Saudis were trying their darndest to prevent us from toppling Saddam. So there's been – it's a slow motion divorce. But I think the direction of the divorce is quite clear.

I think now as I did three years ago that we should issue a very clear list of demands to the Saudis; to the great reformer King Abdullah telling him you have to put a stop – a complete stop and not a schismatic - one that we can verify – to incitement, indoctrination, propaganda, the madrassas, the books, the imams, the preachers, the sermons, and all the rest of it, radio, TV, papers. Secondly, bring a total and final end to all the funding through the charities and the pseudo-NGOs. Since Saudi Arabia is essentially a totalitarian country, nothing of importance occurs without the royals knowing about it or being party to it. So they shouldn't have too much trouble finding – shutting down these things. They'd be shutting themselves down. And then the older – the Saudi intelligence personnel that was involved and the pseudo-diplomatic personnel that has been involved in terror should also – should also be shut down or else, then Saudi Arabia should meet the full wrath of the United States.

Now, don't these guys sell us enormous amounts of oil? No, they don't. Our number one oil supplier is the Province of Alberta in Canada, and I don't think that there's a Canadian jihad or Albertan jihad against the United States. I'm not saying that it's something one should contemplate lightly, but I'm saying it is not this – it is not this absurd choice that's presented to us. Either we give a total pass to the Saudi royals, or it's going to be Bin Laden. And if the choice is so presented to you, then you – you say, oh my God, after all, yeah perhaps it's better to have these bastards because at least they are our bastards like Somoza. And I think this is wrong. I think that there's a whole lot of intermediate solutions, including answering – I was in London last week. I met some Hijazi Independence Movement people – interesting, interesting. After all, Hijaz was way before the al-Saud family was around. Hijaz was led by a very sophisticated merchant bourgeoisie. There was trading internationally. So there's – the Shi'ites of Saudi

Arabia, I don't think, are too emotionally to the al-Saud family. So we could do all kinds of things.

Now one last word concerning the way the Saudis react to what I'm proposing – as I've mentioned, the Saudi press has made me something of a punching bag with all kinds of nice epithets added. But a year and a half ago I was invited to come to Riyadh to speak at a big international conference on terrorism. I receive a letter from – of all people – from the chairman of the big Wahhabi university in Riyadh. It said, dear Mr. Murawiec, blah, blah, blah. So I answered after asking a number of people in town, do you think they want to kill me or what do you think they want? So, you know, they said – they said, well, you know, it'd be bad form to kill you while you're there. My wife said, you know, bad form or no bad form, you'd be dead all the same. So anyway I sent a reply saying, all right, I'll come. I only want two things – VIP security protection and I want to meet the crowned prince and a bunch of your top policy makers. At that point, total silence for several weeks, and then I received correspondence. It said, dear Mr. Murawiec. We've been trying to contact you for three weeks. You bet. Unfortunately, we haven't succeeded and therefore it is too late to have you at the conference. So what I was thinking was that the guy who issued the invitation to me – the chairman of the university – probably went to see Prince Nayef or one of these guys. And the prince looked at him and said, you invited who? The poor guy is probably – if there's salt mines in Saudi Arabia, I know where he is. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. WIMBUSH: Well, without further ado, let me invite Richard Perle to come up here and share his thoughts with you. As Laurent has said, Richard was the person who got him into all of this so he's had a long time to think about the kinds of arguments that have – that you've heard here today and is one of the most – Richard, as we know, is one of the most seminal thinkers on security in the Middle East and how we should be configuring ourselves to deal with it. So, Richard, may I give it to you?

RICHARD PERLE: Thank you very much. I'm glad I made it. I just came back from New York. I wanted to be here in part to say that I think this is an important – a very important book. And I hope it will have the effect of encouraging a real debate about the nature of the Saudi regime and the U.S. relationship to the Saudi regime. I recall very well Laurent making some of the points that are made in the book at a meeting of the Defense Policy Board, and the explosive nature of the reports that followed were really an indication of how little serious analysis had been done of the regime and of U.S.-Saudi relations. As Laurent just said, for six decades we paid scant attention to Saudi policies that over time were helping to create the very difficult and dangerous situation in which we now find ourselves.

Indeed, it is one of the great intelligence failures, I think, of this century and the last that the rise of extremist institutions around the world funded and inspired culturally and intellectually by the Wahhabis of Saudi Arabia went so unremarked. I probed this a little bit when I was in the – closer to government than I am today and asked a succession of directors of Central Intelligence whether at any time while they hold that post they were aware of any effort to place in front of the president the warning signs that one would have thought normal as we observed the rise of

extremist institutions around the world – the madrassas, the pseudo-NGOs and the like. And the answer, I am now quite sure, was no. At no time was any American president apprised of the danger that was – that was taking shape. This seems to me a far larger intelligence failure than the failure to anticipate the details of September 11th because it was a huge and highly visible trend over many years. And our crack intelligence institutions – the CIA in particular – just missed it completely.

They missed it in part, I believe, because the Saudi regime has been extraordinarily skillful – a skill much assisted by large quantities of money. In fact, if the money is sufficient, you probably don't have to be all that skillful. It has skillfully created an image and impression of Saudi Arabia in part by buying or at least renting virtually every U.S. government specialist on the subject of the nature of the Saudi regime as they have left government service. And not only that, they've made it perfectly apparent to the people in government service, who deal with Saudi Arabia and indeed often with the rich – they have made it apparent to them that when they leave government service, there will be opportunities for them. It's corrupt. It's a suborning of American officialdom. And I think if we were to compile a list of the several hundred Americans who have served in Saudi Arabia in various capacities, have been employed by the U.S. government to advise us on how we should think about the Saudis, how we should understand the nature of the relationship between us, I believe you would find that a very high percentage of them earn their living from a continuing relationship with Saudi institutions after they have left government. This needs to be investigated and investigated thoroughly. I wish Patrick Fitzgerald, if he goes on to another intensive investigation, will focus on something like that, which is of immense importance.

Bernard Lewis once, in trying to help us understand the impact of the Wahhabis, said imagine that the Texas branch of the KKK had at its disposal the oil revenues of the state of Texas early in the century. Would the KKK have disappeared as in fact it did or would it have established itself in quite different ways? And I think the answer is that the vast amounts of money that have been spent supporting extremist institutions have had their effect. And they've had their effect all over the world. And that money continues to do what it has done all along. There are – those of you who know Steve Emerson will know of his work on extremist institutions in the United States and elsewhere. I've heard Steve say that he's had conversations with – with Muslim middle Americans, who have complained about what was being preached on Fridays in mosques in the Midwest, only to be told that if they didn't like what the imam had to say, they should raise the money and hire their own imam because the imams are largely paid by the government of Saudi Arabia or institutions closely associated with the government of Saudi Arabia. And in frustration – because the Muslim community in America is not a wealthy community, devout Muslims have accepted the reality that their religious environment and culture is dominated by Saudi money and Wahhabi thinking. It's a threat. It's a fundamental threat. It's an even more fundamental threat in my view than the individual terrorists who have been spawned out of that – out of that environment because it is widespread and is persistent. And we need to do something about it.

And Laurent is quite right. We won't do anything about it until we accept that the Saudi regime is both responsible and capable of curtailing this activity. And he's quite right to observe that it is a totalitarian state after all. And if they wish to curtail it, they can do so. I sat in a meeting

with one Saudi official, who said, well unfortunately, once money leaves the kingdom, we have no control over it. And even if that's true by the way, money doesn't leave the kingdom without the approval of Saudi government institutions. So there's a great deal that they could do to curtail this if they were willing to do so. But instead of acknowledging that there's a problem that needs to be addressed, they deny the problem. They deny it officially at every level. And we, for reasons that I think are shortsighted, have chosen to accept those denials rather than precipitate the crisis, the confrontation that would inevitably result from demanding an end to the subvention of extremism around the world. And I very much hope, as I said at the outset, that this book will stimulate the sort of discussion that will make it difficult for us to continue the policies of the past, which were to acquiesce in what the Saudi regime has been doing and, even worse, to pretend that things are getting better because there's no evidence that things are getting better.

(Applause.)

MR. WIMBUSH: We have time for a few questions. Let me invite both of our speakers to circle the mic, and I'll stand over here and try to direct traffic. Right here, sir, would you please identify yourself and speak up please so that the C-SPAN mics can try to pick this up.

Q: My name is Cameron Vagey (ph). I want to point to a different area of the problem, and that's the universities, having just been recently in universities. The funding of these Islamic study centers and the professors who teach there – some of the professors are afraid of talking the truth or discussing anything that is not politically correct. And if the universities – (inaudible) – very important institutions of this country for the free thought and education, if the professor is worried that he might lose his livelihood, is there anything that can be done in the university area as for investigate the funding and to not allow for them to take over our universities also?

MR. MURAWIEC: We're fortunate to have in the room Martin Kramer, who has written an entire book on the subject. It's called *Ivory Towers in the Sands*, and it makes the point that Middle East Arabology, Islamology in this country in academia is an unvarnished disaster. Intellectually, it is the sons of Michel Foucault and Edward Said. It's violently anti-American. It's violently – that's the Middle East Studies Association, which is like the guild of the anti-Americans in Middle East studies -- (audio break) – to whom I was asking, what should we do with the CIA? There's a big problem. That friend said, well, let's put some barbed wire around Langley to prevent them from coming out. And I would say, perhaps we should do the same thing around John Esposito center at Georgetown, countless others – just prevent them from coming out. Send food in there, you know, because we're nice people.

MR. PERLE: If I could just add, this creates another – and I think Laurent's assessment is right – this creates another problem because it is finally dawning on the CIA and some other intelligence organizations that we have been woefully ill equipped to deal with Islamist radicalism, in part because we don't have people who have the language, culture, historical skills. And so they have resolved that we'll fix that problem. We will now go out, and we're pretty good at fixing problems like that. We found tens of thousands of people to study Russian and Russian history and Russian culture, and now we're going to do the same thing, I'm quite

sure, with respect to the threat that we all know we face from Islamist extremism. But unfortunately if we turn to the educational institutions that are capable of producing scholars in these areas, we're going to encounter the problem Laurent has just described. So it's a real dilemma. We need people who understand the region, but the institutions for training them are already pretty far gone.

Q: Noemie Emery, the Weekly Standard. (Inaudible.) You spoke before about regarding the Saudis that they – (inaudible) – faith, the full graphic – (inaudible) – with the United States. I was wondering if you could tell us what form you would picture this – (inaudible) – is taking. And when you also said – (inaudible) – we shouldn't back away from prepared prices, I – (inaudible) – wondered how you thought that crisis might play itself out.

MR. PERLE: I think the role of family understands the fragilities in a society with a very rapidly expanding population, immense disparities in material well-being, deep historical and geographic divisions. It is in short a society that is vulnerable to destabilization. They know that. We know that too. They have counted, I think, on our not taking any action that would destabilize the kingdom, in part because of the sense they have helped to create of Saudi Arabia as an ally and friend of the United States, in part because I think they have assumed that the alternative – the view that the alternative is bound to be worse – is bound to be a bin Laden – will cause us to show great restraint and regard the stability of the kingdom as an American asset. That's what Brent Scowcroft thought it was, probably still thinks it is. So it's not easy to persuade them that our interest in the stability of their reign is rapidly declining. If they ever became persuaded of that, I am quite sure they have enough respect for our ability to destabilize their quite fragile kingdom, and would become a good deal more amenable to our concerns.

So I would put it to them very clearly – the continuing subvention of extremism around the world means that it is no longer in the interest of the United States that you remain in power, and if you look at simple things like where the oil is and who benefits from its production, you can see the basis for what should give them an awful fright. And I would hope that at some point, we would privately convey the message that as we lose interest in the stability of your regime, you'd better watch out. And I think we'd have a better dialogue with them after that opening conversation.

MR. MURAWIEC: Yes, last week as I mentioned, the Senate Judiciary Committee was holding hearings on lots of things that are wrong with Saudi Arabia. The day before, the night before the department of State informed the committee that nobody would be coming from State to testify, and as I understand it, the Saudi embassy was involved in massive lobbying to have the hearings cancelled altogether, and certainly if you have nobody from the State Department there. Now, if we have diplomats who consider that using a feather to hit any Saudi as already tantamount to an act of war, the idea of putting pressure on the Saudi regime becomes outlandish. So there are intermediate forms or steps between the feather and the nuclear weapon. We don't need to occupy the oil fields tomorrow morning and wait for tomorrow afternoon. There are lots of intermediate steps, and we should, as any normal state, as any American government should do, think. Okay, these people are doing lots of things that are inimical to us. What are the means that are appropriate to put pressure on them without necessarily, you know, calling Norman

Schwarzkopf back out of retirement and telling him, this time, south – not necessarily. But we can do lots of things. We haven't even begun. That's the problem.

Q: My name is Said Ganji (sp). I am with the National Union for Democracy in Iran. First of all, I'd like to commend you for your presentation. I really enjoyed it. My question to you is, as you do know, Saudi Arabia obviously they are pursuing certain goal towards this terrorism – support of terrorism financially. Islamic Regime of Iran does the same thing. In your view, are these folks simply supporting the same goal? Are they after the same goal? Are they working against one another? What do you think works?

MR. MURAWIEC: My friend Michael LaDean has drawn the comparison between international terror and the mafia families in New York City. You know, they spend their time killing one another with gusto, but when the feds show up, they all gang up. Now, in 1949, I believe there were 47. One of the founders of the most extreme terror in Iran, a cohort of the then-young Ayatollah Khomeini called Navab Safavi went to Cairo to meet Hassam al-Banna, the founder of the Muslim Brotherhood. And they didn't like each other much, because you know each of them – it's like Trotskyist, you know? But they didn't like each other much, but like the mafia families in New York, they made a deal. So the same could be said about – like a number of years ago, Rafsanjani the terrorist came to Riyadh and made a deal with the Saudi terrorists. I mean the royal family. And from them on, instead of imams preaching the systematic slaughter of Shiites every hour, it was only every second hour, which was, you know, a great turn. And some cooperation was made, notably with the idea of turning to the Americans and saying, woo hoo, see? You're trying to put pressure on, et cetera. This has just come to an end actually with the murderous fool that is now the president, supposedly the president, of Iran and King Abdullah. These two seem to be back in their – you know, both of them want – there's only one crocodile that can go in the waters of the Gulf.

Q: Hi, I'm Raphael. With respect to Saudi countermeasures to American pressure, I was wondering if you were familiar with what Gerald Posner wrote in his book about the possibility that Saudi Arabia has rigged their oil fields with radiological devices, or Saudi efforts to acquire nuclear weapons from Pakistan or from other third party countries?

MR. MURAWIEC: It seems to me that there is this gangster who has just ransomed the whole crowd in some situation, and he says, don't touch me or I'm going to commit suicide. No, no, let them say that. It's an amusing thing. But look, we've had enough of these Saudi countermeasures. It's called terrorism. It's called jihadi terrorism. That's what the Saudi countermeasures are. We've suffered the full brunt of these countermeasures already. And if these characters say we are going to slit our own throat, shatter our own skulls to spite you, say, well gentlemen, please go ahead.

MR. PERLE: I don't think the Saudis rely on measures of that nature to protect themselves. I think they rely instead on having created and sustaining the impression that American and Saudi interests are so closely aligned that countermeasures are unnecessary, because we are their natural friend and ally. It's why they have reproduced I don't know how many millions of copies of the famous photograph of Roosevelt and the king. You see it in every Saudi publication, practically every month. They haven't been confronted with American measures

that would require them to look for countermeasures, because we have been so willing to accept the proposition that they are really a friend and ally.

MR. WIMBUSH: We're almost out of time. Let me just ask in closing, each of you, thinking of the downside scenarios, which you have painted for us, what could Saudi Arabia look like in 20 years?

MR. PERLE: Well, if the current birth rate continues, I imagine it would be somewhere around 35 or 40 million people. That may be a slight exaggeration, but it's been growing. I believe it's the largest birth rate, certainly in the Arab world, and maybe in the world. If oil prices remain high over a sustained period of time, I think they will find it a lot easier to deal with what inevitably is likely to be the instability of the maldistribution of wealth in the country. Most of Saudi Arabia is relatively poor. And I don't believe that can go on forever. The Saudis greatly fear success in Iraq. And they fear it because they believe that a democratic Iraq, an Iraq that is providing a decent life for its people, that is predominantly Shi'a, will pose a threat to them. And they have a long list of ways in which they would feel threatened, not least of which because of the power of the example to the Shi'a of Saudi Arabia, for example, who happen to live where the oil is.

So they – they're very fearful about their own future, which is why so much of the money is offshore. When the Saudis buy Citibank, it's not because they are so confident that it will be there for them in Saudi banks. I think this is a – the House of Saud, at this point, is thinking only narrowly of its own survival. And I believe they're alarmed. They quite understandably try to exude confidence, but the signs are there that they're troubled about their future, and they should be. So I would not invest in Saudi Arabia today. But then the Saudis don't invest in Saudi Arabia either.

MR. MURAWEIC: If your policies create destruction, if your policies create destruction not only within your own country – 60 percent of the doctorates awarded by Saudi universities are in Islamic sciences, and it's really difficult to operate an oil well with a doctorate in Islamic science, which is why they have to rely on foreign slaves, or glorified foreign slaves, technicians, and so on to run most of what works in Saudi Arabia. If you create nothing that has to do with the sources of wealth and prosperity, if you don't educate people, if you decree that one half of society is only good for reproductive purposes, it's actually 67 children per woman per fertile period, so this is I think only Gaza is higher. If you create what not only in your own country, but your creed, your ideology is to create rot elsewhere and everywhere, to make the whole world look like you, which is what the Wahabbi and the Saudi grand design has been and is.

This is what King Faisal undertook. You know, he was the guy who was distributing copies of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion II to every single one of his visitors. So if you create that rot, Alex Alexief has shown, the impact of Saudi Arabia buying Pakistan over a period of 30 years, Pakistan is essentially the only country in the world where literacy rates dropped. Literacy rates in Black Africa for women are higher than they are in Saudi Arabia or in Pakistan for that matter. So if your creed generates rot, corruption, destruction, and fails to build whatever it is that is necessary for the survival, the maintenance of society, doctors engineers, all the rest, people that sweep the floor and that are not Filipinos, because this is against the honor of the Bedouin, and

all the rest of it. You are preparing a formidably troubled future, in fact the formidably troubled future is here, except that right now \$60 a barrel for oil allows the Saudis to paper over or to buy time to buy people, to buy people that sweep the floor, and all the rest of it.

So I think that Saudi Arabia has poisoned the Middle East. Remember when Sadat went to Jerusalem, there was the greatest chance for peace in the Middle East. And it was king Faisal who led the charge to prevent that from happening, giving the Syrians and all the rejectionists lined up behind him. Saudi Arabia is single-handedly responsible for very much of all the conflicts that have Pace, Brent Scowcroft, bloodied and destroyed the Middle East. And when you breed attack dogs so much, the attack dogs sometimes turn into wolves. And this is what has been happening, and this is what increasingly will be happening. The only difference in time is a function of the amount of money that the Saudi royals can apply to buying people. So three years ago, Jim Baker was telling his Arab friends that he gave the Saudi regime five plus years of survival. I wonder what he thinks now.

MR. WIMBUSH: Ladies and gentlemen, the book is called *Princes of Darkness*. Don't forget that the holidays are coming. I'm sure that Laurent will stay and sign a few more copies for you. Why don't you join me now in thanking Richard Perle and Laurent Murawiec.

(Applause.)

[END]