

THE ISRAEL PROJECT

CONFERENCE CALL WITH AYAAN HIRSI ALI

**MODERATOR:
BARBARA LEDEEN,
SENIOR ADVISOR ON IRAN,
THE ISRAEL PROJECT**

**SPEAKERS:
AYAAN HIRSI ALI,
FELLOW,
AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE**

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2010

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

BARBARA LEDEEN: Good morning. Hello, and welcome, everyone. My name is Barbara Ledeen, and I'm the senior advisor on Iran at The Israel Project. On behalf of our entire team, I'm very pleased that such a prominent group of journalists and others could join us today to hear from our friend, the noted author Ayaan Hirsi Ali.

First of all, for those who don't know, The Israel Project is an international nonprofit organization dedicated to providing journalists accurate information about Israel. The Israel Project is not related to any government or government agency.

We have offices in Washington and Jerusalem. And we have a team of 44 experts and former journalists who are always ready to help you get the facts that you need to cover the Middle East, so please do not hesitate to contact us if we can help you in any way. The information on our website is in 10 languages: English, French, German, Spanish, Russian, Arabic, Turkish, Chinese, Japanese and Portuguese.

Now I would like to introduce you to Ayaan Hirsi Ali, who will speak with us this morning about her newest book, "Nomad," the second best-selling volume of her autobiography, as well as a very important L.A. Times op-ed, which was published on September 27th and which offers a new idea about how to fight back against the death threats, which are increasingly and successfully used to intimidate and to stifle free expression.

Today's briefing with Ayaan is on the record. Now, for a few facts about Ayaan: Ayaan was born in Mogadishu, Somalia, in 1969. The daughter of a political opponent of the Somali dictatorship, Ayaan grew up in exile, moving from Saudi Arabia to Ethiopia, and then Kenya. As a young child, she was subjected to female genital mutilation at the hands of her grandmother.

Growing up in Saudi Arabia, she studied and practiced Islam and strove to live as a devout Muslim. She began to question aspects of her faith while listening to a sermon on the many ways women should be obedient to their husbands. She couldn't resist asking, "Must our husbands obey us, too?" After she learned that she was to marry a distant cousin who lived in Canada, Ayaan fled to the Netherlands, where she was given asylum and, in time, citizenship.

After learning Dutch, and while working as a translator for Somali immigrants, she saw firsthand the inconsistencies between liberal, Western society and tribal Muslim cultures. Ayaan served as an elected member of the Dutch parliament, focusing on furthering the integration of non-Western immigrants into Dutch society and on defending the rights of Muslim women.

She campaigned to raise awareness of violence against women, including honor killings and female genital mutilation – misogynistic practices that had followed the immigrants into Holland. In her three years in government, she found her voice as an advocate for an enlightened Islam.

In 2004, Ayaan gained international attention following the murder of Theo Van Gogh, who had directed her short film, "Submission," a film about the oppression of women under

Islam. The assassin, a radical Muslim, left a death threat for her at the end of the knife he had plunged into Van Gogh's chest.

In 2006, Ayaan resigned from parliament when the then-Dutch minister for immigration revoked her Dutch citizenship, arguing that Ayaan had misled the authorities at the time of her asylum application. However, the Dutch courts confirmed that Ayaan was indeed a legitimate Dutch citizen, a decision which led to the fall of the government. No longer able to live as a free person in Holland, she subsequently moved to the United States.

A resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute in Washington, D.C., Ayaan is continuing her research regarding her relationship between the West and Islam. She has to live with round-the-clock security. Her willingness to speak out has made her a target for violence by Islamic extremists.

She is now working on another book, "Shortcut to Enlightenment," a fascinating dialogue between Muhammad, the founder of Islam, and three of her favorite 20th-century Western thinkers: John Stuart Mill, Karl Popper and Friedrich von Hayek. She is the founder of the AHA Foundation, a charitable educational foundation, which works to protect the rights of women in the West from radical Islam and from tribal customs. And with that, I will open the discussion to Ayaan, who will make a presentation to you all. Thank you.

AYAAN HIRSI ALI: Thank you very much, Barbara Ledeen. Thanks to The Israel Project and the guests for being here and for giving me this platform. I'm just going to limit my intro to about, well, less than 10 minutes because you have a number of questions you want to ask me and I think we have only about 40 more minutes left.

I wrote "Nomad" as a follow-up to "Infidel," and I tried, in "Nomad," to answer the questions that readers of "Infidel" had. And I grouped those questions into four categories. The first question – and it wasn't one – but groups on both sides of the Atlantic – asked me was, how are things between you and your family?

And in the first part of the book, I not only answer that question, but I use members of my family and the context of my family – you know, the values, the relationship between my father and my brother, the relationship between my mother and my brother – to illustrate the differences between the two cultures: the one that I grew up in that was Somali, that was tribal and that was Islamic, and the culture I found in the Netherlands that was Western, secular and individualistic.

The second question I address in "Nomad" is a question that also both Europeans and Americans asked, which was, do you think that radical Islam is also present in the United States? Because at the time, in 2006, 2007, it seemed as if Americans thought of their Muslim immigrants and their Muslim citizens as better off than the Muslims in Europe, which is the case. And because of their economic integration and educational integration, Americans – or at least, most Americans felt that they were immune to radical Islam and to homegrown terrorism.

And I addressed that question, also, in “Nomad,” and unfortunately, I’ve been proven right with – I was here in the U.S. when Nidal Malik Hasan, in Fort Hood, among others – and after the book was published, the Times Square bomber, and others – all homegrown, all middle class, all highly educated – decided to not only reject the American Constitution but to designate the United States as an enemy and attack it from within.

The third question, which is a bit more complex, is if there are differences in values between, say, the secular, Western, liberal, individualistic one and the tribal, Islamic one, what exactly are those differences and which ones are the most important? And those differences are many.

And tribal families, themselves, have their own differences within, as is true for, obviously, in the Western context. Not every individual is the same; not every family is the same; not every country is the same that is Western. And I zoom in only on three themes that are universal: values and attitudes toward sexuality, values and attitudes toward money, values and attitudes toward aggression and violence.

I chose the theme of sexuality because it is essential in the relationship between men and women. And I describe how, both in “Infidel” and in “Nomad,” why the values that regulate, whether they’re religious or tribal, put women in a subordinate position, and where sexuality is mystified, and how it is taboo, and how, in the secular West, that is – things used to be like that a long time ago, but how that has evolved to a point where men and women are not only considered equal, but sexuality itself is demystified. And the emphasis, now, for the average European and the average American is to inform young people, both boys and girls, about their sexuality and teach them to be responsible.

The attitudes towards money, I thought, was interesting, especially in the context of Europe because of the poverty. You know, there’s a large Muslim underclass. Whether they come from Pakistan and Bangladesh or whether they come from Afghanistan or Somalia, there is a growing number of families, communities in Europe, particularly, that seem to get stuck in that welfare situation. And I thought examining the attitudes toward money, sharing – everything is more communal, as is opposed to, you know, the Western way of being selfish and saving your own money and all of that. But examining these different attitudes toward money might give us a clue as to why some of them remain in poverty situations or in these welfare states.

And finally, aggression. And aggression was one of the – when I was a translator, I noticed, very often, Europeans debated about crime on the streets, domestic violence, especially violent crime. And at one point, it was inescapable that if you went into a prison in a white country like the Netherlands, that you actually saw color in the prison. And most people were of color – most of them from Turkey or from Morocco, and later joined by Somalis, Afghans, Iraqis; these are the new asylum-seekers. Now, not all of them are criminals and not all of them are violent criminals, but there was an element of violence, an element toward aggression, which seemed to be what they called a lower threshold compared to the native Dutch, who, even though they were violent, were just – the numbers were just very different.

And I thought it was also very important to explore that element toward aggression, starting from the family, and zoom in on how little boys are brought up as opposed to little girls. Even though little girls are brought up to be submissive, boys are brought up to be aggressive. And that doesn't apply to every single family but it does explain why some of the numbers in these prisons – violent crime is more common than in the other Westernized groups.

If you read the book, I think it makes more sense and it's much more consistent. But that's, I think, where I'll stop it now and invite Barbara to ask me any number of questions until 11:45, when I have to stop.

LEDEEN: Okay. Would you – thank you, Ayaan – would you care to talk about the op-ed that you did for the L.A. Times, which was called – well, the way it was described is, “It's Time to Fight Back Against Death Threats by Islamic Extremists,” and that a federal law is needed to cover threats against free speech rights here in America. Could you just review that for us?

HIRSI ALI: Yes. Daniel Huff and I, who I think works at the Senate, talked about, you know, is it possible to think of legislation that might deter extremists, like the ones who threatened the “South Park” writers and producers?

And Daniel educated me on the FACE Act – the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances – which was passed in 1994, and it protected people who were fighting for reproductive rights here in the U.S. It protected them from violent extremists who took their pictures – and at the time, I don't think things were online, but put them up in places, you know, kind of inviting people who were against them – the pro-life people – to shoot them, kill them, maim them and harm them in some way.

And that act has led – it's not only the legislation and the enforcement of the legislation, but it has considerably decreased the risk that reproductive rights – the members of the reproductive rights movement were faced with. And the idea of the op-ed was, is it possible to bring up legislation against Islamic extremism, against individuals who threaten people like me and Molly Norris and the “South Park” guys, put up our names and faces and then invite, pretty much, every radical Muslim to kill us? Is it possible to do something like that?

And the op-ed argues that we should emulate the FACE Act. And the reason that we think it might help is, one, as a deterrent. And two, there is a civil damages provision for that, where you can countersue those people who want to harm us. Now, that will only solve half the problem. What wasn't in the op-ed and is a problem of its own is the high cost of police protection. The high cost of hiring security men to, you know, guard an individual who is not in government, who is not an elected official – that is the law, now – or not a foreign delegate to have 24-hour protection. That just means that most people feel, I can't deal with this. And someone like Molly Norris decided to go into hiding because she couldn't afford that kind of a 24-hour security and has resigned. And that's very sad, but it just gives you an idea of how extreme and deep and the huge impact it has on an open society if you allow people to threaten.

LEDEEN: Could you describe Molly Norris' situation? Maybe not all the listeners know who that is.

HIRSI ALI: Molly Norris is a comedian who lives in Seattle, and after the “South Park” guys were threatened for making a sketch of Muhammad, among other religious icons, when they were threatened, she proposed a “draw Muhammad Day.” I think that would have been on the 20th of May.

And in response to that, Muslim extremists threatened her, follow her around, to the point where the FBI advised the comedian to go into a witness protection, as one of the options of staying alive, to go into a witness protection program, which means your identity gets completely erased. You become someone else. You give up your occupation. It might even force you to move houses. But in any case, it is permanent hiding, if I may put it that way – very dramatic.

LEDEEN: Very dramatic. So let me move, now – thank you – to the questions that we have received. “Is it hard to write the books about your life?” “How do you find the courage to maintain your public position of opposing Islamic extremism?” There are a lot of questions that came in about your personal ability and your personal commitment to do what you do, even in the face of death threats.

HIRSI ALI: Well, I think if I rewind things to just after the 11th of September, 2001, I may have reconsidered things if I had known I was going to live with permanent security for many years to come. I don’t know if I would have done that. You know, you just can’t avoid it. But it started out simply with that response that we all had on the 11th of September, and all the different theories about what just happened. Did Islam have anything to do with it? How can Muslim minorities be integrated into Dutch society?

And I just kept writing based on my education, my observation, my experiences. And I didn’t only get threats; I also got a great deal of appreciation and encouragement. And unlike Molly Norris, I got protection from the police in the Netherlands. And that was one—I mean, I’m brave to an extent. I’m brave to the extent that I’m not suicidal – I can continue writing and doing my work knowing I’ll wake up the next morning.

LEDEEN: Well, we’re all grateful for that. Another question that came in: “Do you have a website?”

HIRSI ALI: The AHA Foundation – A.H.A Foundation – has a website. I do not personally have a website, and part of that is because of the safety issues involved. But I can do my work – I’ve decided to dedicate the foundation to the protection of women’s rights here in the West, here in America – Muslim women’s rights – from tribal customs, from militant Islam.

And that website is there for potential victims and potential helpers to connect and to reach us, and so that we can connect them. So for now, that is enough for me. Also, I’m too mobile. I don’t stay in one place. I travel all the time. So maintaining a website has its own difficulties. And I’m also not that tech savvy. (Chuckles.)

LEDEEN: Me either. So some of the other questions that we received: “Do you think that there are many radical Islamists in the United States, or has this been overstated?” “What do you think can be done to stop the growth of, quote, unquote, ‘radical Islam’ in both Western and Muslim societies?”

HIRSI ALI: Well, first, radical Islam comes in two flavors. And one flavor is the violent flavor – the al-Qaida type, the suicide bomber. And the other is more the Muslim Brotherhood type. And both groups have the same objective, but they disagree on the means to get them to that same objective, that objective being either the introduction of Sharia law or the dream of a caliphate, of an Islamic empire.

Now, a lot of attention and a lot of money and a lot of resources goes to preventing the violent ones from committing acts of terror and disrupting society. And you see this all the time if you travel at airports, just how much energy is spent on preventing the next attack.

The other group – the Muslim Brotherhood type of group – have the same objectives, but they go in a very different way about it, and that is, they try to influence society in such a way that we should not criticize Islam, they can continue to build mosques and Muslim centers and go on about their da’wa or their propaganda toward, mainly, other Muslims.

The Brotherhood’s main objective today is not so much to convert Americans to Islam or Europeans to Islam, but to capture the hearts and minds of all the Muslim immigrants. And once they have a large enough majority, they may or may not resort to violence. And if you look at the genesis of the Muslim Brotherhood in places like Egypt, you see them oscillating between violent phases and nonviolent phases.

How do you deal with that? I think that the administration – this administration and the previous administration and all the European governments – have put in place a system in which they can target the extremists – the violent ones – and make that more of a chronic problem instead of a warlike problem.

I haven’t seen any strategy to deal with the other side, and the reason being because they are peaceful and also because they are very good with their PR; they’re very good with their marketing; they’re very good in playing white guilt – you know, conflating a set of beliefs – and that’s what Islam is – with racism. Any form of criticism toward Islam is labeled “Islamophobia.”

And they’ve been successful, also, in not only infiltrating but becoming a part of the system. And I think that, that group – in my view, that group is much, much more dangerous. And the way to deal with it – and we are not there yet. The way to deal with it is to take Islam and make it into more of – you know, divide it into two dimensions: the religious dimension – you know, the faith dimension, the way we define religion in a country like the U.S.– the prayer, the fasting, the charity, the visiting of Mecca and all other kinds of birth and death rituals. That would be treated as religion and should be protected by the First Amendment in the way that a religion is protected by the First Amendment.

The political-social dimension of Islam – that is, the Sharia-type Islam – should just have the same status as any other political ideology. And if we give it that status, then we will be able to compete by composing counter-propaganda against the utopia that they use to attract Muslim immigrants and then compete for the hearts and minds of other Muslims.

And that would happen here in the U.S. and in the West, but also in Muslim countries. But the two Muslim countries that we're involved in today is Iraq and Afghanistan. That's where there is U.S. presence – U.S. and American allies – and I think what we have in place in those two countries is the counterinsurgency strategy, which is a military strategy.

And I think that should be supplemented with a counter-propaganda strategy so that the population can be told – can be educated over and over again on what it means to live under Sharia law. And that is not – right now, it is not a government policy. It's also not a civil society movement, or there's no activity toward that counter-propaganda.

LEDEEN: Do you have a sense that the Islamic world is familiar with the freedoms that women and human beings have in this part of the world? Do you think that they're familiar with our rights and what guarantees them?

HIRSI ALI: I'm not sure they're familiar with it in detail. I don't know if Muslims out there read and study the American Constitution and the Declaration of Independence and so on, but they are certainly familiar with human rights, and they certainly find this respect and protection of human rights just as attractive as all other human beings in the world. And a measure of that is just the sheer number of people in Muslim countries who live under despots, whose human rights are violated, and who all want to come here.

And that is why I find it very, very important that we compete with the agents of radical Islam for their hearts and minds, and familiarize them more and more, not only with freedom, as a state, but also the institutions and the language of liberty. And that is, when it comes to how we are dealing with the political ideology of Islam, I think that's what we are neglecting to do.

LEDEEN: “How would you explain” – this is another question that came in: “How would you explain why formerly outspoken women's-rights groups, such as the National Organization for Women and others, have been almost silent regarding the cause of Muslim women? What can be done to further women's rights in Muslim countries?”

And then the next question came in: “What can be done to motivate women's groups in America to actively participate to combat this problem?”

HIRSI ALI: Well, the first – when I explored why feminists were silent on the plight of Muslim women – and not only Muslim women; or Chinese women, Indian women, women of what was formerly “the third world” and is now politically correctly labeled “the developing world”. The answers that I've found are, the feminist movement was essentially a white movement, and the aggressor, the oppressor, was the white man.

And by the time most feminists actually realized their objective, they had moved – there was a mission drift where they had moved from fighting for women’s rights to fighting for the rights of Palestinians and types of other, you know, cultural groups that they felt whose rights were violated, and moved away from the focus of women only.

Besides, in the 1960s and 1970s, when this shift takes place, it’s also the rise of multiculturalism and moral relativism, where you’re not allowed to compare cultures and religions and values, because if you do so, that makes you into a racist, an ethnocentrist, an imperialist, et cetera, et cetera.

And unfortunately, that created a situation where the white man would be criticized for every single misstep he makes, and that gets corrected, but all men of color could get away with oppressing women simply by claiming that their culture be respected or their religion be respected, by claiming the minority status. And you know, while that is globalizing at this fast pace that it is now globalizing, there are no more minorities and majorities, and in fact, the minorities and majorities are very much reversed, in a way.

Now, how can feminists come out of that trap and focus again on their mission and take on the real oppression of, you know, the honor killings, the female genital mutilation, the abortions of Chinese girls. There are about 100 million girls missing in Asia, according to some of the reports because families who are told you can have only one child want only a boy and don’t want a girl.

And these are very dramatic and, you know, very – these are matters of life and death, and they affect women. And they could take these things on if they left the moral relativism path and also, if they could persuade themselves that belief – you know, there’s a difference between a set of beliefs and a faith and a culture is an abstract term. And a culture pertains to groups.

And feminists, but also liberals, started out by protecting the rights of individuals, individual human beings. And individual human beings are not abstract; they are flesh and blood. And I think it’s not only the feminists, but in general, the liberal West has to go back to that focus of human rights, where it begins with individual human rights, regardless of your faith, gender, sexual orientation, religion, et cetera.

LEDEEN: Have you seen incidences of, I want to say, honor crimes here in the United States?

HIRSI ALI: Oh, yes, yes. If you go on the AHA website and, you know – I would love to put you all on the news – we have this newsletter that we send out. And you get the examples of the two girls in Texas who were killed by their father, a cab driver; the man in Arizona, an Iraqi, who ran over his daughter for having a boyfriend.

You know, there are tons of examples not as – I think America is behind when it comes to giving this problem a name and either creating the institutions and the laws that should stop it, or informing and influencing the existing agencies, whether they are civil society or whether they are government agencies, in informing them about this particular domestic violence problem.

LEDEEN: “Do you still follow the political situation in the Netherlands?” “And if so” – these are questions that came in – “what do you think about the court case against Geert Wilders?” “Will Geert Wilders be influencing the Dutch government?” “Do you think freedom of speech is in danger in the Netherlands?” Those all came in this morning.

HIRSI ALI: Yes, yes, I follow the political situation in the Netherlands. They have just signed a government coalition pact that puts Geert Wilders and his party as a supporting part, but they’re not part of the government in the sense that they provide ministers. This situation is new for Holland, and I think it is precarious but it’s better than nothing.

We didn’t have a government in the Netherlands since February, when the government fell. We’re in October. In a way, it’s embarrassing, especially in a situation like this one.

Now, for those people who’ve been following the presence of – you know, the predicament of Islam in the Netherlands and in Europe, the problem didn’t start with Geert Wilders. And Geert Wilders is not the problem. And prosecuting him and applying all kinds of strategies to silence him only exacerbates the irritation that the population has with the elites. In the 1990s, there was a small party that addressed immigration issues. They were labeled racists; they were silenced.

Fritz Bolkestein, who was an EU commissioner, brought the subject to the mainstream politics of the liberal party, and he was in a coalition with the Labor Party and the smaller liberal party.

For a while, things seemed to go well. When Bolkestein left, the issue was again marginalized. Again, we had another group – another party that only wanted to talk about immigration and Islam issues. That wasn’t even a party. It was a man being paid full time. But he managed to get such a huge vote that it shocked everyone, even though he was labeled a racist and all kinds of tricks were applied to silence him, and he definitely wasn’t a racist. Still, the problem will not go away.

And then someone like Geert Wilders comes along, and today, when I watch politics in the Netherlands, what I see is a persistence of these problems and a persistence within the Dutch population that they think this is a priority and that it should be addressed. And it doesn’t matter if it’s Geert Wilders or if it’s anyone else; that problem persists. And it’s not only Dutch; it’s in Sweden; it’s in Switzerland; it’s in Germany; it’s in France; it’s everywhere.

And this is going to go on for a while, and I think it’s best if European governments would quit ignoring the issue and pretending that everyone who addresses it is the devil incarnate, and actually address the issues that its population wants to be addressed. And it would also be great if the Americans learned that lesson from Europe, where silencing the critics will have a counterproductive outcome.

LEDEEN: Another question that came, “When compromise is considered a weakness, how does one negotiate? This has a particular implication for the two-state solution.”

HIRSI ALI: Oh, for the two-state solution, in Israel, you mean?

LEDEEN: Yes. When compromise is considered a weakness, how does one compromise with one's adversary, especially when you're talking about things like your border and the national security of the country?

HIRSI ALI: Yeah, that is – I've said, every time I've ever written anything on this and ever looked at the situation in Israel between the Israelis and the Palestinians, what I see is, the Palestinians who do want to compromise are weakened by those who do not want to compromise.

And it is no longer a contained, territorial conflict between the Palestinians and the Israelis; it's become a huge religious problem, where it's not only the Palestinian that Israel is dealing with, but all of Islam. And giving in or bringing about a two-state solution is something that the mainstream – well, mainstream Muslim countries like Saudi Arabia and Iran and the UAE and even countries like Egypt – deplore and don't want to have anything to do with.

So when one party wants to compromise and the other one does not want to compromise, then there is no negotiation possible, and that is why this issue's been going on for decades. And as long as the Arabs who want to compromise remain the weaker group, that compromise is going to – yeah, to be a mirage, as all things in the Middle East are it seems.

LEDEEN: There have been a number of questions on another type of subject, which I'll try to encapsulate into one question: How does one safely inject the topic of Islamic law in conversation without sounding offensive, Islamophobic, bigoted, racist, xenophobe? Those are ugly words that are used to describe people who refuse to be self-censored. Can you give them a hand on that?

HIRSI ALI: Well, the question is, is Islamic law a threat to Israel, to America, to the West? Is Islamic law—Sharia law—a threat in Turkey and Indonesia and Malaysia – countries that were, you know, relatively democratic compared to other Middle Eastern countries? If that is true, then – no, when you pose the question, at least, you need an opportunity to explore it. What is Islamic law?

And if you can't ask that question – if by asking the question, you are considered racist or Islamophobic, xenophobic, then those who do that – those who want to silence any kind of exploration or criticism of Sharia law – are not – they're not genuine participants in the discussion. They don't want to debate.

They have only one objective, and that's to silence criticism so that they can continue their propaganda to get almost all Muslims to believe – or, no, all Muslims to believe in Sharia. So what I would do is just ignore them, and I think an insult like Islamophobic or racist is a very small price to pay to prevent them from getting what they want.

LEDEEN: Thank you. And another question – I think this will be the last one because of the time restrictions – “Women in Islamic countries are subjugated and frequently abused. What percentage of Muslim women know about Western women’s lifestyles? Do the women resent their restrictions, or do they just accept them? Do the women have any way to assert themselves?”

HIRSI ALI: On the question of knowing, with the television and with soap operas, with the Internet, with the revolution in information technology, I think many non-Western women and many Muslim women know about the freedoms that women have in the West. Do they want them? I think they do. I don’t think that human beings want to live in oppression. But getting out of that oppression means you pay a very, very high price.

And the question for every Muslim woman is a very personal one. To get out of oppression and seek freedom, is she able or willing to pay that price? And I think that right now, most Muslim women find themselves in a position where the price of freedom is too high. You can see that in all the incidents when you follow in places like Pakistan and Iran, and even in Saudi Arabia.

Some of the women who choose to be the architects of their own destiny are faced with violence; they’re faced with death threats; they’re faced with rejection by their own families; they’re faced with challenges that I think European and American women have never seen, not even in past centuries.

LEDEEN: I think that’s right. Have your experiences in the United States fulfilled your expectations?

HIRSI ALI: They have fulfilled mine.

LEDEEN: Good, well we’re glad that you’re here and we’re very grateful that you participated in our call with us today. And I want to thank all of our listeners for this wonderful discussion this morning. And I hope that they will stay in touch with The Israel Project. Thank you very much, Ayaan.

HIRSI ALI: Thank you very much. And I wish you all the best and I wish that you succeed in your objectives.

LEDEEN: Thank you so much.