



## ISRAEL NEWS

*A collection of the week's news from Israel  
From the Bet El Twinning / Israel Action Committee  
of Beth Avraham Yoseph of Toronto Congregation*

Such sentiments reflect a sorry state of ideological fatigue, weariness of spirit and loss of resolve. More importantly, though, they indicate a failure to dream.

Every person, every nation, has its dreams. Take that away, and what is left? As the great French writer Anatole France noted a century ago, "To accomplish great things we must not only act, but also dream, not only plan but also believe." Sadly, however, many

## Events...

**Wednesday, September 24, 8:00PM**

**Thornhill federal election candidates debate at the Thornhill Community Shul (Aish Hatorah), 949 Clark Avenue West. Sponsored by Bnai Briith Canada and the Thornhill Community Shul.**

**December 7-16**

**BAYT Brotherhood Seventh Annual Solidarity Mission to Israel. Based in Jerusalem's Sheraton Plaza Hotel. Visits to Hevron, Sderot and throughout Israel. For info contact Moishe Posner 416-878-6606 or moish@GMDwholesale.com or Larry Zeifman 416-256-4000 ext. 239 or LWZ@Zeifmans.ca**

## Commentary...

**Reverse the Process of "De-Patriotization"** By Michael Freund

With his departure from the political scene imminent, Prime Minister Ehud Olmert has apparently decided to slam the door on his way out. Like a boorish guest storming out of a gathering at which he is no longer welcome, the premier used this past Sunday's weekly cabinet meeting - possibly his last - to hurl invective at those who remain faithful to the land of Israel.

In his parting shot, Olmert declared that "the notion of a Greater Israel no longer exists, and anyone who still believes in it is deluding himself."

"Deluding himself"? Frankly, I'm insulted. I don't think I'm deluding myself because I share the dream that Jews have nurtured for 2000 years to return to all parts of our homeland. Nor do I think it is a flight of fancy to believe in the promises that God made to our biblical forebears - Abraham, Isaac and Jacob - that this land would be ours and no one else's.

Indeed, it says a great deal about the state of our leadership, and our political culture in general, that the head of government would so breezily belittle the heartfelt beliefs of a large part of the nation.

The prime minister can choose to think differently, of course. But why must he resort to insults to make his point? Needless to say, this is not the first time that Olmert has used such disparaging terminology.

In a May appearance before the Knesset Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee, he branded those who believe in Greater Israel as "delusional fantasists." "Only fantasists," he said, "can believe that in this day and age, and in the current situation, it is still possible to cling to the vision of 'Greater Israel.'"

Not content that he had gotten his message across in May, Olmert evidently felt the need to add insult to injury once again. But this time, however, he went a step further. Because in addition to bad-mouthing the people of Israel, he also ridiculed the land itself.

Hinting at media reports that he had offered 98.1 percent of Judea and Samaria to the Palestinians, Olmert told the cabinet that "we have to ask ourselves if losing a hill here or there is worth forfeiting the chance to achieve something."

THAT SENTENCE alone embodies all that is wrong - not only with Olmert himself, but with the entire leadership of this country. To demean Judea and Samaria, to reduce the heartland of the Jewish people to just "a hill here or there," is to denigrate the very cradle of our existence.

It reveals the underlying weakness behind Israel's position in the 15 years since the start of the Oslo process: The Palestinians seem to want this land more than our own leaders do. Hence, the ease with which Olmert and his colleagues are so willing to part with it.

Israelis no longer seem to understand this.

What, then, can be done to reverse this trend? Is it still possible to reenergize and reinvigorate the public and instill within it a basic love of land and country? Sure thing, though it will of course take time, and lots of education, to reverse the process of "de-patriotization" that has set in.

But here is a simple idea that could go a long way toward reconnecting us all with our ancestral patrimony: Let's launch an annual "Land of Israel Day." The holiday would be devoted to celebrating the land and our eternal bond with it, and should include a range of educational, social and cultural activities stressing the Jewish people's attachment to this holy soil.

I suggest the 10th day of Nisan. Why? Because according to the Book of Joshua (4:19) it was on that day that the Jewish people miraculously crossed over the Jordan River and entered the land as a nation for the first time.

What could possibly be better than utilizing the anniversary of this momentous historical event to underline our renewed commitment to this land so many thousands of years later? Inaugurating such a day would also serve as a potent reminder to us all that the notion of Greater Israel was around long before Olmert and his sort, and it will outlast them well into the future too.

For, as Menachem Begin once put it so well, "Yet faith is perhaps stronger than reality, for faith itself creates reality." (Jerusalem Post, Sep 17)

**Method in Their Madness** By Barry Rubin

*The Middle East refuses to learn from experience.*

One evening you're walking down a street. A robber jumps on you to steal your wallet. You fight back and after a protracted battle you injure him enough so that he flees the scene.

The next day newspapers report that you assaulted a poor innocent man to mug him. From pulpits, religious leaders denounce you as a bad moral example that should be punished. Politicians urge that the forces of the law be deployed against you. Your attempts to defend yourself are ignored and dismissed as lies and excuses. Most people never even hear your version.

And then, after all that, someone explains: "You know the reason why people don't like you? It's the way you behave. After all, you assaulted that poor man."

That, my friends, is another way of saying that your policy is the cause of your problems.

Of course, the parallel outlined above is too simple - deeds have been done, mistakes made, conflicts occurred - and yet it does convey something essential about the Middle East and the September 11 attacks, as well as being part of a broader pattern of how much of the area deals with the United States, Israel and the West in general.

For example, the most outrageous lies and exaggerations are told in the Arabic-speaking world about Israel. This material then serves as a basis for explaining that Israel is hated, under constant terrorist attack and targeted for genocide because of what it does.

But the question remains: What it does according to whom?

Or consider this question: What's the main lesson the Middle East has drawn from September 11? That terrorism is bad? Don't mess with America? Radical Islamism is dangerous and irrational?

Surely, some have done so. Yet, probably the dominant idea is that the United States is responsible for the September 11 attacks on itself. The less "sophisticated" idea, though common among the well educated, is that the event was a direct conspiracy. The more "educated" notion is that it was a response to US actions. And this latter concept itself comes in two versions:

Readers are requested to please mail contributions to: BAYT - re: *Israel News*, 613 Clark Avenue West, Thornhill, Ontario. L4J 5V3  
Annual Rates: Friend - \$36, Supporter - \$50, Benefactor - \$180. Dedications are welcome at \$120/week. Call (905) 886-3810 for further info.

See *Israel News* on the internet at [www.bayt.org](http://www.bayt.org) and [www.frumtoronto.com](http://www.frumtoronto.com)

Opinions expressed do not necessarily represent the views of BAYT. Thank you to Continental Press for their ongoing support.

the more radical ("you had it coming") and the more moderate ("regrettable, but necessary").

Just because the Middle East refuses to learn from the experience, however, doesn't mean we shouldn't.

First, we should understand that a sphere of dictatorship requires a surrounding universe of lies to protect it. Of course (being a Western thinker requires I engage in self-criticism), that doesn't mean Western democracies are perfect by any means. But they do try hard and their systems seek to correct themselves when they make mistakes, because democracies have numerous independent people and institutions protected by freedom of speech who can challenge and correct each other, presenting different viewpoints.

In Arabic-speaking states, diversity means a choice between agreeing with the dictatorship or being even more extreme in misrepresenting reality.

Second, this situation is not just a matter of repression or regime misinformation, to be corrected by either regime change from outside or massive apologies and concessions. There is a popular base of support for the system, based on culture, history and an interpretation of religion which makes such ideas appeal to the masses.

As Tarek Heggy, the most incisive contemporary Arab intellectual, wrote in 1998, "Even the most outlandish statement, if repeated often enough, can... be accepted as true... in a society in which half the population is illiterate and the other half displays only a very modest standard of education..." This situation provides, "a fertile breeding ground for the most untenable, demagogic and unfounded assertions to take root and flourish."

The only solution is to set different goals and interpretations of the world through rethinking, reform and education. Western glorifications of the Middle East's status quo - "these are customs which must be preserved," "how dare you criticize people's beliefs and offend their sensibilities," etc. - will merely ensure another century of bloodshed, dictatorship and poverty.

Third, just because you're nice and tolerant doesn't mean you're wrong. Otherwise, you'll never understand that just because it is the "other" doesn't mean it's wise. No amount of apology or concession will change those who hate you on the basis of ideology, and who need to hate you to preserve their political, ideological and cultural system.

Or as former Syrian Information Minister (note the significance of his past job) Mahdi Daklallah explained recently regarding his regime's philosophy, "But who cares about the truth?" His words, referring to his claim that the United States planned the September 11 attacks, apply much better to the world in which he exists: "What is important, always, is the use of the events in order to carry out a strategy planned in advance..."

Fourth, politics happens. The Islamist upsurge is no more a mere reaction to what foreigners have done in the Middle East than was the French revolution (Austria did attack France), the Russian Revolution (World War I undermined the Czarist regime), the Nazi revolution (the Versailles treaty and indemnities punished Germany and angered its people), and so on.

The point in discussing the distortion of September 11 in the Arabic-speaking world is that the vast majority of issue discussions there are dominated by lies and nonsense. What is needed is to understand the intellectual preconceptions and social-political structures that create this situation.

Reform-minded Arab intellectuals have repeatedly made these points and been ignored, or vilified, for doing so. Shortly after the first anniversary of September 11, the Egyptian writer Abd al-Moneim Sa'id explained that the response in the Middle East "was to deny that the perpetrators were Arab and that the event had any connection with Arab society and culture." Wild conspiracy theories were spread precisely because confronting the tragedy's implications would require examining real problems "which Arab societies have been so assiduously avoiding." The more Middle Eastern terrorism spread globally, "the greater was the rush to look the other way." Five years later, that statement is all the more true.

We hear endlessly that the problem is the West's failure to understand the Middle East. The truth is the exact opposite: the Middle East doesn't understand the West and, by the same token, doesn't understand what it needs to do to get out of the hole it has dug for itself.

*The writer is director of the Global Research in International Affairs (GLORIA) Center and editor of the "Middle East Review of International Affairs Journal". (IsraelNationalNews.com Sep 16)*

---

### **The Myth of Al-Aqsa** By Mordechai Kedar

*The holiness of Jerusalem to Islam has always been politically motivated*

When the Prophet Mohammad established Islam, he introduced a minimum of innovations. He employed the hallowed personages, historic legends and sacred sites of Judaism and Christianity, and even paganism, by Islamizing them. Thus, according to Islam, Abraham was the first Muslim and Jesus and

St. John (the sons of Miriam, sister of Moses and Aron) were prophets and guardians of the second heaven. Many Biblical legends ("asatir al-awwalin") which were familiar to the pagan Arabs before the dawn of Islam, underwent an Islamic conversion, and the Koran as well as the Hadith (the Islamic oral tradition), are replete with them.

Islamization was practiced on places as well as persons: Mecca and the holy stone - al-K'abah - were holy sites of the pre-Islamic pagan Arabs. The Umayyad Mosque in Damascus and the Great Mosque of Istanbul were erected on the sites of Christian-Byzantine churches - two of the better known examples of how Islam treats sanctuaries of other faiths.

Jerusalem, too, underwent the process of Islamization: at first Muhammad attempted to convince the Jews near Medina to join his young community, and, by way of persuasion, established the direction of prayer (kiblah) to be to the north, towards Jerusalem, in keeping with Jewish practice; but after he failed in this attempt he turned against the Jews, killed many of them, and directed the kiblah southward, towards Mecca.

Muhammad's abandonment of Jerusalem explains the fact that this city is not mentioned even once in the Koran. After Palestine was occupied by the Muslims, its capital was Ramlah, 30 miles to the west of Jerusalem, signifying that Jerusalem meant nothing to them.

Islam rediscovered Jerusalem 50 years after Mohammad's death. In 682 CE, Abd Allah ibn al-Zubayr rebelled against the Islamic rulers in Damascus, conquered Mecca and prevented pilgrims from reaching Mecca for the Hajj. Abd al-Malik, the Umayyad Calif, needed an alternative site for the pilgrimage and settled on Jerusalem which was then under his control. In order to justify this choice, a verse from the Koran was chosen (17,1 = sura 17, verse,) which states (translation by Majid Fakhri): "Glory to Him who caused His servant to travel by night from the Sacred Mosque to the Farthest Mosque, whose precincts We have blessed, in order to show him some of Our Signs, He is indeed the All-Hearing, the All-Seeing."

The meaning ascribed to this verse is that "the furthest mosque" (al-masjid al-aqsa) is in Jerusalem and that Mohammad was conveyed there one night (although at that time the journey took three days by camel,) on the back of al-Buraq, a magical horse with the head of a woman, wings of an eagle, the tail of a peacock, and hoofs reaching to the horizon. He tethered the horse to the Western Wall of the Temple Mount and from there ascended to the seventh heaven together with the angel Gabriel. On his way he met the prophets of other religions who are the guardians of heaven.

Thus Islam tries to gain legitimacy over other, older religions, by creating a scene in which the former prophets agree to Mohammad's mastery, thus making him Khatam al-Anbiya ("the Seal of the Prophets".)

Not surprisingly, this miraculous account contradicts a number of the tenets of Islam: How can a living man of flesh and blood ascend to heaven? How can a mythical creature carry a mortal to a real destination? Questions such as these have caused orthodox Muslim thinkers to conclude that the nocturnal journey was a dream of Mohammad's. The journey and the ascent serves Islam to "go one better" than the Bible: Moses "only" went up to Mount Sinai, in the middle of nowhere, and drew close to heaven, whereas Mohammad went all the way up to Allah, and from Jerusalem itself.

What are the difficulties with the belief that the al-Aqsa mosque described in Islamic tradition is located in Jerusalem? For one, the people of Mecca, who knew Muhammad well, did not believe this story. Only Abu Bakr, (later the first Calif,) believed him and thus was called al-Siddiq ("the believer".)

The second difficulty is that Islamic tradition tells us that al-Aqsa mosque is near Mecca on the Arabian Peninsula. This was unequivocally stated in "Kitab al-Maghazi," a book by the Muslim historian and geographer al-Waqidi. According to al-Waqidi, there were two "masjeds" (places of prayer) in al-Gi'irranah, a village between Mecca and Ta'if - one was "the closer mosque" (al-masjid al-adna) and the other was "the further mosque" (al-masjid al-aqsa,) and Muhammad would pray there when he went out of town.

This description by al-Waqidi which is supported by a chain of authorities (isnad) was not "convenient" for the Islamic propaganda of the 7th Century. In order to establish a basis for the awareness of the "holiness" of Jerusalem in Islam, the Califs of the Ummayyad dynasty invented many "traditions" upholding the value of Jerusalem, which would justify pilgrimage to Jerusalem for the faithful Muslims. Thus was al-Masjid al-Aqsa "transported" to Jerusalem. It should be noted that Saladin also adopted the myth of al-Aqsa and those "traditions" in order to recruit and inflame the Muslim warriors against the Crusaders in the 12th Century.

Another aim of the Islamization of Jerusalem was to undermine the legitimacy of the older religions, Judaism and Christianity, which consider Jerusalem to be a holy city. Islam is presented as the only legitimate religion, destined to replace the other two, because they had changed and distorted the Word of God, each in its turn.

Though Judaism and Christianity can exist side by side in Jerusalem, Islam regards both of them as betrayals of Allah and his teachings, and has always done, and will continue to do, all in its power to expel both of them from this city. It is interesting to note that this expulsion is retroactive: The Islamic broadcasters of the Palestinian radio stations consistently make it a point to claim that the Jews never had a temple on the Temple Mount and certainly not two temples. (Where, then, according to them, did Jesus preach?)

Yasser Arafat, himself a secular person (ask Hamas!), did exactly what the Califs of the Umayyad dynasty did 1300 years ago: He marshaled the holiness of Jerusalem to serve his political ends. He must not have given control of Jerusalem over to the Jews since according to Islam they are impure and the wrath of Allah is upon them. Moreover, the Jews are the sons of monkeys and pigs. The Jews are those who distorted the holy writings which were revealed to them and denied God's signs. Since they violated the covenant with their God, He cursed them and they are forever the inheritors of hell. So how could Arafat hand over Jerusalem to the Jews?

The Palestinian media these days are full of messages of Jihad, calling to broaden the national-political war between Israel and the Palestinians into a religious-Islamic war between Jews and Muslims. For them, Christianity is no better than Judaism, since both "forfeited" their right to rule over Jerusalem. Only Islam - Din al-Haqq ("the Religion of Truth") - has this right, and forever.

Since the holiness of Jerusalem to Islam has always been, and still is, no more than a politically motivated holiness, any Muslim leader or ruler would be putting his political head on the block should he give it up. Must Judaism and Christianity defer to myths related in Islamic texts or envisioned in Mohammad's dreams, long after Jerusalem was established as the ancient, true center of these two religions, which preceded Islam? Should Israel give up on its capital just because some Muslims decided to recycle the political problems of the Umayyads 1250 years after the curtain came down on their role in history? (YNET Sep 15)

*The writer is a lecturer at Bar-Ilan University's Department of Arabic.*

---

### **E Pluribus Pluribus?** By Rabbi Francis Nataf

*The fight against laziness and complacency.*

When I used to dream of moving to Israel, I thought about a Jewish country with one common destiny. Even back then, I knew that this destiny was contested and that the religious vision that I cherished was not something all Israelis would quickly adopt. At the same time, I looked forward to the possible impact that I could have on my less traditional fellow Israelis in the same way that I impacted on my largely non-Orthodox community in the United States.

Of course, in the United States, or at least where I was living in the United States, my co-religionists were actually neighbors. Beyond the fact that they lived next door and down the street, we read the same newspapers, shopped at the same stores, sent our children to the same schools and camps and discussed many of the same issues. Realizing that this was largely due to the small size of this particular Jewish community, I expected that things would be different in Israel. I knew that the much larger communities there allowed every group of Jews to live with others more similar to themselves. On some level, I welcomed this. Living with people who more closely shared my lifestyle and values would certainly make many things easier.

Yet, I realized that living in a type of religious ghetto would not only limit the challenges of a mixed environment, it would also limit its benefits. I realized that my children would have very little exposure to people different from themselves. I bemoaned the fact that if meeting non-Orthodox Jews would be a rare experience, contact with non-Jews would be almost non-existent, making proper education about diversity a much greater challenge.

I drew some consolation from the notion that since I identified with the religious-Zionist camp, I would be more connected with the general Israeli society than my friends in the more segregationist Haredi camp. Little did I realize that as yeshiva study and resultant serious observance of Halacha became blessedly more widespread in my community, so did greater segregation from general society.

Not only do we have religious-Zionist towns and neighborhoods, we have our own schools, youth groups, newspapers, books and websites. Our children have learned the lesson well and have developed their own music, their own modes of dress and even their own holidays. On Yom Yerushalayim, the day marking the reunification of Jerusalem under Jewish sovereignty, religious-Zionist youth converge on our holiest city in joyful celebration. Watching these festivities gives us pride in our youth, who, by and large, display wholesomeness, unswerving loyalty to the Jewish nation and enthusiasm for the heroic return to our land. At the same time, the lack of hardly anyone else participating in these festivities is a cause for deep sadness, not only about the

lack of identification of other sectors of the Jewish people with what this important day represents, but also at the isolation of our own sector thereby revealed.

On a personal level, I do not regret the choice to live in a religious neighborhood - children need to be nurtured in an environment that reinforces a family's central values. Moreover, we no longer live in de Tocqueville's America or Hirsch's Germany, whose values were often symbiotic with our own. Today, exposure to even the respectable media brings with it exposure to moral anarchy, promiscuity and idle gossip, and this is not something we should want for our children. It is true that, as adults, they will need to be concerned about the problems of all Jews and all Israelis. They will need to understand that Jewish tradition doesn't allow us simply to hide behind ghetto walls. Still, as children, they will have a harder time incorporating our moral vision if they were to see their friends trampling all over it.

The question is whether we can still produce adults interested in the larger community and who will want to engage in sincere dialog with it. Is disengagement from general society the unavoidable cost of strengthening our own community? I would like to think not. However, without an awareness of the problem and serious attempts to do something about it, it will be the default outcome.

Right before the pullback from Gush Katif, religious anti-Disengagement forces organized a campaign called Panim el Panim. It consisted of settlers and their supporters knocking on doors throughout the center of Israel to explain their case on a personal level. One of the goals was to break down the stereotypes about settlers developed from the secular media. It was a brilliant idea and did a lot of good. Many people visited by Panim el Panim had never before met a religious person, never mind a settler. As far as its political effectiveness, however, it proved to be too little, too late.

But why did it take the Disengagement to make us realize that we have to reengage with Israeli society? The answer may be simpler and less pleasant than we would like to admit: discomfort.

One of the greatest commodities held out by modern society is comfort. We spend a great deal of our time and effort trying to be comfortable; materially, emotionally and otherwise. Indeed, working hard to attain comfort may be the greatest paradox of our day. Be that as it may, contemporary society's pursuit of comfort has also impacted on religious Jewry. More than ever, we are not willing to do things that are uncomfortable.

And as we become more insular and as the gap between us and the secular widens, it becomes increasingly uncomfortable to engage in meaningful personal interaction with them. So much so that it has become easier for our youth to risk their lives, facing wild police brutality at Amona, than it is for them to have a meaningful conversation with a secular Jew.

My greatest concern here is not about segregation. The more important fight is against laziness, complacency and the increasing unwillingness among all sectors of society to do that which is difficult.

If we justifiably claim ourselves to be the most idealistic sector of the Israeli population - to be the ones who are still perfectly at peace with giving up our lives for "our people and the cities of our G-d," then we must also realize that idealism and self-sacrifice are not only expressed on the battlefield. (IsraelNationalNews.com Sep 12)

*The writer is the Educational Director of the David Cardozo Academy and the author of "Redeeming Relevance in the Book of Genesis" (Urim). He has held senior educational positions in Israel and the US at Yeshiva University, the Shehebar Sephardic Study Center and the David Shapell College of Jewish Studies.*

---

### **Into the fire** By Frank J. Gaffney, Jr.

The question on Wall Street in the wake of the latest meltdowns in the U.S. financial sector is "Who's next?" The more important issue is not which of the major banks or investment firms will follow Lehman Brothers into bankruptcy or Merrill Lynch into fire sale. Rather, the question should be "What's next?"

After all, the problem afflicting so much of the U.S. capital markets - and, therefore, those around the world - is not one of individual corporations hitting a rough patch and requiring bail-outs from the federal government or the private sector. It is, instead, the result of a reckless disregard for sound investing practices in the unscrupulous pursuit of profit. In a word, the last "what" was "subprime."

As we all know by now, the practice of building financial houses of cards on various investment instruments based in non-transparent and problematic subprime mortgage-backed securities was a formula for disaster. It induced firms that not only should have known better but are required to behave better to perform unconscionably. In the process, they violated industry standards and government regulations with respect to transparency,

disclosure, due diligence, good governance and accountability.

Tragically, in the process of leaping out of the scalding subprime frying pan, Wall Street is heading directly into a fire that promises, if anything, to be more devastating than the present disaster. Incredibly, it bears all the hallmarks of subprime with respect to a lack of transparency, a systematic failure to disclose and an utter absence of due diligence, good governance and accountability. The next "what" is called Shariah-Compliant Finance (SCF).

Shariah, of course, is the term the Islamists use to describe the ruthlessly repressive, totalitarian program they believe should govern every aspect of the lives of faithful Muslims. It is also the instrument they intend to use to rule the world. The first clue that something is wrong with Wall Street's next big thing is that it is Shariah-compliant.

The next clue is how Shariah-Compliant Finance works. Like subprime, it is a black-box, in which management and investors alike are told to trust in the experts. In this case, the experts are Shariah authorities who are accorded exclusive responsibility for determining whether investments are "pure" (halal) and therefore acceptable, or "impure" (haram) and not.

As an important monograph on the subject recently issued by the McCormick Foundation and the Center for Security Policy (for copies contact the Center at [www.SecureFreedom.org](http://www.SecureFreedom.org)) makes clear, these authorities are, unsurprisingly, adherents to Shariah. A number of them explicitly embrace its call to jihad (including a former senior member of the Dow Jones Islamic Index, Sheik Taqi Usmani). This "holy war" is to be waged where possible through violent means, where necessary through "soft" means like Shariah-Compliant Finance. For this reason, such Islamists call SCF "financial jihad."

Earlier this year, David Yerushalmi, a litigator specializing in securities law and an expert on Shariah, produced a riveting legal memorandum (soon to appear in the University of Utah Law Review) examining the civil and criminal exposure inherent in Shariah-Compliant Finance (). His conclusion: banks and investment houses offering SCF products may be enabling or engaging in the following: racketeering, anti-trust activity, securities fraud, consumer fraud and/or material support for terror.

What makes Shariah-Compliant Finance even more dangerous than subprime is that, in its effort to legitimize and institutionalize Shariah in America, it is advancing a criminal conspiracy whose purpose is the violent overthrow of the U.S. Constitution and government in favor of Islamic rule.

That would make it sedition.

For these reasons, we should be especially wary of the purported silver-lining to the current Wall Street crisis: the infusion of vast quantities of petro-dollars, primarily from OPEC's Saudi Arabia and other Islamist nations in the Persian Gulf. It is bad enough that these putative rescuers of our subprime-fueled liquidity debacle are buying up engines of our capital markets for pennies on the dollar. Worse yet, they are, in the process, putting themselves in a position to promote Shariah-Compliant Finance and the seditious theo-political agenda it serves.

A forthcoming book about SCF by Center for Security Policy Vice President Alex Alexiev offers a further, sobering thought about the fire next time: It is becoming ever-harder to differentiate between the Gulf states' so-called Sovereign Wealth Funds (actually they are the slush funds of the sovereigns) and Shariah-Compliant Finance. The former is increasingly being invested in ways that promote the latter, adding unfathomably large pools of funds to what is estimated already to be an \$800 billion global industry.

The Center for Security Policy has sent copies of David Yerushalmi's legal memorandum to the heads of scores of Wall Street firms and the nation's leading commercial banks, warning them of the ominous similarities between subprime and SCF. Interestingly, only the late Merrill Lynch bothered to respond, albeit with a vacuous note blithely affirming its concern about terrorism.

Fortunately, Congress is beginning to recognize the possible peril in what may happen next to Wall Street. Notably, last month, a senior and highly respected member of the Senate Finance Committee, Arizona Republican Jon Kyl, wrote SEC Chairman Chris Cox, Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke, Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson and Attorney General Michael Mukasey asking them to respond to Mr. Yerushalmi's analysis of Shariah-Compliant Finance. The question occurs: Will they encourage or discourage the capital markets' leap into the fire via a headlong plunge into subprime on seditious steroids? (Jewish World Review Sep 16)

*The writer heads the Center for Security Policy.*

# CANADA'S FEDERAL ELECTION

WILL BE HELD ON OCTOBER 14, 2008

This date corresponds with the first day of Succot.

*You can still exercise your right to vote.*

You can vote at **ADVANCED POLLS** on October 3rd or 6th.

You can also vote **NOW** by obtaining a **SPECIAL BALLOT** from your local Elections Canada office.

You must apply for your special ballot registration form before 6:00 pm on Tuesday, October 7th.



Visit [www.bnaibrith.ca](http://www.bnaibrith.ca) for your copy of the Election Task Force Guide: *Issues of Jewish Community Concern and Recommendations for Action*

**COMMUNITIES THAT VOTE ARE COMMUNITIES THAT ARE HEARD**



For the location of your local Elections Canada office or polling station, contact Elections Canada at 1-800-463-6868 or [www.electionscanada.ca](http://www.electionscanada.ca)

