The Truth and nothing but the Truth

by SANE Staff, Sun, October 26, 2008, 09:28:AM

Some of the visitors to this site come by way of CAIR press releases attacking SANE, David Yerushalmi, or our Mapping Shariah project. The link to this blog provides some background for those PR attacks. Others come here by way of a dozen or so other pro-Shariah or dhimmi Elite (e.g. Salon) web sites which regurgitate CAIR's talking points. Some few come via a Far Left pseudo-Jewish site called Tikun Ola which also employs ad hominem argument rather than substance.

The approach used in these attacks is to quote literally a word or phrase or in some cases a provocative query in a long analytical piece that examines the hard reality of facts but to quote it in such a way as to suggest some demonic (i.e., racist) agenda on the part of SANE and its participants.

(Other smear approaches include: (1) making up quotes and not providing an actual link to the SANE site; (2) simply supplying the title and link to a long article, such as "On Race: a Tentative Discussion", to suggest that it must be "racist" and betting on the fact that most cyberspace drive-bys will never take the time to read the article much less attempt to study it at any level of seriousness; and (3) linking to articles by others that have been posted on other websites in David Yerushalmi's name--we're not sure if the spurious attributes have been deliberate or not because we haven't bothered to track them all down and read them. We ignore these smear tactics because they are facially juvenile.)

Here we go through some, but not all, of the representative samples of the more "substantive" critiques:

[1] The name: **Society of Americans for National Existence**. By just mentioning the word "national" in some positive way, the Elite respond by immediately crying out as if that were a demonstration that one advocates fascism. The argument: because some of the 20th century fascists have called themselves "national socialists" or would emphasize national interests as their calling, anyone who advocates "national" as opposed to "human" interests is a fascist. Little needs to be said here since in fact most fascists are not true advocates of national existence and sovereignty but rather seek global hegemony well beyond "national" identity. This was true of Hitler's ultimate designs and certainly true of Marxist-fascist regimes such as the Soviet Union. National existence or the advocacy of such is not an "ism" as in nationalism. It is a statement about how men live in political society--that is, about political order. It is about discriminating between a distinct people and others.

Now, it is absolutely the case that the Elite and the Shariah faithful abhor national existence--viz., the distinction between a nation and others. They both seek a worldwide political order where each man is a citizen of the "human race". They both understand, by necessity, man reduced to indiscriminate society--that is, about political order. It is about discriminating between a distinct people and others.

[2] From SANE's Mission Statement:

*America was the handiwork of faithful Christians, mostly men, and almost entirely white, who ventured from Europe to create a nation in their image of a country existing as free men under G-d. This constellation of forces existed no where else in the world and resulted in a unique people and nation.*

This reference to historical fact is often used to prove "racism". The reason this type of argument is successful is that almost any reference to the historical founding that emphasizes the particularity of the people who came to these shores with dreams of a new and different political order contradicts the absolute narrative imposed by the Elites and exploited by the Shariah faithful following the CAIR line of attack. This narrative allows one only to speak of non-peoplehood dressed up in talk of "mutil-culturalism" and "pluralism". If you do mention White, or Christian, it must be in a denigrating way. Thus, beginning in the 1960s and continuing to this day, the Bill Ayers-Noam Chomsky genre on university campuses never tires of speaking about how America is grounded in the White Christian racist, imperialist, colonialist agenda. The Muslim Brotherhood types like Edward Said of Columbia University exploited this narrative to attack non-Muslim academics who dared to to even attempt to study what Shariah and Islam say about the world.
But, the quite obvious question must be asked: had the pioneers who came to this continent not been who they were, in particular White European Christians, would they have developed a constitutional republic resembling America? If one were to argue in the affirmative, we'd like to hear that argument made outside a comedy routine.

[3] Referencing the black subculture of violence, drugs, and the abuse of women is forbidden. In an earlier article (referenced here), we point to statistics collected by the Department of Justice and reported by the New York Times indicating that blacks in NYC are 2.5 times more over represented as murderers than any other race and their victims are more likely to be black. Pointing to this statistic and asking hard questions about the source of this violence is similarly "racist" UNLESS you blame the White majority culture and identify institutionalized racism and poverty as the cause. We pointed out in our earlier article that while Latinos in NYC are more likely to live in poverty than blacks, the Latino murder rate mirrors their overall representation in the population. That of course suggests something other than simple poverty at work. Now, we certainly will not discount the impact of slavery on African Americans or even colonialism on the African continent to explain in part the violence of this sub-culture but that suggests issues of intractability that the Elite glibly ignore when they devise "social policies" such as affirmative action and welfare programs to "fix" the problem.

We note here as we did in our article that black Americans who have raised this same issue, such as Bill Cosby, have been excoriated by the Elite as well but not labeled racist since that epitaph is reserved for any one who is not "of color" who dares to raise these issues.

[4] The Founding Fathers purposely limited the political franchise to a subset of the overall adult population. In several articles we asked the question why that was. It certainly was not, in their estimate, a mistake or an oversight. These men were brilliant political theorists who came together to author our founding documents and to create a social and political culture which developed into the greatest nation of modern times. This forces the question what it is the Founders sought to institutionalize by allowing such a limitation to the most important aspect of representative government. The modern narrative is that these men were flawed in the extreme and the great founding political error limiting the franchise in the way it did can be explained by the fact that the Founders were racists, bigots, and misogynists. But this narrative does not even bother to ask whether America could have come to exist or survive if modern notions of "democracy" as a kind of constant plebiscite among peoples with no common culture or worldview had existed at the time. Might it be worth asking if these men understood there to be an importance -- either in fact or in political theory - - to this discriminating limitation? But alas, to even ask this question is to suggest, at least by implication, that there might have been good reasons for such limitations. That, in today's politicized environment, is enough to indict even the best men.

[5] Finally, SANE’s Immigration Proposal, which is linked here, in its original form called for outlawing Islam but it specifically defined Islam as synonymous with Shariah, the Islamic law doctrine which seeks an Islamic worldwide political order predicated upon Shariah as constitutional and the use of violence and murder to achieve that end. In the various CAIR and CAIR-like attacks, this definitional limitation was ignored and the proposal was quoted out of context to suggest that we proposed outlawing Islam when worshipped as a personal, pietistic and quite peaceful relationship with Gd sans Shariah. We have since moved the definition up to the actual substantive provisions to avoid this version of cyberspace vandalism.

If someone wishes to take issue with our understanding of Shariah, which is effectively sedition when advocated from within our borders and an act of war from without, that is fine. We will take up that argument quite readily. But to argue that discriminating between legitimate religious expression and worship on the one hand and a violent doctrine seeking our destruction on the other is "racist" or "Islamophobic" is absurd in the extreme and deserves no more attention than we pay it here.

With this we conclude this defense of our purposes and ultimate mission in the context of race-baiting slurs by the enemies of America as a distinct nation and people. Reasonable visitors to this site and others who come across the dishonest diatribes of our critics will certainly have enough to discern for themselves the value of our analysis and the provocative nature (meaning contrary to the PC narrative) of our inquiries.
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David Yerushalmi responds to the false analogy often used by the Muslim Brotherhood spokesmen that "Shariah is just like Jewish law or Catholic Canon". This time, however, the ploy was used by a Bush administration official, Suhail Khan, during a debate with Frank Gaffney of the Center for Security Policy. (The letter has been revised slightly from its original form and reported given the refrain-like quality of this argument to this day.)... more »
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Is Counterinsurgency a Viable Strategy?
Affairs of War
By Col. Thomas Snodgrass, USAF (ret)
Fri, October 02, 2009, 03:03 PM
This essay, a companion piece to the Colonel’s (“Can We Find Clarity in the Afghan Strategy Debate”), provides the historical and theoretical context of the Colonel’s criticism of modern warfare strategy in Af-Pak and Iraq, which provides the critical lessons in what we can and cannot expect going forward.

This essay also appeared in the American Thinker.... more »
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By Col. Thomas Snodgrass, USAF (ret)
Sun, September 13, 2009, 07:44 PM
SANE’s Col. Snodgrass cuts to the chase on the problem with our current military strategy in Afghanistan in particular and more generally in the war on Islamic terror, or what the Obama administration calls "overseas contingencies". It is an important clarification to the war punditry.
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REMEMBER WHAT OUR ENEMIES ARE CAPABLE OF!
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President Bush tells us that we are not fighting Shari'a-faithful Islam. Only against "radicals" who have "kidnapped this noble religion." He is wrong. President Bush tells us the Elite who would weaken this country's defenses are not unpatriotic or disloyal. He is wrong. (Original posting: 9-11-2006)...
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In November 2007, the Center for Security Policy retained SANE's David Yerushalmi to prepare a legal memorandum which examined the civil and criminal exposure of U.S. financial institutions involved in Shari'ah-compliant finance (SCF). This memorandum was shortened and published by the Utah Law Review in Vol. 2008, No. 3.

Below is the stated Purpose of the memorandum and the Conclusion.

The PDF file links above will allow you to download the memorandum in its entirety and the latest pre-publication draft of the shortened version published by the Utah Law Review. (The links are broken; working on repair.)...
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This paper was submitted and accepted by the National Defense Intelligence College in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Science of Strategic...