

America's Jihad

America's Jihad

America has declared war in response to the destruction of the World Trade Center in New York and the partial destruction of the Pentagon on September 11, 2001. President Bush has called it a war on terrorism, which must be fought in a manner unlike any other war in history. Others have termed it World War III. Neither of his assertions is correct, as it is merely the continuation of the War of Independence launched by the Declaration of Independence in 1776 and the subsequent adoption of the Constitution, as amended by the People of the United States.

It is in every aspect a religious war (the "American Jihad"), and the applicable "scriptures" are the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. It is these "scriptures" which provide for the separation of church and state in specific recognition of the evils heaped upon mankind in the name of religion exercised via the power of the state.

All religions validate and reward irrational thought as they urge men to rely on inner, emotional feelings, and promote complete subjugation to God's teachings as pronounced by the clerics themselves!! This is irrational because no one can prove or disprove the existence of God, and the only provable aspect regarding the clerics assertions of what constitutes God's will is the self-interest of the clerics themselves and the power they secure in persuading others of their insight into God's nature and will.

"Fundamentalists" of any faith, Christian, Jewish or Muslim, seek to impose their religious convictions on the remainder of the populace, and seek the powers of government to do so; and in this vein become "extremists." Osama bin Laden and the Taliban seek a union of church and state, with the muslim church to be the governing body. It is this religious zeal which has led to the oppression of Afghanistan and its citizens, performing public executions in a soccer stadium financed by the international community. They are true zealots. Their position is identical to the conservative, fundamental christian in America represented by Jerry Falwell and those who profess to know the will of God, and varies only in degree from the Taliban, not in precept. Indeed, Bush's proposal to provide monies to "faith based charities" flirts with the very evils our founding fathers sought to avoid, as the distribution of such monies would not be subject to the principles of due process embodied in the Constitution any more than the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. ("NASD") is subject to the procedural due process requirements imposed on the Securities and Exchange Commission as a part of the Federal government. And yet government has now dictated that no one can engage in the securities business without being a member of the NASD. It is no stretch of the imagination that such "faith based charities" could withhold funds from any needy recipient based on a promise to vote for any given candidate willing to impose the will of the "fundamentalist-extremists."

Actually, this war even precedes the Revolutionary War, and can be traced-back to tribal organizations where a "Chief" or leader represented the power of the state and the "Shaman" represented the power of religion or the church. And ever since, obedient parents have been giving power over the lives of their children to either the Church or the State, once convinced of their own impotence in exerting power over others or their own inability to discern the will of their gods. Some faiths refer to the latter as the "power of discernment," which only the clerics are deemed to possess.

This war from the dawn of time is a war for men's souls, in order to control their actions. The promise is one of glory in the hereafter in exchange for obedience in this life to the intermediary cleric. And the goal of obedience is today expressed in many other phrases, e.g. "law & order." And it is only in those societies where "obedience" is the overriding principle that blood atonement has been practiced, i.e. Christianity during the Crusades, Catholicism during the Inquisition, Protestants against the witches of Salem, Mormons under Joseph Smith, Jr. and Brigham Young upon their instruction to their Danite Avenging Angels, and Moslems today in Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran, etc.

The bottom line is that religious tenets are by definition divisive. As soon as one religion or another professes to know more than another about the nature of God and His rules for life decisions, or declares itself a "chosen people," the boundaries are drawn which divide one man from another. And, it does not seem to be dependent on the sufferings of any given people. Although the Jews suffered at the hands of the Nazis, they learned no lesson of tolerance for others from that experience and upon the establishment of Israel mandated Judaism as the state religion. This is really no different than what the Taliban and Osama bin Laden seek in Afghanistan and other moslem countries!! And as long as either side asserts claims to the property underlying the Mosque in Jerusalem, there can be no peace between them. This is based on a zeal to exhibit obedience to God, rather than recognize that men of any faith are more valuable to God than a piece of dirt. This is exemplified as follows: "As long as I am "in tune with God", it doesn't matter what I do to my fellow men."

America's role in this war was summarized in the movie "A Few Good Men" starring Tom Cruise and Jack Nicholson, when one of the defendants explained to the other why the mere following of a "superior's" order was improper: "We were supposed to protect those unable to protect themselves, and we didn't do that."

It is interesting that of all the governments formed since 1776, the only one which even tried to follow the example set by our "Scriptures" was Vietnam under Ho Chi Minh. America dishonored itself (and its role in this war for souls) when it failed to honor its commitment to Ho Chi Minh to not support France's reoccupation of Indochina after World War II in return for Ho Chi Minh's agreement to fight against the Japanese. To whom was Ho Chi Minh to turn for help other than the communists? If one has ever watched the movie "Indochine" starring Catherine Deneuve, one understands that France's occupation of Indochina was nothing more than the slavery of those people.

Terrorism

The seeds of terrorism find fertile soil wherever injustice abides, and governments can be terrorists as much as a misdirected religious fanatic. Rampant injustice results in a keen sense of justice, and when coupled with idealism of any source leads to a rationalization that terrorism is justified.

It is my opinion that every act which vitiates or nullifies the operation of the Constitution as our "scripture," constitutes a "terrorist act." Such acts are as much an attack on our Constitutional way of life as an attack with hijacked aircraft, for such acts hijack the Constitution itself!!!

The Oklahoma City bombing by Timothy McVeigh was the result of injustices heaped on others at Waco and Ruby Ridge by a government out of control. The terrorism of Osama bin Laden would not be possible absent the perceived injustice of America choosing the defense of Israel to the exclusion of any Muslim interests and the "invasion" of Saudi Arabia by America in connection with the Gulf War. But, even more than this, had America not treated Afghanistan like a third-world African nation once it defeated Russian forces, and had assisted in reestablishing a freely chosen government, that country would not have been left with the power void filled by the Taliban.

Terrorism in America continues, and is not limited to outside sources:

Was it not a terrorist act for the Supreme Court to alter the processes of government in giving George W. Bush the Presidency in violation of our "Scriptures" in the Constitution? This was an hypocrisy of the first order as the "majority" had to abandon their own professed principles of "states rights" to arrive at the decision. **It was purely a political decision, without any legal foundation, but especially without any legal foundation based on their own professed "strict construction" of the Constitution!!!**

Was it not a terrorist act for Senator Orrin Hatch of Utah to forestall every judicial gageship nomination by President Clinton from 1996-2000 in his role as Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, regardless of the qualifications and with specific reference to skin color? His constitutional obligation was to process those nominations!

Was it not a terrorist act for Congress to pass uniform sentencing rules, thereby eliminating the judiciary from applying any mitigating factors; and what about ever increasing limitations on "admissible evidence" one can present in one's defense against criminal charges?

Is it not a terrorist act for prosecutors to misrepresent facts and law to grand juries to secure indictments?

Is it not a terrorist act for President Bush to seek to give governmental powers to faith-based charities, knowing full well that such powers can later be used to influence votes?

Is it not a terrorist act for Congress to give more credence to special corporate interests able to line their "war chests," than to a citizen in their own constituency earning minimum wage? This includes legislation which favors big business and prejudices those unable to muster the same financial resources, including alterations to the bankruptcy laws which favor even more already profitable lenders, elimination of the right to sue HMO's for medical malpractice or limit lawsuits against medical professionals for medical malpractice, or allow for planned obsolescence of products without disclosing the planned useful lives of those products, for which the last effects of repair affect the poor disproportionately, and all this without any mention of corporate welfare to already profitable companies.

Was it not a terrorist act for Senator Trent Lott to assert that voting reform was not necessary as citizens are more concerned about feeding their families and paying power bills than securing voting justice?

Is it not a terrorist act for Congress to pass tax laws retroactively as it did in 1976 and 1986, thereby preventing tax planning by citizens?

Was it not a terrorist act for both Republicans and Democrats to ignore the plight of the 20% of American children living in poverty? Neither party addressed those issues during the campaign of 2000?

Was it not a terrorist act for Congress to allocate \$15 Billion to bail-out the airlines at the same time the airlines are citing "acts of war" in laying-off their employees and avoiding financial obligations to those employees?

Was it not a terrorist act for Congress to declare war on an unknown enemy, and thereby delegate its powers to the Presidency?

Was it not a terrorist act for Congress to limit the rights of citizens to sue HMO's for medical malpractice?

Is it not a terrorist act for congressmen to alter their votes based on contributions from special interest groups?

Is it not a terrorist act for government to fail to address environmental concerns which can lead to the very extinction of the human race, e.g. global warming, destruction of forests and wilderness, destruction of wetlands which clean our waters, and over-fishing of the fisheries of the world?

Is it not a terrorist act to ignore the plight of children forced into labor in third world countries to sew our clothes, make our Nike shoes and athletic equipment?

Is it not a terrorist act to monopolize the resources of the world to the detriment of those not financially strong enough to compete for those resources?

Is it not a terrorist act for big business to plan the obsolescence of each product produced in our economy without disclosing the period of utility?

The only persons who will not agree that the foregoing acts are "terrorist acts" are those who are not adversely affected by them. Thus, "terrorism" is defined by each affected group, and no single definition can be applied! **The power is in the definition!!!** And in each instance, the definition will be provided by those unable to protect themselves from the action complained of.

We must ever remember that "We [are] supposed to protect those unable to protect themselves..." for that is the mandate of the Constitution, which was designed to protect the rights of the minority against the terrorism of the majority! And in this context, the philosophy of Ayn Rand that logic dictates that each of us is better served when all of us are doing well. The issue is whether we will include our "brothers and sisters" in other lands within the definition of "us"?

In the words of the theme song from "Les Miserables," "Let he who is strong come stand with me," with the implication that we will all endeavor to aid those unable to help themselves.

Raymond L. Ridge
September 23, 2001

P.S. When the men of Islam come to understand the full extent of our war, i.e. that all persons, including women should be to have full civil rights, they will understand that this holy war under the Constitution is a war against their rights to discriminate against their women and treat them as anything less than first class citizens. This will indeed lead to a religious war between the west and the east!!!

Additionally, once it becomes clear to China and other eastern nations that they cannot improve the lives of their citizens because the Western nations have monopolized the resources of the world, another world war will eventually erupt.