

for Muslims. That is to say nothing of Islam's history of anti-Christian violence or of the long-standing U.S. policy in the Middle East, which has antagonized the Muslim world for decades. Estimates of how many Muslims reside in the United States vary (from 1.5 to 7 million), but the numbers are striking, no matter which estimate is accurate.

The virtually undefended 4,000-mile border with Canada may be just as much a potential entryway for terrorists as the 2,000-mile border with Mexico. Canadian security officials have admitted that as many as 50 terrorist groups are operating in their territory. Since Canada's immigration and asylum policies are more lax even than our own, can we simply ignore the threat?

Despite all of this evidence suggesting otherwise, Homeland Security Under Secretary Asa Hutchinson, reacting to questions about border security, has assured Americans that "the strategy we have is appropriate for the threat." Really? Is this another example of the apparently delusional Bush administration rejecting "reality-based" analysis?

The administration is currently attempting to cut off one important source of real-world information: Border Patrol whistle-blowers, who are being threatened with retribution. Agent Ron Zermeno, of the Temecula, California, office, told local officials last August that illegal-immigrant roundups had been stopped by officials in Washington, setting off a public outcry, according to the *North County Times*. Zermeno says he was subsequently threatened with being fired by Border Patrol management. It seems the Border Patrol is implementing new, looser rules regarding agents' performance reviews—rules that Border Patrol agents say can be used to kill dissent within the ranks.

In another move signaling the Bush administration's real intentions (as opposed to public reassurances) regarding border security and immigration control, the White House successfully lobbied to have many immigration and border-security provisions stripped from the intelligence reform bill passed by Congress and signed by the President last December.

It is evident that the Bush administration does not take homeland security seriously. What's more, the White House's wrong-headed "War on Terror" is a distraction from the real threat to the United States, which is at our very borders and in our hometowns, not in Baghdad or Tehran. It should be clear to all who have paid attention and have put loyalty to country ahead of loyalty to party that the Bush administration's misadventure in Iraq is unjustified, has turned into a quagmire for the U.S. Armed Forces, and is likely doing wonders for terrorists' recruiting efforts. Patriots who opposed this war did so precisely because we regarded the invasion of a country that had not attacked us and did not represent a threat to the United States as morally indefensible and contrary to American interests. Many of us were appalled that the administration was chock-full of officials whose primary allegiance was apparently to a foreign power, Israel, and that these officials had helped push America into an unnecessary war to defend someone else's country. We were angered that the administration did next to nothing to defend our homeland from attack, as the readily available information on the border-security crisis made plain.

The Bush administration's "War on Terror" has drained resources that could have been used not only to pursue and to punish those responsible for the September 11 attacks but to

defend our country where it really mattered—on our own soil. To do so requires a comprehensive approach, involving revising our immigration and border-security policies; reevaluating our relations with our neighbors, Mexico and Canada, which would entail demanding that they do their share to help the United States counter the terrorist threat and police our common borders; and reviewing a foreign policy that unquestioningly supports Israel without any regard for the cost, antagonizes the Islamic world, and undermines U.S. standing around the globe.

Finally, as long as Washington is wedded to globalization and multiculturalism (President Bush himself has assured us, despite all contrary evidence, that Islam is "a religion of peace"), America will not be secure. There is no reason for the United States to make war on the entire Islamic world—but neither is there a reason to allow a substantial portion of that world into the American homeland, gaining a foothold that is a serious threat now and will be a greater one in the future. Patriots should not be distracted by the administration's sly-dragons-across-the-sea policies, the same policies that have allowed the Islamic threat into our homeland. Real homeland security demands an uncompromising love for that homeland, a devotion to her people, and a willingness to act. If the United States can send 150,000 troops to Iraq, then America can defend her borders. If Americans are willing to fight and die in distant lands, then surely we must be willing to move decisively to defend our own homes and neighborhoods. c

The Lake by Peter Hunt

Bell-cries of swan and grebe ring out
The sunlit spell of day's delight
As trembling wavelets gleam like foil
Across the lake in morning light.

Nestlings come from rippled shade
In yellow reeds, by sun made bold,
Fussing and playing in broccoli-green
Where willows pour their streams of gold.

But beneath the red and gold
Of that old Autumn oak which dies,
Where silver light and mellow warmth
Can't come, the sunken dinghy lies.

Is There a *Khilafah* in Your Future?

The Coming Islamic Revolution

by James George Jatras



Discussions of *jihad* terrorism and the best defense against it rarely avoid entanglement in the contentious question of the relationship of terrorist actions to Islam as a religion. Is the terrorism an aberration of Islam, or is it, judged in light of history, the prevailing orthodoxy? Indeed, the question is an important one, and, in a society that avoids uncomfortable realities, answering it honestly is less a matter of analysis than of moral courage.

Perhaps less important in theory, but more central in terms of policy, is a question less commonly asked: *What is it, exactly, that the terrorists mean to achieve?* Nonstate violence as a political/military methodology is not new, nor does it exist in a vacuum. It proceeds from a worldview and, in almost all cases, has stated, ideologically defined, conscious goals. The question then becomes one of whether the terrorists' motivations are essentially *reactive* (i.e., they are offended by the presence of infidels on the sacred soil of Arabia, they are opposed to U.S. policy in the Middle East, they are trying to preserve a traditional way of life from the depredations of modern moral corruption, etc.), in which case we would need to stop doing something (pull U.S. forces out of Saudi Arabia, stop supporting Israel, stop exporting trashy movies, etc.). Or is what they want something *affirmative*, something that has an independent, positive imperative?

In suggesting an answer to the question, I ask the reader to do a quick Google search for the word *khilafah*. When I first tried this about a year ago, the result was in the range of 26,000 to 29,000 links (some of them redundant). Now, the results are above 50,000, and, by the time you read this, maybe more. Almost all of these sites link to material available in English; I can only guess what is out there in Arabic, Urdu, Farsi, Turkish,

Malay, and other languages. The location of the site operators is not always clear, but many of them seem to be based in the United Kingdom. (Since many of the quotations in this article were downloaded a few months ago, some of the sites have been removed, to some extent because of action of the British government. Since the sentiments expressed on the sites are unlikely to have disappeared as conveniently as the sites themselves, this appears to be, at best, treating the symptom.)

Khilafah—perhaps more familiar in the common form in English, *caliphate*—historically refers to the state ruled by a successor (called *khalifah* or, in English, *caliph*) of Muhammad, beginning in the seventh century. The *khilafah*, in one form or another, lasted until it was abolished in 1924 by Mustafa Kemal Ataturk at the founding of the Turkish Republic.

Even a cursory review of these websites shows that in only a very few of them does the *khilafah* reference pertain to this purely historical entity. On the contrary, as far as I can see, most of them are found on advocacy sites. These are people who date the current decrepitude of the Islamic world in comparison with the West to abolition of the *khilafah* and insist that all Muslims are obligated to work for its revival. For example, the following is from the website (hizb-ut-tahrir.org) of the Turkish branch of an international political party whose stated goal is reviving the *khilafah*:

It was a day like this 79 years ago, and more specifically on the 3rd of March 1924 that . . . the criminal English agent, Mustafa Kemal (so-called Ataturk, the "Father of the Turks"!) announced that the Grand National Assembly had agreed to destroy the Khilafah; and . . . he establish . . . a secular, irreligious, Turkish republic. . . .

Since that day the Islamic ummah [nation, community] has lived a life full of calamities; she was broken up into small mini states controlled by the enemies of

James George Jatras, an attorney in Washington, D.C., was formerly a policy analyst with the Republican leadership of the U.S. Senate.