

Australian Infidels Grow Restless: Federal Senator Jacqui Lambie Says "Halal Money" Funds Islamic State, Will Move Private Bill

As reported in "The Australian".

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/jacqui-lambie-says-halal-money-funds-islamic-state-to-move-private-bill/story-fn59nix-1227215526328>

'Jacqui Lambie says "halal money" funds Islamic State; to move private bill

'Jacqui Lambie is threatening to introduce a private senator's bill to stop what she believes is "halal money" (*that is: money garnered by Muslims in the shape of fees paid by non-Muslim businesses in order to have their product/s certified – by Muslim halal certifiers – as 'halal'. And those fees are not 'one-off', I understand that they have to be renewed at intervals.* – CM) funding terrorist group Islamic State.

Or, for that matter, other similarly sinister entities. After all: a good Muslim, such as would be expected to set up a 'halal certification' business, would pay zakat. And one of the prescribed and documented beneficiaries of zakat is the Muslim who is waging Jihad fi sabil allah. Senator Lambie might have been better advised to speak more generally, and argue that the money being raised by all those busy-bee halal certifiers as being funnelled, via zakat, to "Muslim jihad terror organisations". – CM

'In a late-night address to the Senate last night, the

outspoken independent senator questioned whether halal certification funds militants (*sic: jihadi terror raiders* – CM) in Syria and Iraq.

'She said she was prompted to look into the issue after receiving hundreds of emails from concerned residents.

Excellent. A politician who actually pays attention! The unhappy rumblings from the Islamoinformed are, it appears, beginning to be heard. I myself have written to this Senator, in the past, back when she was proposing a burqa ban and at the same time expressing some perfectly reasonable misgivings about sharia (as reported and discussed, here) –

http://www.newenglishreview.org/blog_direct_link.cfm/blog_id/56550

'The Tasmanian senator said a study by the parliamentary library, which she commissioned, exposed some “surprising facts” which alarmed her.

Sensible woman. That is what the researchers in the parliamentary library are supposed to do: provide our representatives with information that they may not have time or expertise to unearth for themselves. – CM

'Certifiers are not legally required to disclose their fees, nor is there a formal reporting or auditing system to ascertain whether funds are being misused, she says.

She would do well, besides consulting Patrick Sookhdeo and Barnabas Fund for yet more information on why it is wise to be uneasy about the normalisation of halal and the accompanying “halal certification” moneymaking racket, also to read Sookhdeo’s useful little book on sharia finance, which is a very similar can of worms. – CM

“Given that our enemies in Islamic State are receiving a steady cash flow to control their caliphate in Syria and Iraq,

why isn't there a legal requirement in Australia for halal certification fees to be disclosed?" Senator Lambie said.

"And given that our nation is on high terrorism alert, while hundreds of Australian (*sic: she should have said, 'Australian-passport-holding'* – CM) Islamic State sympathisers are fighting our ADF forces in Iraq, why is there no formal reporting or auditing mechanism in Australia to ascertain whether monies paid for halal certification are misused?"

'Senator Lambie warned if the government failed to answer her questions, she would introduce legislation to close such "legal loop-holes".

"(The loopholes⁰ could allow financing of terrorists and Australia's enemies through halal money", she said.

'She's not the first politician to raise the issue.

'Nationals MP George Christensen last year wrote an opinion piece suggesting consumers who bought halal products could be funding Islamic extremism.

Zakat – the portion of their earnings that pious Muslims are supposed to devote to 'charity' – has always gone at least in part to support those waging Jihad. – CM

'Last year, after Mr Christensen's comments, Halal Australia, a company that certifies halal food, denied supporting terrorism.

"The service fees paid to Halal Australia for halal certification and accreditation are used to maintain the normal costs of running a registered business in Australia", it said at the time.

A business providing a 'service' that 98 percent of Australians – the 98 percent who are not Muslim – neither need nor desire, but which practically everybody in our food industry – and a good few others besides – are now being

conned into buying. – CM

“Halal certification profits do not go towards supporting any terrorist activities or violent politically-motivated religious organisations.

There is, of course, the little problem that in Islamspeak ‘terrorism’ does not necessarily mean what it means for infidels. In Saudi Arabia, for example, atheism has been classified as ‘terrorism’. Strictly speaking, from the Muslim POV, any word or deed that involves rejection of Islam or resistance to Islamisation can be defined as ‘terrorism’. The drawing of a picture of Mohammed, by the Charlie Hebdo satirists, was from a pious Muslim POV, an act of terrorism; a crime worse than the slaughter of said satirists by a team of Muslim assassins bent on imposing the sharia punishment for ‘blasphemy’. So when he says that his profits don’t support ‘terrorist activities’ he might not necessarily mean what the naive Infidel hearer thinks he means. He might just mean that his profits don’t go to sustain any unislamic activities...And note that by excluding ‘violent’ politically-motivated religious organisations, he doesn’t exclude the funding of what might be called ‘stealth jihad’ engaged in by politically-motivated Muslim organisations that do not, at present, openly use violence. Though again, what Muslims think of as ‘violence’ and what Infidels think of as ‘violence’ are not necessarily one and the same. – CM

“Nor do we have anything to do with any organisation or group anywhere in the world that incites violence and are not aligned with our values of freedom, egalitarianism, equality of opportunity, and mutual respect and **tolerance.**”

Flowery nothings. One must bear in mind, always, in cases like this, when some aspect of the Islamisation process is being confronted, that Muslims are permitted to lie in order to protect Islam and Muslims. In any case, if one is familiar with Islamspeak, then words like ‘respect’ and ‘tolerance’ and

'freedom' in the mouths of the likes of the Muslim spokespeople of Halal Australia don't necessarily mean what they seem to mean at first glance. Think of Orwell's Newspeak, in 1984, and proceed from there. Some time ago, an astute European wrote an essay entitled "Islamic Dictionary for Infidels". Here's a link to a copy of that article, for anyone who wants to get some idea of the ways in which Muslimspeak works.

<http://www.jihadwatch.org/2006/07/islamic-dictionary-for-infidels>

*An excerpt, re. "tolerance". The author, citing Islamic scholar Bassam Tibi: "...when Muslims and the Western heirs of the Enlightenment speak of **tolerance**, they have different things in mind. "In Islamic terminology, this term implies abiding [*that is: "putting up with"* – CM] non-Islamic monotheists, such as Christians, Jews, and Zoroastrians, as second-class believers. They are 'dhimmi', a protected (*sic: – CM – but read Mark Durie "The Third Choice" and Bat Yeor's books to find out just what that 'protection' was like...degradation, humiliation, exploitation, and perpetual physical peril*) but politically immature minority".*