



ÆGIS journal

Addressing threats that affect your bottom line

Volume 11 Number 7, July 2008

From the case files of

LUBRINCO

<http://www.lubrinco.com/>

1-212-695-1759

and

FE&E CLARITY FROM COMPLEXITY
Financial Examinations & Evaluations, Inc.

<http://www.feeinc.com/>

1-480-838-1728

Due diligence outside North America and Western Europe? Call us!

This month's features:

• **Special Announcements**

- 1. Asset Location and Due Diligence — Who's lying? Follow the money!**
- 2. OPSEC, Economic Espionage, and Competitive Intelligence — Remembering the Trojan horse**
- 3. Executive Protection — District of Columbia v Heller**
- 4. Technical Issues — The Lamperd EMD Safety Bracelet**
- 5. Real Stories from the Field — Finders keepers...**
- 6. Book and Product Reviews — *Who Speaks for Islam?***
- 7. Subscription/Unsubscription/Copyright Information**

- **Special Announcements**

L Burke Files will be speaking at:

- Sept 15th - 17th The 13th Annual International East West Security Conference, Rome, Italy
- Oct 16th - 17th Detectando al Empleado Deshonesto, A Comprehensive Look at Occupational Fraud and Money Laundering, Mexico City, Mexico
- Oct 20th – 24th International Structures - Panama City, Panama

Richard Isaacs will be speaking at:

- December 9th – 15th International East-West Security Conference & Exposition, Malta

1. Asset Location and Due Diligence — Who's lying? Follow the money!

We recently were looking at a public policy debate, whose adherents on both sides kept sending us compelling information. When looking at these kinds of issues it is difficult to figure out what is going on because each side presents its point of view in a way that best makes its point, and because objective journalism is hard to come by. So you have to do the basic research on your own.

From a law enforcement and investigative perspective, one way to make a preliminary judgment is to follow the money, and see who profits most from their lies. Now, in some cases, the profit will not necessarily be financial: We knew a man who worked hard to get a building declared a landmark. He didn't actually care anything about the building; he just didn't want construction going on outside his window. This kind of behavior needs to be examined and recognized.

In general, however, we are really looking for competing financial gains, or financial gains in conflict with some social benefit. Because these issues can be complex, you often have to do a lot of work to find a valid answer. As an example, one can look at the financial problems of pension funds. In theory, these should be self-sustaining. People put in money, the money is invested, and the growing pool sustains future demand. In practice, however, the surplus is sometimes shifted to other uses. The fund gets into trouble because benefits then need to be paid out of current revenue, not the missing reserve. Since the issue that will be discussed is the fact that there is not enough current revenue going in, rather than that the reserve has shifted, the solution chosen will be unlikely to be optimal.

When you follow the money, you often get a better handle on who is lying, and what needs to be done. You can then make a rational decision that will minimize unintended consequences.

As with all policy decisions, whether it is regarding airport security, Social Security, health care, or drilling for oil in fragile ecosystems, five questions need to be asked:

1. What problem is the policy or measure trying to solve?
2. How can it fail in practice?
3. Given the failure modes, how well does it solve the problem?
4. What are the costs, both financial and social, associated with it, and flowing from its unintended consequences?
5. Given the effectiveness and costs, is the policy or measure worth it?

2. OPSEC, Economic Espionage, and Competitive Intelligence — Remembering the Trojan horse

As readers of this journal know, the United States is under increasing intelligence attack, with the most obvious being cyber attack. Of late, there has been increasing realization that the risk of attack has been heightened by outsourcing of manufacture of computers. Let us assume, for the sake of discussion, that:

1. The Chinese are our geopolitical and economic competitors.
2. The Chinese consider espionage to be a viable means of competition.
3. The Chinese will use cyber-attacks against their competitors.
4. The Chinese are not total idiots.

Assuming that we accept these assumptions, it would be both unreasonable and insulting to posit that computers designed and built in China would not have hardware backdoors built in.

What does this mean in practical terms? Well, we know that we have areas of vulnerability. Thus, we know that when we make phone calls there is no longer an expectation of privacy, that the facility to listen in has been built into the system. You can expect that people might be listening in under court order, to test the system, by the government without court order, or if someone at the phone company has been bribed. Therefore you need to be careful about what you say, based on your expectation that anything you say will be overheard. By the same token, it is not unreasonable to expect that in

the near future anything on your foreign-made computer will be accessible to those who built it.

Is this something that will concern you? It should concern you, but whether or not it actually does depends on several factors. At IPCI 2007 there was a general view that the only reasons to be concerned about loss of IPCI was

- (a) if there would be an enforced compliance issue;
- (b) if dealing with it would produce a profit in the *current* quarter; or
- (c) if you were a really small company. (If you are a \$35 billion company and lose \$100 million or have to close a division, who cares?).

If you have an OPSEC program you will care, and are probably already dealing with this issue, as well as others.

3. Executive Protection — District of Columbia v Heller

The Supreme Court's decision in DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA v. HELLER (<http://www.supremecourtus.gov/opinions/07pdf/07-290.pdf>) is significant, in that it clarifies the meaning of “the people” as used in the Constitution (“We the people...”). The confusion in understanding the Second Amendment was the explanatory phrase, “A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state” which preceded the explanation of the right. In 21st century parlance this is often construed to mean that “**the people**” should have guns available only while they participate in the National Guard.

The meaning, however, was quite different in the 18th century. When the Bill of Rights was being written, the Founding Fathers feared both foreign and domestic tyranny. For this reason they didn't want to have a standing army that could try to take over the country. Instead, they wanted the militia – all white males between 18 and 45 – to assemble as needed. This would be sufficient to repel foreign invaders – and by keeping guns in the hands of the populace, eliminate the risk of domestic tyranny. However, in order for this to work in a timely manner, for there to be able to be a well-regulated militia, the people who showed up had to have guns to bring, *and* know how to use them, as there would be time to organize the troops, but not to train them from the ground up. Thus, the right was a broad individual right, not a privilege, and was aimed at individuals, not the government.

This distinction is critical because the term “the right of the people” is used three times in the Bill of Rights alone.

It is used in the First Amendment, which says:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or **the right of the people** peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

It is used in the Second Amendment, which says:

A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, **the right of the people** to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

It is used in the Fourth Amendment, which says:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

In addition, the phrase “**the people**” is used in the Ninth, Tenth, and seventeenth Amendments which say:

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by **the people**.

and

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to **the people**.

and

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by **the people** thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

Had the Court decided that **the people** meant some government or administrative agency, rather than individual citizens, then the First Amendment would allow Congress to meet and to interact with the government, but it would not have allowed you to join with other like-minded citizens to make your voice heard. And while Congress would have been inviolate, Fourth Amendment rights would no longer have applied to you.

We understand the Founding Fathers' concern for liberty expressed in the Bill of Rights, including their intent to encourage a pool of citizens familiar with the handling of guns. The Court has upheld this concern in their decision.

We also understand, as did the Court, that, of the 2,448,017 Americans who died in 2005, the last year of record, 17,002 committed suicide using handguns. While there is a clear relationship between the presence of guns and gun suicide (duh!), all clarity stops there. The United States ranks first in gun ownership but twenty-sixth in suicide: There is no correlation between presence of guns and suicide rates. In comparisons of cities where guns were common with cities where guns were not common, the cities without guns had much lower gun suicide rates (duh!). However, the total suicide rate was the same in both environments. We would not be surprised, therefore, to discover that while the number of suicides will not change in Washington, DC, some suicides which otherwise would take some other form will now become gun suicides.

In addition, 12,352 Americans were victims of homicides using handguns in 2005. This is a reflection of the culture of violence that has become interwoven into the fabric of American society since the Civil War. This level of violence is much higher than most Americans are aware: If you list total number of homicides by country, the United States ranks as fifth. What happens if gun homicides are removed from the count? Sadly, the level of violence in this country is so high that when we take guns out of the picture we barely creep from fifth position to sixth.

We also understand that the Second Amendment has rarely been called into play. The last case we can think of would be the Battle of Athens (McMinn County, Tennessee) back in August, 1946. However, the fact that the Second Amendment is called into play frequently is not the issue. The issue is its availability to be called into play when needed. As Mrs. Roosevelt noted at the time, "If we want to continue to be a mature people who, at home and abroad, settle our difficulties peacefully and not through the use of force, then we will take to heart this lesson and we will jealously guard our rights. What goes on before an election, the threats or persuasion by political leaders, may be bad but it cannot prevent the people from really registering their will if they wish to.

The decisive action which has just occurred in our midst is a warning, and one which we cannot afford to overlook."

4. Technical Issues — The Lamperd EMD Safety Bracelet

As everyone in the world is aware, on 11 September 2001 several sets of essentially-unarmed men – they had mat cutters whose blades were shorter than the length allowed by FAA regulations, and significantly shorter than your kid’s Swiss Army knife – took over aircraft which they ran into the Pentagon and the World Trade Center. The fact that they did not bother to arm themselves shows an astonishingly good, albeit contemptuous, insight into the way Americans had been trained never to fight back, instead leaving this to law enforcement. The danger of a reoccurrence ended that day, since passengers will no longer allow that to happen, no matter what government regulations say.

In another aircraft, a bunch of vigilantes decided to fight back in spite of decades of law enforcement orders to never fight back, likely causing the plane to crash in Pennsylvania. This act of lawlessness on the part of passengers prompted rules and procedures to make sure that in the future passengers will not be able to illegally take matters into their own hands. When push comes to shove, we are confident these rules will be ignored.

This tragic incident was used to develop a politically powerful albeit largely ineffective federal agency – they are the folks that handled Hurricane Katrina – that revitalized a number of agencies whose utility had become questionable since the end of the Cold War. Because so many people now choose to drive rather than fly, one of the direct results has been an increase in deaths of American travelers.

In keeping with their current approach, the Washington Times has reported (<http://www.washingtontimes.com/weblogs/aviation-security/2008/Jul/01/want-some-torture-with-your-peanuts/#again>) that DHS has expressed an interest in the Lamperd EMD Safety Bracelet, which you can think of as a wrist-worn stun gun. If you become troublesome a crew member can shock you into unconsciousness.

This is an interesting approach, assuming you have no knowledge of, well, anything. It certainly fits in with the agency’s view of the American way of life, and is appropriate to their current level of understanding of risk and risk management. And yes, apparently research *has* been funded.

While the Lamperd EMD Safety Bracelet has no value as a counterterrorism device, we don’t think it should be dismissed out of hand all that quickly. Its primary value, as we see it, is that it could be used to render crying babies unconscious, not to mention children who kick the back of your seat. And on

a recent trip to China, a man who was terrified of flying was being fed a lot of coffee by his daughter. Not only did this increase his level of agitation, but, because he apparently had a bladder the size of a pea, he kept getting up to go to the bathroom, each time pulling this editor's seat in front of him. In this case, too, the Lamperd EMD Safety Bracelet could have been used to render him unconscious for the duration of the flight.

While obviously some kinks need to be worked out – for example, should you, as a passenger, be able to zap only those annoying children and adults directly behind you – we can see that installation of the Lamperd EMD Safety Bracelet could make flights much quieter and more restful.

A more cost effective alternative approach suggested by some reviewers would be to have all passengers fly nude, thus precluding, after an obligatory cavity search, transport of any weapons. In addition to the security benefit, there would be a public health benefit. As anyone who has ever traveled throughout the United States knows, there is an epidemic of obesity, which manifests itself, according to the CDC, in a number of health problems, including Hypertension (high blood pressure), Osteoarthritis (a degeneration of cartilage and its underlying bone within a joint), Dyslipidemia (for example, high total cholesterol or high levels of triglycerides), Type 2 diabetes, Coronary heart disease, Stroke, Gallbladder disease, Sleep apnea and respiratory problems, as well as some cancers (endometrial, breast, and colon). It is posited that the embarrassment of flying nude while overweight might provide the push needed to get people to watch their weight. Not to mention early detection of prostate cancer!

Of course, we still need to deal with children and babies. Perhaps we could reserve the Lamperd EMD Safety Bracelet for them.

5. Real Stories from the Field — Finders keepers...

Twice recently one of our editors lost something of value. The first time it was his cell phone – a sort of practice run – and the second time it was his wallet. Both times he was acting first and thinking later, or, as it is sometimes called, acting stupid in the smart zone. We are familiar with this syndrome, because it is something we know our clients have done when we are retained to aid in a recovery.

The loss of the cell phone came when the editor was traveling from Nevis to Santiago, in the Dominican Republic. The fire truck was broken at the Nevis airport, so American Eagle would not land there to pick us up. Instead, passengers were told to arrive an hour and a half early to check in. They

were then loaded on to vans and driven from the airport in Nevis to the airport in St. Kitts – no mean feat since they are on two different islands!

The new Nevis/St. Kitts ferry service, a roll-on/roll-off ferry, was very pleasant, but by the time we had arrived in St. Kitts everyone had missed their connection. They were collectively loaded onto a later flight, which arrived late in San Juan Puerto Rico, which meant our editor missed his connection to Santiago.

He was put on a later flight to Puerto Plata, DR, which at least put him on the right island, and provided an airline voucher for a taxi to Santiago. The first cab driver, who said he accepted vouchers, announced as he left the airport that he would *not* accept the voucher. So our hero ordered the cab back to the airport. Quite miffed at this bait-and-switch, he got into a second cab, who also said that he took vouchers. As they left the airport the driver asked for the voucher and 2,000 more pesos! He too was ordered back to the airport. Finally, after much haggling in English and Spanish, one cab driver accepted the voucher, with the proviso he would need to make some stops along the way. This seemed not-unreasonable, so the editor had some local rum and a bite of chicken with the driver at a shack along the way. All quite agreeable. It was while eating and going to call his host that he would be very late, he noticed he cell phone was missing and concluded that he exited both of the first two cabs so hastily – being miffed and all – that he left one of the cabs with all of his belongs and left the other with nearly all of his belongings – acting with out thinking, but with a pleasant end, albeit no phone.

The second item lost was a wallet. This was more troubling since it had credit cards and ID. It was lost just prior to a trip – the day before, in fact – when the editor was flying around town trying to accomplish tasks before he left. The editor watched the credit cards on line to see if there were any charges accruing on the missing credit card – there were none – so he was more or less assured that he had put it some place safe and just could not remember where it was. That was until the wallet arrived by mail at his post office box! It seems the wallet fell out of his car when our hero dropped off a coworker and a good Samaritan dropped it in a postal box. The Post Office rewrapped the wallet and sent it along. Many thanks to the USPS for this, as well as to our good Samaritan.

The editors, far from being hardboiled international investigators who make no mistakes, are like most of you. We become impatient, hurried, and rushed, and we make mistakes. For this editor it was two significant mistakes in one month. And in both cases he was pleasantly reassured by the

goodness that was found amongst his fellow man. To the cab driver in the DR who was so pleasant and the street person who found my wallet: Thanks for being there when I was acting and not thinking.

6. Book and Product Reviews

Who Speaks for Islam?

John L. Esposito and Dalia Mogahed

Gallup Press ISBN: 978-1-59562-017-0 222 pages \$22.95

<http://www.gallup.com/press/104209/Who-Speaks-Islam-What-Billion-Muslims-Really-Think.aspx>

Religion *per se* clearly does not fall into the bailiwick of this journal. The effect of either religion or what is perceived to be religion on the life of a business or its employees, however, does. Because of this, we felt it was appropriate to discuss *Who Speaks for Islam* here in this journal.

Religion is a tricky issue. Those not a participant in another religion, or who are not a student of the other religion, generally have something of a misconception of even the most fundamental aspects of that other religion. For the sake of convenience, we will limit our discussion to the two largest religions, Christianity and Islam, which account for roughly fifty-five percent of the world's population. (Adherents of all the other religions combined account for roughly thirty percent of the world's population.) We do not wish by this to denigrate any religion, or give the impression that your religion of choice, if you, gentle reader, are not Christian or Muslim, is not the true religion, giving you the inside to track to God. That said, we nonetheless like to think that Thuggee is not the one true religion, but late at night we tend to suspect that Fitzgerald was right when he wrote in his *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayam*:

LVI

And this I know: whether the one True Light,
Kindle to Love, or Wrath consume me quite,
One glimpse of It within the Tavern caught
Better than in the Temple lost outright.

As an example of this trickiness, imagine that you were looking at Christianity as an outsider, and basing your view of Christianity on American religious television and a quick reading of history. You might very well think that Christianity was a monolithic religion (from the outside, the differences among Catholic, Greek Orthodox, Russian Orthodox, Amish, Baptist, Branch Davidian, Presbyterian, Quaker, and the other various sects

being so slim as to seem indistinguishable); that Jesus' main message was that abortion and homosexuality are bad; and that Christianity's primary activity was killing people through the Catholic Inquisition (in several incarnations from 1231 – 1835), the Protestant killing of witches and Catholics, the 100 Years War, the Crusades, World War II¹, blowing up gay bars and abortion clinics, and killing doctors who do abortions to affirm the sanctity of life, *et cetera*. One might randomly pick some scriptural verse to demonstrate the inherent violence of Christianity, such as Luke 22:36: *Then said he unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one.* Although this might be the way Christianity appears from the outside, most Christians – actually, we like to think *all* Christians – would disagree with this characterization of the religion. By the same token, many of those not familiar with Islam have an equally distorted view of Islam.²

The word Islam means “a strong commitment to God,” and shares the same root as *salaam* (similar to the Hebrew *shalom*), the word for peace. Thus, the traditional greeting is *the peace be with you*: We don't speak Arabic or Hebrew, but in Urdu it would be السلام عليكم. *Peace be with you* seems strikingly similar to what we say to one another after mass, and to the Hebrew *shalom aleichem* (peace be upon you). And, in fact, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam are more similar than dissimilar. This should come as no surprise since Jesus was Jewish, and since our Muslim friends insist that Mohammad was born Jewish. It may come as a surprise to some, but Mary is mentioned more often in the Qur'an than in the New Testament!

For this editor, the constant state of misunderstanding among religions was captured in Richard Lester's 1973 movie *The Three Musketeers*, which starred Joss Ackland, Jean-Pierre Cassel, Richard Chamberlain, Geraldine

¹ Ich sage: Mein christliches Gefühl weist mich hin auf meinen Herrn und Heiland als Kämpfe. Es weist mich hin auf den Mann, der einst einsam, nur von wenigen Anhängern umgeben, diese Juden erkannte und zum Kampf gegen sie aufrief, und der, wahrhafter Gott, nicht der Größte war als Dulder, sondern der Größte als Streiter! In grenzenloser Liebe lese ich als Christ und Mensch die Stelle durch, die uns verkündet, wie der Herr sich endlich aufraffte und zur Peitsche griff, um die Wucherer, das Nattern- und Ottergezucht hinauszutreiben aus dem Tempel! Seinen ungeheueren Kampf aber für diese Welt, gegen das jüdische Gift, den erkenne ich heute, nach zweitausend Jahren, in tiefster Ergriffenheit am gewaltigsten an der Tatsache, daß er dafür am Kreuze verbluten. Als Christ habe ich nicht die Verpflichtung, mir das Fell über die Ohren ziehen zu lassen, sondern habe die Verpflichtung, ein Streiter zu sein für die Wahrheit und für das Recht. *Adolf Hitler, 12 April 1922 in the Munich Buergerbraeukeller.*

² For a comprehensive overview of issues associated with Americans who are followers of Islam, see www.archives.gov/research/alic/reference/military/japanese-internment.html and <http://www.archives.gov/research/japanese-americans/index.html>.

Chaplin, Faye Dunaway, Frank Finlay, Charlton Heston, Roy Kinnear, Christopher Lee, Spike Milligan, Oliver Reed, Simon Ward, Raquel Welch, Georges Wilson, and Michael York. During what we recall to be the Siege of Orleans, an exchange between the musketeers went something like, “Do you mean we are killing them because we cross ourselves left to right and they cross themselves right to left?” “Yes.” “That makes no sense.” “You just don’t understand religion.”

In our travels – and we have been to most of the countries in this world – it has been our experience that most people’s primary goals are to get up in the morning, work fruitfully during the day, spend time with their families, and have their children’s lives be better than their own lives. (See <http://youtube.com/watch?v=zlfKdbWwruY#> to get a good understanding of people in different cultures.) Everything else is a far-distant second place. This holds true independent of country, language, religion, race, or political system.

That said, we believe that for the uninformed and unsophisticated, the views of Islam and Christianity, each by the other, are generally formed by the actions of the few, not the many. Thus, for many uninformed and unsophisticated Americans, their perception of Islam is based on pictures of some whack job, who appears to have little faith in God’s power or the Islamic way of life, cutting Nick Berg’s head off, or running planes into the Twin Towers. Conversely, for many uninformed and unsophisticated Muslims, their perception of America is based on pictures of some whack job, who appears to have little faith in God’s power or the American way of life, having wired up Satar Jabar in Abu Graib, or dropping bombs on the homes of innocent families. Neither view is accurate, and it is important to keep in mind that while you should, unless you are a total fool, be able to find a scriptural justification in either the Bible or the Qur’an for *any* viewpoint you wish, that doesn’t mean that your justification is, in fact, representative of Christianity or Islam, or, even more to the point, of contemporary mainstream Christianity or Islam.

Getting an understanding of Islam, and of what Muslims believe, has just gotten easier for Westerners (and Easterners, as it apparently turns out) with to the publication of *Who Speaks for Islam?* by the Gallup Press and authored by John Esposito and Dalia Mogahed. Dr. Esposito teaches at Georgetown University, and Ms Mogahed is executive director of the *Gallup Center for Muslim Studies*. The book is based on Gallup’s World Poll, which conducted tens of thousands of interviews with residents of more than 35 nations that are predominantly Muslim or have significant Muslim populations. It is important to understand that Gallup is an independent organization with no

ox to gore, and that the book came from analysis of the data, and not from theories that the data was to prove or disprove. It is a good reflection, in our opinion, of the beliefs of Islam's diverse 1.3 billion adherents.

Who Speaks for Islam? attempts to present the diverse viewpoint of the majority – roughly ninety percent statistically – of Muslims, based on very extensive interviewing. The book has an introduction, five chapters, and two appendices which deal with the design and methodology of the polling, and with an anecdotal description of the process. The chapters are:

1. Who Are Muslims?
2. Democracy or Theocracy
3. What Makes a Radical?
4. What Do Women Want?
5. Clash or Coexistence?

In looking at the issues, it is important to understand that Islam is no more monolithic than Christianity. This is noted by Fitzgerald in the Rubaiyat, when he writes (emphasis ours):

XLIII

The Grape that can with Logic absolute

The **Two-and-Seventy jarring Sects** confute:

The subtle Alchemist that in a Trice
Life's leaden Metal into Gold transmute.

Because of the wide variety of locations, customs, and behaviors represented in the survey, we feel that the uniformity of answers cuts across the cultural differences, revealing the beliefs influenced by religion.

We have neither the space nor the inclination to go through everything touched on in the book, so we wanted to pick one key issue that gets bandied about. We thought this might be why there are no Islamic democracies, but realized that this is roughly equivalent to asking why there were no 17th century European democracies, and therefore not particularly interesting.

Then we thought it might be interesting to compare common law, which is based on Roman law (which modern writers have thought started from the blood feud) and German law (which all authorities believe began in that way), to Sharia law, which was implemented to protect the populace from the power of the Caliph. And, lest you have become concerned, the fact that the American jurisprudence system is based on common law does *not* mean

that decisions made today will necessarily be directly based on the view of Roman or Medieval law.

Instead, because of a luncheon conversation, we decided to pick the question of whether Muslims are more willing to kill innocent people than are Christians. The answer is no. According to *Who Speaks for Islam*:

A recent study shows that only 46% of Americans think that “Bombing and other attacks intentionally aimed at civilians” are “never justified,” while 24% believe these attacks are “often or sometimes justified.”

Contrast this with data taken the same year from some of the largest majority Muslim nations, in which 74% of respondents in Indonesia agree that terrorist attacks are “never justified;” in Pakistan that figure is 86%; in Bangladesh, 81%; and in Iran, 80%.”

Similarly, 6% of the American public thinks that attacks in which civilians are targets are “completely justified.” As points of comparison, in both Lebanon and Iran, this figure is 2%, and in Saudi Arabia it’s 4%.

We will **not** discuss the puerile question of whether one religion is more valid than another. It is important to remember that faith, by definition, is belief absent proof or reason. We therefore feel that a discussion of whether the revelations given to our forebears are better than the revelations given to someone else’s forebears is a lose-lose game for *all* people of faith.

Instead, we would like to remind readers of the overwhelmingly common aspirations of people whomsoever they may be. And that terrorist activity on the part of some Muslims – always backed by political, rather than religious, justifications – is no more necessarily representative of Islam than the terrorist activity of some Christians is necessarily representative of Christianity.

We also like to remind readers that the political activities of a religion often bear, to both the insider and the outsider, no resemblance to the teachings of the religion. It would therefore be imprudent to expect Islam, over the long haul, to behave any better or worse than has Christianity.

The perceived conflict between Christianity and Islam, the widespread ignorance regarding Islam, and the vast sums dumped into the commercial exploitation of terrorism, adds *Who Speaks for Islam?* to the must-read list that now includes:

- *All You Need Is Love, and Other Lies about Marriage* by John W. Jacobs, M.D (<http://www.lubrinco.com/ejournal/ej200504.pdf>)

- *Better* by Atul Gawande, M.D.
(<http://www.lubrinco.com/ejournal/ej200708.pdf>)
- *Beyond Fear* by Bruce Schneier
(<http://www.lubrinco.com/ejournal/ej200309.pdf>)
- *Corporocracy* by Robert A. G. Monks
(<http://www.lubrinco.com/ejournal/ej200802.pdf>)
- *The End of America*, by Naomi Wolf
(<http://www.lubrinco.com/ejournal/ej2000711.pdf>)
- *Free Lunch* by David Cay Johnston
(<http://www.lubrinco.com/ejournal/ej200805.pdf>)
- *How Doctors Think* by Jerome Groopman, MD
(<http://www.lubrinco.com/ejournal/200803.pdf>)
- *Inside the Tornado* by Geoffrey A. Moore
(<http://www.lubrinco.com/ejournal/ej200211.pdf>)
- *Rediscover Your Native Fitness (PACE)*, by Al Sears, M.D.
(<http://www.lubrinco.com/ejournal/ej2000711.pdf>)
- *Reinventing the CFO* by Jeremy Hope
(<http://www.lubrinco.com/ejournal/ej200708.pdf>)
- *Taking Sex Differences Seriously* by Steven E. Rhoads
(<http://www.lubrinco.com/ejournal/ej200411.pdf>)
- *What Clients Love* by Harry Beckwith
(<http://www.lubrinco.com/ejournal/ej200508.pdf>)
- *With Winning in Mind* by Lanny Bassham
(<http://www.lubrinco.com/ejournal/ej200509.pdf>)

7. Subscription/Unsubscription/Copyright Information

•• **ÆGIS** is supported and maintained by voluntary efforts. This publication is owned, published, and copyright © 2008 by The **LUBRINCO** Group Ltd, Inc. and Financial Examinations and Evaluations, Inc. It is edited jointly by Richard Isaacs (RBIsaacs@lubrinco.com), L. Burke Files (LBFiles@feeinc.com), and Terry Philips (TPhillips@aegisjournal.com).

LUBRINCO provides services in three high-threat areas, too specialized to be dealt-with in-house, that can adversely affect domestic and international bottom lines.

- **Identification, valuation, and protection of intellectual assets and critical information.**
 - American businesses lose \$300 billion in revenues annually to competitive intelligence, economic espionage, inappropriate disclosure, and information theft.
 - LUBRINCO provides private sector consulting access to OPSEC, the government-standard process for identification, valuation, and protection of intellectual property and critical information.
 - Implementing an OPSEC program is likely to increase revenues for an at-risk operating group by \$75 million.
- **International asset location and due diligence.**
 - Location of concealed assets in fraud, theft, and divorce.
 - Due diligence to prevent fraud and loss in China, Central and Eastern Europe, Central Asia, the offshore financial centers, Latin America, and the Caribbean.
 - Financial fraud, anti-money laundering, and anti-corruption program development and training.
- **Protection of management, staff, and families.**
 - In the high-threat environments of Latin America, Africa, the Mid-East, and Southeast Asia.
 - When traveling and living overseas.
 - When transporting items of substantial value.

LUBRINCO identifies and quantifies threats and vulnerabilities, and their associated risk, then manages the vulnerabilities so you can transfer or live with the residual risk. We prevent disastrous financial loss to your company, and physical harm to you, your family, and your staff.

For information on **LUBRINCO** and its services, or for the archive of all past issues of **ÆGIS** in PDF format, please go to <http://www.aegisjournal.com/>.

Subscription to **ÆGIS** is available for \$15 per year in North America and \$20 per year outside of North America.

To sign up for a **complimentary subscription** to **ÆGIS** or the **ÆGIS** PDF notification list, send an email to subscribe@aegisjournal.com.

To subscribe to our AvantGo channel, go to http://avantgo.com/channels/_add_channel.pl?cha_id=1773

To be removed from the subscription list, send an e-mail to unsubscribe@aegisjournal.com.

If you know of anyone else who should be receiving **ÆGIS**, please send their e-mail address to subscribe@aegisjournal.com.

If there is a topic that you would like to know more about, send it to editor@aegisjournal.com and the editors will consider it as the topic for an article in an upcoming issue.

If you would like to submit an article for publication in **ÆGIS**, send it as an attachment to an e-mail to editor@aegisjournal.com. Submission of an article certifies that (a) all information in the article is in the public record, or (b) that you are authorized to release any personal or corporate proprietary information contained in the article, and (c) that none of the article has previously been copyrighted. The submission of materials for publication in **ÆGIS** constitutes a license to **LUBRINCO**, and/or Financial Examinations and Evaluations, Inc, their assigns, associates, or affiliates, to abridge and/or edit said submission, and to copyright and publish/republish any submitted materials in whatever written and/or electronic form they may choose.

If you would like to go beyond normal fair-use in reproducing articles from this issue of **ÆGIS**, you may do so freely as long as appropriate source, copyright, accreditation, and link to the **ÆGIS** Web site is included. This should be in the form

Article Title, from the July 2008 **ÆGIS** (© 2008 **LUBRINCO** and FE&E), to be found at <http://www.aegisjournal.com/>.

ÆGIS is a forum for the exchange of information, ideas, operating styles, theories, and related topics for corporate managers who make decisions about threats typically outside the expertise available in-house, yet which have the potential to affect their company's domestic and international bottom lines. Nothing appearing in **ÆGIS** should be construed as legal advice. The information provided is "general information," not "specific advice."

The solution to any problem is highly dependent upon the precise facts involved. Thus, before making any reliance upon anything said here, you should consult with an appropriately skilled professional. Opinions expressed by contributors are not necessarily endorsed by the publisher, and may be presented to encourage a dialogue among subscribers. The publisher and any re-publisher cannot be held responsible for any loss incurred as a result of the application of any information published in **ÆGIS**.

Please be safe, and be smart.