

# ISLAM — A POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS IDEOLOGY

Paul Duke  
August 2008

[Footnotes appear at the bottom of each subsection.]

This paper is about Islam. It is not about Muslims. Islam is a movement that can be studied objectively and dispassionately by studying its sacred and other documents. Muslims are individual and unique human beings and thus cannot be studied and aggregated in the same way the doctrines of their religion can. Muslims span the social gamut from New York improv comedian to Kashmir suicide bomber. Trying to draw some conclusion about Islam by studying Muslims would be hopeless. Studying the basic doctrines of their political and religious ideology, however, is most enlightening.

Westerners have developed a reverence for freedom of religion. This is one of the great cornerstones of our society. But in doing so, they have placed religion in a politically-correct category with race, gender, and ethnicity that shields it from honest examination and critical analysis. If Westerners try to subject religion to the same kind of critical analysis that they might apply to financial or scientific issues, political correctness chastises them by labeling such analysis prejudice and intolerance. In addition, Western esteem for diversity and multiculturalism brands any criticism of another culture as xenophobic. [01] Between xenophobia and intolerance, the West has paralyzed itself and accepts almost anything as being “okay” without criticism. Islam, being both a religion and an exotic culture, cannot be honestly criticized without risking accusation of intolerance and/or xenophobia by Western liberals. Zealous proselytizers of Islam know how to exploit these social flaws of the West.

The purpose of this paper is simply to honestly discuss the fundamental principles and doctrines of Islam as contained mostly in the Quran [02] and the Hadith (the teachings of Muhammad), the two sacred sources of Islam. In other words, Islam will speak for itself. This paper will provide the reader with ideological facts about Islam, even at the risk of being labeled intolerant, racist, and xenophobic.

The basic ideologies of Islam will be examined by discussing the following core issues:

- 1) Fatalism of Islam
- 2) Gender Discrimination
- 3) Allah Calling for the Murder of Disbelievers
- 4) Life Is a Struggle Between Believers (Good) and Disbelievers (Evil)
- 5) The Struggle Must Continue Until the Whole World is Ruled by Muslims
- 6) Jihad
- 7) Apostasy
- 8) Incompatibility of Islam with Western Civilization
- 9) Separation of Religion and State.

Sometime after 9/11 Jihad, I decided to try to better understand how Islam really relates to the attackers and to our so-called “War on Terrorism.” I came to the issue with no preconceived ideas about Islam other than a suspicion that what we read in the paper about Islam and about our conveniently-long war might lack some degree of truth. I believe that truth has the ultimate value and that it alone will cause people ultimately to do the right things. This paper is thus an intellectual exercise aimed at promulgating truth. It is neither a warning nor a call to arms, and I am not proposing any kind of action. Nor is this paper a defense of Christianity or the Bible. I am simply proposing that we need to understand more about Islam than Western political, academic, and media institutions are telling us.

I have based this study primarily on the Quran and the Hadith and also on the works of both Muslim and Western scholars of Islam. I have used no source that appears to be prejudiced toward or against Islam.

There are two important truths about Islam that can help one derive an accurate picture of the belief system and of the relationship of Islam to our Western democratic philosophy: 1) The Quran is the founding document of Islam. One cannot be a Muslim without believing that the Quran is the absolute, unalterable, infallible word of Allah, the one god. 2) Muhammad is the perfect model for all Believers as revealed in the Hadith (the teachings and traditions of Muhammad compiled over a period of several hundred years after his death). Thus reading the Quran and the Hadith can give much needed insight. Since the Quran is more fundamental to Islam and a shorter and easier book, this paper mostly focuses on it.

[01] Xenophobia - an intense fear or dislike of foreign people their customs and culture or foreign things.

[02] Quran (also Qur'an) is the preferred modern form of Koran. Likewise Muhammad replaces Mohammad, Islam replaces Mohammedanism, and Muslim replaces Moslem.

## A. ISLAM — SOME BASICS

From its founding in the seventh century to the present, the openly-stated goal of Islam is to bring the entire world into Dar al-Islam, that is, the “abode” or “house” of Islam, where the word *islam* means peace under total submission to Allah. Dar al-Islam is a social condition and a geographic territory in which no other system of religion or government is tolerated. In Dar al-Islam, government cannot be distinguished from religion and relies totally on the religion of Allah for both its philosophy and its statutes. Any society or territory outside Dar al-Islam not willing to subjugate itself to complete Islamic authority, after having been offered that option, has automatically placed itself in the House of War, or Dar al-Harb, against Islam. The very act of rejecting Islamic domination makes that society the aggressor against Allah. Thus, the notion of just war refers to both the defense against invasion and the defense against rejection. [03]

When in Dar al-Harb, Muslims, as a community, are required to fight holy war, which is a type of jihad that will be discussed in Section D. The tradition of Islamic jurisprudence is described by John Kelsay in his book *Islam and War*:

The peace of the world cannot be fully secure unless all people come under the protection of an Islamic state (Dar al-Islam). Thus there always exists an imperative for Muslims to struggle to extend the boundaries of the territory of Islam ... to fulfill the trust given to humanity by its creator to establish peace with justice within a secure political order. [04]

This is a totally different view of just war than we have in the West and must be understood before we can appreciate the actions of Islam which focus on two thrusts: living according to the laws of Allah (the responsibility of each individual Muslim) and spreading the laws of Allah to every person on earth (the responsibility of Islam as a whole).

Early Islamic jurists recognized the practical need to define intermediate states between Dar al-Harb (war) and Dar al-Islam (submission). Dar al-Sulh (the House of Truce ) is a common one. This consisted of certain Disbeliever territories which have entered into a covenant or a contractual relationship with the Muslims by which the two sides recognized each other's sovereignty. [05] Dar al-Sulh exists during periods when Muslims are in a position of weakness and while Islam is attempting to gain sufficient power to fully launch into Dar al-Harb. It must be remembered that Muslims are required by the Quran and the Hadith to be collectively and constantly striving to spread Dar al-Islam beyond its borders. Practically, however, there are times when their strength is insufficient, and they have to bide their time via a truce until they are strong enough to proceed with holy war.

The classic Islamic approach to subjugation as taught by Muhammad is: 1) when you are in a position of weakness (Dar al-Sulh), use politics, your resources, and truces to grow strong, 2) when you achieve a position of strength, demand surrender or conversion to Islam and, if your demand is not accepted, use open warfare (Dar al-Harb), and 3) finally achieve peace under Islam (Dar al-Islam) once the land is conquered. [06] Islam has been forced into a long and humiliating period of Dar al-Sulh in much of their previous empire for about the last half millennium as a result of being overthrown in Spain (1492) and Austria (1683) and their Mediterranean navy defeated at Lepanto (1571). The last and greatest blow of this humiliation was losing the great Caliphate [07] of the Ottoman Empire after WWI. This humiliation has continued right up to the present and is in stark contrast to the first few hundred years of Islamic expansion and glory. The great oil wealth of many Islamic nations, the defeat of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan, and the preliminary defeat of America in 2001 have lifted their spirits and may have instilled a new focus on jihad.

But oil wealth is a two-edged sword. It has excited the money-seeking elements within countries like Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States to invite Western powers within their borders, thus destroying the pure Dar al-Islam status even there at the heart of Islam.

The division of the world into countries and nations, so important in the Western world's perception of itself and its political and ethnic loyalties, has traditionally been of minor importance in the territories of Islam. It is only in the last couple of centuries that Western influence has forced Muslims to recognize political boundaries that we have imposed on them for mutual commercial benefits. [08] But it is only in the last half century that various geo-political forces have given Islam the financial, social, and military strength to begin to reassert

itself in traditionally non-Islamic areas. These geo-political forces include wealth from oil exports and political influence with Western powers, especially in Europe, who are pandering to Arab cultural expansionism to maintain the flow of cheap oil. [09] For example, they are in Dar al-Harb (war) in Afghanistan, Sudan, Iraq, and other African and Asian countries, while in some European countries they are beginning to slip out of Dar al-Sulh (weakness) into Dar al-Harb as Muslims gain more political and demographic power. North America, India, China, and South America are still Dar al-Sulh.

The United States is home to an estimated two to four million Muslims. [10] Dar al-Sulh may describe Islam's formal relationship with America, but the motive force still exists within Islam toward ultimate confrontation between the Disbeliever territory of America and Islam (i.e., to make America Dar al-Harb). Most Muslims in America are probably unconcerned, and some even unaware, of this coming confrontation. I will discuss this important point in more detail in Section G.

[03] Anthony Vitali, *Confronting Terror: Reasserting Ethical Resolve over Political Realism - Page 5*, [http://dialogues.rutgers.edu/vol\\_03/essays/a\\_vitali/a\\_vitali\\_V.html](http://dialogues.rutgers.edu/vol_03/essays/a_vitali/a_vitali_V.html).

[04] John Kelsay, *Islam and War: A Study in Comparative Ethics*, Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993.

[05] Bernard Lewis, "The Muslim View of the World," from his *The Muslim Discovery of Europe*, W.W. Norton, New York, 1982, Chpt II, pp. 59-69. (Part of a course taught at Michigan State University) <http://coursesa.matrix.msu.edu/~fisher/hst372/readings/lewis3.html>.

[06] Daniel Pipes, "[Al-Hudaybiya and] Lessons from the Prophet Muhammad's Diplomacy," *Middle East Quarterly*, September 1999, <http://www.danielpipes.org/article/316>.

[07] The caliphate is the Islamic form of government representing the political unity and leadership of the Muslim world. The head of state is the Caliph, who is considered to be a direct successor to the Prophet Muhammad. The Ummah is the entire region of Islam domination. The Caliphate moved with the holy wars of Islamic expansion from Medina to Kufa, Iraq to Damascus, Syria to Baghdad, Iraq to Cairo, Egypt and finally to Constantinople (present day Istanbul, Turkey). The Ottoman Caliphate was dissolved and partitioned by the Allies after World War I, and Islam has been without a Caliphate or a Caliph since. Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, an admirer of Enlightenment, became president of the modern, secular, democratic Republic of Turkey in 1923.

[08] Bernard Lewis, "The Muslim View of the World," from his *The Muslim Discovery of Europe*, W.W. Norton, New York, 1982, Chap II, pp. 59-69.

[09] Bat Ye'Or, *Eurabia: The Euro-Arab Axis*, (Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2005) presents a complete, though often tedious, description of how Europe has been systematically inundated with Muslims and Arab culture in the last forty years. Melanie Phillips, *Londonistan* (Encounter Books, 2007) discusses how post-war attitudes in Europe have led to Western culture self-deprecation and thus allowed a strong culture, such as Islam, to flourish.

[10] The politically-correct U.S. Census Bureau asks no questions about religion in their detailed 73-question American Community Survey Form, assuming that no tolerant American would ever care to know the actual population of any religious sect in America. The very act of religious differentiation has come to be viewed as religious discrimination, and thus intolerance, due to our expanding acceptance of political correctness. The CIA estimates the Muslim population at about two million. The Council on American Islamic Relations says six million.

The CAIR number is probably exaggerated in an attempt to exaggerate their power.

## **B. THE QURAN — ISLAM’S FOUNDING DOCUMENT**

The Quran [11] is: 1) *the* founding document of Islam, 2) the absolute, unalterable word of Allah, the one god, 3) the perfect book against which *all* other books are measured, and 4) the *only* source of information (along with the Hadith) needed to make *all* life decisions. All Muslims believe #1 and #2. Nearly all Muslims believe all four.

[11] John Gilchrist, *Am' Al-Qur'an: The Codification of the Qur'an Text*, <http://www.answering-islam.org/Gilchrist/Jam/index.html>.

### **1) Quran Basics**

The Quran was “revealed” to Muhammad over a 22-year period from 610 AD until his death in 632. During the first twelve years, he was in Mecca and his religious message, which was highly critical of the popular local polytheist religion, was not well received. He and his small band of Muslims were in quite a weak position, so his verses often spoke of tolerance and peace. Then he migrated to Medina and through good luck, good politics, and brutal force, he achieved a position of authority and military might [12]. He no longer had to placate his enemies, so the Medina verses openly contain hatred and violence toward idolaters (polytheists, i.e., pagans) and Disbelievers (People of the Book [13], i.e., Christians, Jews, Sabeans, and Zoroastrians. [14]) People of the Book, defined as Christians, Jews, and Sabeans in the Quran, have a distinct status in Muslim eyes because they follow a genuine, though incomplete, revelation from a genuine prophet. Islam considers Jesus to be an earlier, and lesser, prophet than Muhammad. Zoroastrians were added to People of the Book later.

The Quran comprises 114 chapters or surahs. There are 92 Mecca chapters (appeasing and somewhat tolerant): 1, 6, 7, 10 - 21, 25 - 32, 34 - 46, 50 - 56, 65, 67 - 97, and 99 - 114. Surah 9 is actually Meccan since it was Muhammad’s last revelation and occurred after he had returned from Medina to Mecca to defeat his Quraysh enemies. It contains some of the Quran’s most violent verses. There are 22 Medina chapters (containing many hateful, violent, and dogmatic verses): 2 - 5, 8, 22 - 24, 33, 47 - 49, 57 - 64, 66, and 98. During Muhammad’s 22 years after the revelations began, he evolved from restraint to fighting defensive war to fighting offensive war. This evolution mirrored his growing strength. [15]

The individual chapters are called surahs. At the death of Muhammad, the Quran existed as notes on palm leaves, stones, and parchment, and mostly as memory and was scattered among many people. Muhammad's successor, Abu Bakr, saw many of the Muslims who contained the Quran “in their breasts” getting killed in battles and dying of other causes and decided to put the Quran on paper. He tasked Zaid ibn Thabit to do it. It was apparently quite a monumental job, and probably afforded many opportunities for creative Quranic writing.

Allah himself is believed to be the actual author of the Quran. One finds numerous passages where men, angels, prophets, and even Satan himself speak, but their words are in quotations.

Allah is always the narrator, and what was reported by Muhammad during his recitation of the Quran was considered to be nothing less than a revelation from Allah himself. Allah usually speaks in the third person, for example: "...and if Allah had pleased, He would have given them power over you ...” Over a period of twenty-two years the revelation came to Muhammad through the medium of the angel Jibril, said to be the angel Gabriel (2.97) (Chapter 2, Verse 97), after having been sent down to the first heaven during the month of Ramadan.

The Quran is almost the length of the New Testament though its structure and form is very different. Its 114 surahs (chapters) are of unequal length and are not compiled in any sort of chronological order. The longest surahs appear first and, as one progresses through the Quran, the surahs become shorter and shorter so that, whereas the second surah has 286 verses, the last ten surahs are made up of only a few lines each.

[12] For an on-going and insightful discussion of these and other Quranic issues, see Robert Spencer, Blogging the Qur'an, <http://www.jihadwatch.org/articles/bloggingtheq.php>.

[13] The Book is a sacred book of revelation, such as The Bible or The Torah.

[14] Sabaeans are mentioned in the Bible as a distinct people and lived in Southern Arabian Jof about 200 miles north-west of Aden. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/13285c>

Zoroastrians were monotheists and lived in pre- and post-Christian Persia.

<http://www.book-of-thoth.com/thebook/index.php/Zoroastrianism>.

[15] David Bukay, "Peace or Jihad? Abrogation in Islam," *The Middle East Quarterly*, Fall 2007, pp. 3 - 11, [www.meforum.org/article/1754](http://www.meforum.org/article/1754).

## 2) Abrogation and Dualism

It is generally thought by Islamic scholars that chronologically later surahs abrogate (replace) earlier surahs when they discuss the same issue and contradict each other. There are many such contradictions in the Quran. One source counts 242 abrogations according to a summary of thirteen Muslim scholars. [16] According to the practice of abrogation, the 22 Medina surahs (chronologically later) are weighted much more heavily than the 92 Mecca surahs. Thus Meccan tolerance is abrogated by Medinan bigotry and hatred—at least by Wahhabis, who are the most extreme fundamentalists and are the overwhelming majority of Muslims in the Middle East, Europe, and the Americas.

Surah 9, Ultimatum, was the last, and thus the most authoritative, surah. It was revealed to Muhammad in the final year of his life after he had returned to Mecca from Medina at the peak of his power. Surah 9 contains some of the most violent verses in the Quran, including the famous Verse of the Sword (Surah 9. Verse 5 – see Section C.3) which abrogates many earlier peaceful verses. Quranic scholars have convoluted logic for centuries to explain this dualism—how one word of Allah can be abrogated or repealed by a later and opposite word of Allah and still have both be the perfect truth in the perfect book by the only and perfect god. [17] Illogic easily prevails in an atmosphere of fear and ideological zealotry.

The Quran is very user friendly for Islamic proselytizers and apologists because it is actually two very different books, so an imam may choose the kind of text he quotes depending on his audience. For example, it is a book of peace, love, and tolerance when he is talking to students

at an American university; but it is a book of vengeance, hatred, and domination when he is recruiting “victims of prejudice” in an American prison. Both sides of the contradiction are true in dualistic logic. The circumstances govern which “right” verse is used.

An example of this dualism is the following:

(Quran of Mecca) [Surah 73. Verse 10] Listen to what they [unbelievers] say with patience, and leave them with dignity.

From tolerance we move to one of the contradicting intolerant verses:

(Quran of Medina) [Surah 8. Verse 12] Then your Lord spoke to His angels and said, “I will be with you. Give strength to the believers. I will send terror into the unbelievers’ hearts, cut off their heads and even the tips of their fingers!”

The principles of Western logic are based upon the law of contradiction—if two things contradict, then at least one of them is false. But Islamic logic is dualistic; two things can contradict each other and both are true.

One can begin to understand, or at least organize, dualistic systems by using statistics. For an example, look at the question: what is the real meaning of jihad—inner, spiritual struggle or holy war? (Jihad is discussed in more detail in Section D.) Using one of the two primary books of the Hadith (Bukhari) as a source, 97% of the jihad references are about war and 3% are about the inner struggle. So the statistical answer is that jihad is 97% war and 3% inner struggle. [18] So you can conveniently make a case for either depending on the circumstances. A similar bias toward holy war is found throughout the Quran and the Hadith and by virtually all Islamic scholars over the centuries.

Western politics and ethics are based upon a unitary ethic that is best formulated in the Golden Rule: Treat others as you would be treated.

The basis of this rule is the recognition that at some level, we are all equal. Everyone wants to be treated as a human being, especially under the law. On the basis of the Golden Rule, we have created democracy, ended slavery, and treat women and men as political equals. So the Golden Rule is a unitary ethic since it is only fair that we should treat others as we want them to treat us. All people are to be treated the same. All religions have some version of the Golden Rule except Islam.

The term *human being* or *neighbor* is not used in the Quran or the Hadith. There is no such thing as humanity, only the duality of the Believer and the Disbeliever. According to the Hadith, a Muslim should not lie, cheat, kill, or steal from other Muslims. But a Muslim may lie, deceive, or kill a Disbeliever if it advances Islam.

There is no such thing as a universal statement of ethics in Islam. Muslims are to be treated one way and Disbelievers another way. The closest Islam comes to a universal statement of ethics is that the entire world must submit to Islam. After Muhammad became a prophet, he never treated a Disbeliever the same as a Muslim. Islam denies the existence of the Golden Rule.

Of course, Disbelievers have frequently failed at applying the Golden Rule, but they are judged and condemned on its basis. Disbelievers often fall short, but the Golden Rule is their ideal.

The dualism of Islam offers two choices on how to treat the Disbeliever—the nice way or the harsh way. The Disbeliever can be treated nicely, in the same way a farmer treats his cattle well. So Islam can be “nice,” but in no case is the Disbeliever a “brother” or a friend. In fact, there are 14 verses of the Quran that are emphatic—a Muslim is *never* a friend to the Disbeliever. A Muslim may be “friendly,” but he is never an actual friend. And the degree to which a Muslim is actually a true friend to a Disbeliever is the degree to which he is not a Muslim, but a hypocrite, or even an apostate.

[16] [www.thequran.com](http://www.thequran.com)

[17] David Bukay, “Peace or Jihad? Abrogation in Islam,” *The Middle East Quarterly*, Fall 2007, pp. 3 - 11, [www.meforum.org/article/1754](http://www.meforum.org/article/1754).

[18] Bill Warner, “The Dhimmi Revolution,” *New English Review*, March 2007. [http://www.newenglishreview.org/custpage.cfm?fmr=5794&sec\\_id=5794](http://www.newenglishreview.org/custpage.cfm?fmr=5794&sec_id=5794).

## C. SOME SPECIFIC VERSES FROM THE QURAN

All Quran quotations below are from a University of Southern California website [19] containing three translations of the Quran. I have chosen the Shakir [20] text because it seems easier to understand, though there is little difference in content among the three. I have some confidence in these translations because they are very similar to each other, because they are very similar to quotations from other sources, because these translations are commonly referenced elsewhere, and because the USC is a respected institution. [21]

For each quotation, I have included whether the surah (chapter) was written during the early, tolerant Mecca period or during the later, intolerant Medina period. The numbers in brackets indicate the surah number and the verse, e.g., [2.26] is surah 2, verse 26. Remember that Allah is the narrator. The words in parentheses are clarifications by Islamic scholars. For those who don’t want to examine long pieces of Quranic text, I have put in *italics* the parts which illustrate the point. The remainders of the verses are provided for context.

[19] <http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/>.

[20] Little seems to be known about M. (Mahomodali?) H. Shakir. He was a Muslim and lived probably in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

[21] But beware academia. You cannot automatically assume that any information at an American university website is true. Middle Eastern Wahhabi governments and individuals have used Title VI of our 1958 National Defense Education Act to pour billions of dollars into educational institutions to found Middle Eastern studies programs, complete with buildings, staff, and teachers. USC is one of the many recipients of “foreign aid.” These programs and the majority of Muslim Student Associations are dominated by pro-Islamic and anti-American agendas. [Brigitte Gabriel, *Because They Hate*, St. Martin’s Press, 2006, p.158 - 160].

### 1) Fatalism of Islam

I found 22 verses and groups of verses in the Quran which state the fatalism inherent in Islam and the nature of Allah to choose who shall be Believers and lead them in the right way and who shall be Disbelievers and lead them to their destruction. Islam teaches that everything is in the hands of Allah. Devout Muslims always speak of a future event followed by “Allah willing.” This fatalistic philosophy makes Allah responsible for all good that befalls Believers and all bad to Disbelievers, even though Believers are the necessary tools of Allah.

Medina [2.26] Surely Allah is not ashamed to set forth any parable-- (that of) a gnat or any thing above that; then as for those who believe, they know that it is the truth from their Lord, *and as for those who disbelieve, they say: What is it that Allah means by this parable: He causes many to err by it and many He leads aright by it! but He does not cause to err by it (any) except the transgressors,*

[2.27] Who break the covenant of Allah after its confirmation and cut asunder what Allah has ordered to be joined, and make mischief in the land; these it is that are the losers.

Mecca [7.178] *Whomsoever Allah guides, he is the one who follows the right way; and whomsoever He causes to err, these are the losers.*

[7.179] And certainly We have created for hell many of the jinn and the men; they have hearts with which they do not understand, and they have eyes with which they do not see, and they have ears with which they do not hear; they are as cattle, nay, they are in worse errors; these are the heedless ones.

[7.180] And Allah's are the best names, therefore call on Him thereby, and leave alone those who violate the sanctity of His names; they shall be recompensed for what they did.

[7.181] And of those whom We have created are a people who guide with the truth and thereby they do justice.

[7.182] And (as to) those who reject Our communications, We draw them near (to destruction) by degrees from whence they know not.

[7.183] And I grant them respite; surely My scheme is effective.

[7.184] Do they not reflect that their companion has not unsoundness in mind; he is only a plain warner.

[7.185] Do they not consider the kingdom of the heavens and the earth and whatever things Allah has created, and that may be their doom shall have drawn nigh; what announcement would they then believe in after this?

[7.186] *Whomsoever Allah causes to err, there is no guide for him; and He leaves them alone in their inordinacy, blindly wandering on.*

It is a mistake for Christians to believe that they and Muslims worship the same god, but just with a different name. Allah is vastly different from Jesus. Whereas Jesus preached love of all people, even your enemy, Allah preaches love only of other Muslims. This mistaken idea that Muslims and Christians somehow share the same god leads Christians to accept Islam as just a different form of their own religious values. The same is true of the comparison of Allah to Yahweh, the Jewish god. Allah is a very different character from Jesus and Yahweh. It is totally adverse to Western religious principles that God could ever lead someone of any religion into sin.

## 2) Gender Discrimination

### a) Quran

In most Islamic societies, women have few of the rights of men. This is true today and has been throughout Muslim history. The tradition has its basis in both the Quran and the Hadith. Below are some verses from the Quran used to justify the custom.

Medina [2.282] ... *and call in to witness from among your men two witnesses; but if there are not two men, then one man and two women from among those whom you choose to be witnesses, so that if one of the two errs, the second of the two may remind the other; ...*

Medina [4.11] ... *Allah enjoins you concerning your children's [inheritance]: The male shall have the equal of the portion of two females; ...*

Medina [4.15] *And as for those who are guilty of an indecency from among your women, call to witnesses against them four (witnesses) from among you; then if they bear witness confine them to the houses until death takes them away or Allah opens some way for them.*

[4.16] *And as for the two [men] who are guilty of indecency from among you, give them both a punishment; then if they repent and amend, turn aside from them; surely Allah is Oft-returning (to mercy), the Merciful.*

Medina [4.34] *Men are in charge of women, because Allah hath made the one of them to excel the other, and because they spend of their property (for the support of women). So good women are the obedient, guarding in secret that which Allah hath guarded. As for those from whom ye fear rebellion, admonish them and banish them to beds apart, and scourge them. Then if they obey you, seek not a way against them. Lo! Allah is ever High, Exalted, Great.*

### b) Hadith

Though the Quran clearly commands Muslims to discriminate against women, the Hadith is even more discriminatory. There are 46 lessons in the Hadiths of Muhammad Ibn Ismail Al-Bukhari and Abu Al-Husayn Muslim (the two most authoritative collections) relating to women. The following two give a flavor of those Hadiths:

Bukhari Volume 1, Book 2, Number 28

Mohammad said, "I have seen the fires of Hell and most of its residents are ungrateful women." He was asked, "Are they unbelievers, or did they show ingratitude to Allah?" He answered, "They were not grateful to their husbands and not grateful for the kindness shown them."

Muslim Volume 036, Number 6603

Mohammad: "After I am gone, the biggest threat to stability that will remain is the harm done to men by women."

### c) Modern Honor Killing

The following discussion of modern day honor killing [22] reveals a primitive tradition that punishes a woman for crimes committed against her. Sharia Law is the tool by which she is scapegoated to preserve some sense of male honor.

Hundreds of women get shot, burned, strangled, stoned, poisoned, beheaded or stabbed every year in Muslim inhabited countries because their male relatives believe their actions have soiled the family name. They die so that family honour may be preserved. According to tribal and religious culture a woman is a man's possession and a reflection of his honour. It is the man's honour that gets tarnished if a woman is "loose". Being killed deliberately and brutally is, in fact, a price that victims pay for attempting to practice their minimal human rights.

It takes far less than a pre or extramarital relationship for a woman to be condemned as dishonourable and deserving of death. There is no "typical" case one can speak of: "honour crimes" can include a husband killing his wife for leaving the house too often, a son killing his mother to prevent her from remarrying, a brother killing his sister and her husband for marrying without the family's consent, a man killing his wife for refusing to wear the veil when leaving home. ... Because the concepts of male honour and female subservience are deeply ingrained in Islam and in tribal culture, honour killings have become commonplace in Arab and Middle Eastern countries, in other Muslim inhabited countries and Muslim immigrant communities in the West.

The available statistics in honour killings show just the tip of an iceberg. The reality is far darker. The statistics do not show the number of female suicides provoked, or engineered to cover up an honour killing, nor the number of mysterious disappearances. Many honour killings never get reported or registered. Many are mislabeled.

In Egypt between 1998 - 2001 suspicion of "indecent" behavior was the reason behind 79 per cent of all crimes of honour. The women were killed just because of rumours or suspicions that they may have crossed the line. The UN statistics for 1997 show: Yemen 400, Pakistan over 1000, Egypt 52, and Jordan 25 -35. The UN also reported that as many as 5000 women and girls worldwide were killed last year by family members, the majority of them for "dishonour".

Though, honour killing may not seem so surprising in countries such as Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Yemen, that it exists in the heart of Europe in the 21st Century is indeed both shocking and shameful. But sadly, this is where the reactionary idea of Cultural Relativism [23] is used to justify women's victimization and to excuse Islam and backward traditions.

In many of the sizable Muslim immigrant communities in Europe, brutality against women is justified in the name of respecting other's culture and religion. How can we respect any culture or religion that endorses violence and terrorism against women? Over the past twenty years cultural relativism has led to a culture of tolerating intolerance. Criticizing these unacceptable traditions, cultures and religious beliefs and practices has been labeled racism and Islamophobia. Human beings are worthy of respect but not all beliefs can or should be respected.

The following is a recent example of brutal honor killing. In April 2007, a 17-year old Iraqi girl named Du'a Khalil Al-Aswad fell in love with a boy from a different religious sect, thus violating the “honor” of the men in her sect. They sentenced Du'a to death by public stoning, which was immediately carried out by a huge mob of men. It had more the appearance of a cock fight than an execution. The Saudi Human and Women's Rights Activist Wajeha Al-Huwaidar wrote:

Du'a Al-Aswad is a victim of the wild male madness called “honor.” This concept is prevalent throughout the Greater Middle East ... this entire part of the world [is full of] defeated and dejected men, whose only way to gain some sort of victory is by beating their women to death. [24]

[22] Azam Kamguian, “The Lethal Combination of Tribalism, Islam & Cultural Relativism,” Adapted from a speech given at a conference on honor killing and violence against women, January 17-19, 2003, Stockholm, Sweden, <http://www.middleeastwomen.org/html/combination.htm>.

[23] See Section H.4 for a discussion of relativism.

[24] “Saudi Human and Women's Rights Activist Wajeha Al-Huwaidar Speaks Out Against Honor Killings,” Middle East Media Research Institute, Special Dispatch Series, No. 1945, June 2, 2008, <http://memri.org/bin/articles.cgi?Page=archives&Area=sd&ID=SP194508>.

### **3) Allah Calling for Murder of Disbelievers**

To better understand the below verses, one needs to know what Muhammad taught, which is contained in the Hadith (the teachings and traditions of Muhammad), the second sacred book of Islam. In Dar al-Harb (House of War), Disbelievers are given three choices if they are Christian, Jew, Sabean, or Zoroastrian. 1) Convert to Islam. 2) Keep your religion but be very restricted in your worship, maintain second-class citizenship (dhimmitude), cede property ownership to the Muslims, and pay a high tax (jizyah). 3) Be killed. [25] In all Quranic texts where Allah commands killing the Disbeliever, it is assumed that these three choices have been offered, and the Disbeliever has “chosen” to fight. For example, when Allah says: “...when you meet in battle those who disbelieve...” the Disbelievers have “chosen” to battle the Muslims by not acceding to their first two options of conversion or dhimmitude, thus making the Disbelievers the aggressors. Muslims are forbidden to fight Disbelievers in Dar al-Harb (Holy War) until this ultimatum has been delivered. They may, however, fight defensive jihad even outside Dar al-Harb. See Section D for a more complete discussion of jihad.

Muhammad taught in his breach of the Treaty of Hudaibiya with the Quraysh tribe in 628 AD [26] that when the Muslims are in a position of weakness, they may make a treaty with the Disbelievers with a maximum term of ten years or whenever they feel strong enough to defeat the Disbelievers, whichever comes first. Muhammad’s breach of this treaty was no worse than what many politicians have done to many treaties over the ages. The difference lies in the fact that Muhammad is considered the perfect Muslim, so his strategies have become models for all Islamic leaders since. President Pervez Musharraf of Pakistan, Palestine’s Yasir Arafat, and Malaysian prime minister Mahathir Mohamad have all referred to the Treaty of Hudaibiya when proposing treaties to advance their jihads. [27]

The following verses from the Quran exalt murder of Disbelievers. Remember that Disbelievers become the aggressors by the act of resisting conversion or dhimmitude.

Medina [4.88] What is the matter with you, then, that you have become two parties about the hypocrites, while Allah has made them return (to unbelief) for what they have earned? Do you wish to guide him whom Allah has caused to err? And whomsoever Allah causes to err, you shall by no means find a way for him.

[4.89] *They desire that you should disbelieve as they have disbelieved, so that you might be (all) alike; therefore take not from among them friends until they fly (their homes) in Allah's way; but if they turn back, then seize them and kill them wherever you find them, and take not from among them a friend or a helper.*

[4.90] Except those who reach a people between whom and you there is an alliance, or who come to you, their hearts shrinking from fighting you or fighting their own people; and if Allah had pleased, He would have given them power over you, so that they should have certainly fought you; therefore if they withdraw from you and do not fight you and offer you peace, then Allah has not given you a way against them.

[4.91] *You will find others who desire that they should be safe from you and secure from their own people; as often as they are sent back to the mischief they get thrown into it headlong; therefore if they do not withdraw from you, and (do not) offer you peace and restrain their hands, then seize them and kill them wherever you find them; and against these We have given you a clear authority.*

Medina [2.190] And fight in the way of Allah with those who fight with you, and do not exceed the limits, surely Allah does not love those who exceed the limits.

[2.191] *And kill them wherever you find them, and drive them out from whence they drove you out, and persecution is severer than slaughter, and do not fight with them at the Sacred Mosque until they fight with you in it, but if they do fight you, then slay them; such is the recompense of the unbelievers.*

[2.192] But if they desist, then surely Allah is Forgiving, Merciful.

[2.193] *And fight with them until there is no persecution, and religion should be only for Allah, but if they desist, then there should be no hostility except against the oppressors.*

Medina [9.5] *So when the sacred months have passed away, then slay the idolaters wherever you find them, and take them captives and besiege them and lie in wait for them in every ambush, then if they repent and keep up prayer and pay the poor-rate, leave their way free to them; surely Allah is Forgiving, Merciful.*

Medina [47.4] *So when you meet in battle those who disbelieve, then smite the necks until when you have overcome them, then make (them) prisoners, and afterwards either set them free as a favor or let them ransom (themselves) until the war terminates. That (shall be so); and if Allah had pleased He would certainly have exacted what is due from them, but that He may try some of you by means of others; and (as for) those who are slain in the way of Allah, He will by no means allow their deeds to perish.*

[25] Andrew J. Bostom, *The Legacy of Jihad—Islamic Holy War and the Fate of Non-Muslims*, Prometheus Books, 2005, p. 27 - 37. This excellent book is an encyclopedic compendium of the writings of many scholars, both Believers and Disbelievers, on the doctrine and practice of Islamic jihad over the centuries since Muhammad. Bostom is an associate professor of medicine at Brown University who took up the study of Islam after Jihad 9/11. That study resulted in *The Legacy of Jihad*.

[26] Daniel Pipes, "Lessons from the Prophet Muhammad's Diplomacy," *Middle East Quarterly*, September 1999, <http://www.meforum.org/article/480>.

[27] <http://www.danielpipes.org/blog/106>.

#### **4) Life Is a Struggle Between Believers (Good) and Disbelievers (Evil)**

The Quran, especially the Medina chapters, is replete with the confrontational relationship between Believers and Disbelievers. This relentless conflict between Believers and Disbelievers is the dominant theme of the Quran.

Medina [3.196] *Let it not deceive you that those who disbelieve go to and fro in the cities fearlessly.*

[3.197] *A brief enjoyment! then their abode is hell, and evil is the resting-place.*

Medina [4.74] Therefore let those fight in the way of Allah, who sell this world's life for the hereafter; and whoever fights in the way of Allah, then be he slain or be he victorious, We shall grant him a mighty reward.

[4.75] And what reason have you that you should not fight in the way of Allah and of the weak among the men and the women and the children, (of) those who say: Our Lord! cause us to go forth from this town, whose people are oppressors, and give us from Thee a guardian and give us from Thee a helper.

[4.76] *Those who believe fight in the way of Allah, and those who disbelieve fight in the way of the Shaitan. Fight therefore against the friends of the Shaitan; surely the strategy of the Shaitan is weak.*

Medina [4.102] And when you are among them and keep up the prayer for them, let a party of them stand up with you, and let them take their arms; then when they have prostrated themselves let them go to your rear, and let another party who have not prayed come forward and pray with you, and let them take their precautions and their arms; (for) *those who disbelieve desire that you may be careless of your arms and your luggage, so that they may then turn upon you with a sudden united attack, and there is no blame on you, if you are annoyed with rain or if you are sick, that you lay down your arms, and take your precautions; surely Allah has prepared a disgraceful chastisement for the unbelievers.*

Medina [4.144] *O you who believe! do not take the unbelievers for friends rather than the believers; do you desire that you should give to Allah a manifest proof against yourselves?*

[4.145] *Surely the hypocrites are in the lowest stage of the fire and you shall not find a helper for them.*

Medina [9.12] And if they break their oaths after their agreement and (openly) revile your religion, then fight the leaders of unbelief-- surely their oaths are nothing-- so that they may desist.

[9.13] What! will you not fight a people who broke their oaths and aimed at the expulsion of the Apostle, and they attacked you first; do you fear them? But Allah is most deserving that you should fear Him, if you are believers.

[9.14] *Fight them, Allah will punish them by your hands and bring them to disgrace, and assist you against them and heal the hearts of a believing people.*

Medina [9.29] *Fight those who do not believe in Allah, nor in the latter day, nor do they prohibit what Allah and His Apostle have prohibited, nor follow the religion of truth, out of those who have been given the Book, until they pay the tax in acknowledgment of superiority and they are in a state of subjection.*

[9.30] And the Jews say: Uzair [Moses] is the son of Allah; and the Christians say: The Messiah is the son of Allah; these are the words of their mouths; they imitate the saying of those who disbelieved before; *may Allah destroy them; how they are turned away!*

Medina [9.63] *Do they not know that whoever acts in opposition to Allah and His Apostle, he shall surely have the fire of hell to abide in it? That is the grievous abasement.*

Medina [47.12] *Surely Allah will make those who believe and do good enter gardens beneath which rivers flow; and those who disbelieve enjoy themselves and eat as the beasts eat, and the fire is their abode.*

Medina [98.6] *Surely those who disbelieve from among the followers of the Book and the polytheists shall be in the fire of hell, abiding therein; they are the worst of men.*

[98.7] *(As for) those who believe and do good, surely they are the best of men.*

[98.8] Their reward with their Lord is gardens of perpetuity beneath which rivers flow, abiding therein for ever; Allah is well pleased with them and they are well pleased with Him; that is for him who fears his Lord.

This confrontational philosophy of life does not, of course, come from Allah. It is inherent in the Arab culture and existed long before Muhammad founded Islam. It is best expressed by a quote from the novel *The Haj*.

Before I was nine I had learned the basic canon of Arab life. It was me against my brother; me and my brother against our father; my family against my cousins and the clan; the clan against the tribe; and the tribe against the world and all of us against the infidel. [28]

[28] Leon Uris, *The Haj*, Bantam Books, 1985.

## **5) Struggle Must Continue Until the Whole World is Ruled by Muslims**

Medina [2.193] *And fight with them until there is no persecution, and religion should be only for Allah.*

Medina [8.39] *And fight them until persecution is no more, and religion is all for Allah.*

Unlike Old Testament directives to fight certain people toward a specific goal, this directive is against all Disbelievers until there are no more Disbelievers. People who are not religious have a tendency to not take religious fundamentalism seriously. But Islam is dead serious. Its goal is to make every nation on earth an Islamic “republic” under Sharia Law. There are at least 41 verses in the Quran that call Muslims to violent jihad toward this end: 2.216, 2.217, 2.218, 2.191\*, 3.142, 4.74\*, 4.76\*, 4.95, 5.33, 5.35, 7.195, 8.12, 8.15, 8.16, 8.39\*, 8.41, 8.65, 9.5\*, 9.16, 9.20, 9.29\*, 9.41, 9.44, 9.73, 9.81, 9.86, 9.88, 9.111, 9.123, 16.110, 25.052, 29.6, 29.69, 34.5, 34.38, 47.31, 48.20, 49.15, 60.1, 61.11, 66.9. Those with asterisks have been recited above in Sections C.1 to C.5.

Most people view Islam simply as a religion, but it may be more helpful to examine it as a political ideology with a strong religious basis. The latter viewpoint is similar to how we thought of Communism and Nazism as being political ideologies with strong atheistic bases. Our desire to be tolerant did not inhibit our criticism of either Communism or Nazism. Yet tolerance prohibits our judgment of Islam. We must take the Council on American-Islamic Relations co-founder Omar Ahmad seriously when he said in 1998:

Islam isn't in America to be equal to any other faith but to become dominant. The Quran should be the highest authority in America, and Islam the only accepted religion on earth. [29]

The first missionaries for militant Islam who arrived in the United States in the 1920s declared, “Our plan is, we are going to conquer America.” [30]

Westerners have developed a reverence for religious tolerance, which has created an aversion to questioning beliefs or motives when they are associated with a religion. This works to a great advantage for any deists since they can get away with telling us half truths or lies; and we, as Westerners, choose not to probe or criticize lest we appear to be intolerant.

[29] Art Moore, *Should Muslim Quran be USA's Top Authority?*, May 01, 2003  
[http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE\\_ID=32341](http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=32341).

[30] Daniel Pipes, “The Danger Within: Militant Islam in America,” *Commentary*, November 2001, <http://www.danielpipes.org/article.php/77>.

## **D. JIHAD**

Jihad is a complex issue within Islam. There are two kinds of jihad. The greater jihad, the name given by Muhammad, is an inner struggle waged by each Muslim against evil in their own life and is sometimes referred to as jihad of the heart. The second kind of jihad, the lesser jihad, is violent action against enemies of Allah, sometimes referred to as jihad of the sword. [31]. The Quran, the Hadith, and past and contemporary Islamic scholars all discuss violent jihad much more frequently, in much greater detail, with much more zeal, and with much greater demands

on Muslims than they do the greater jihad. Violent jihad can further be divided into defensive jihad and holy war. Defensive jihad is the defense of Islam, Allah, and Mohammad against those who have defiled or otherwise acted against Islam or who occupy Muslim land. Defensive jihad is the responsibility of each individual Muslim male.

[31] Majid Khadduri, “Introduction” and “The Doctrine of Jihad” in *War and Peace in the Law of Islam, Book 2: The Law of War: The Jihad*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1955, pp 49 - 73. This excellent article can be found in: Andrew J. Bostom, *The Legacy of Jihad—Islamic Holy War and the Fate of Non-Muslims*, Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2005, p. 305 - 319.

## 1) Defensive Jihad and Holy War

Holy war jihad is the traditional way Islam spreads itself among the lands of Disbelievers. Holy war is the strategy by which the Islamic empire spread from Medina to Portugal and to the Indian subcontinent. After the initial successes of holy war, it was formalized into the jurisprudence of both major sects of Islam, the Sunni and the Shiite. [32] All four schools of Sunni jurisprudence and the Shiite jurisprudence proscribe holy war as the obligation of Islam as a whole, not individual Muslims, to impose the peace of Allah on all nations. It maintains that the Muslim community has the duty to fight Disbelievers until they either convert or, if Jews, Christians, Sabeans, or Zoroastrians, accept the role of a highly-taxed, second-class citizen (dhimmi) with the Muslims taking ownership of their land. It is what Muhammad taught and is the tactic that made early Islamic expansion so successful. If the Disbelievers neither convert nor accept dhimmitude, they must be killed. [33] Modern Islamists, however, are more aggressive than Muhammad. Islamists today consider holy-war jihad to be mandatory for all Muslims, making it an individual rather than a communal duty. [34]

Douglas Streusand writes in the Middle East Quarterly:

*The Neglected Duty*, a pamphlet produced by Sadat’s [35] assassins to explain and justify this use of violence, is perhaps the purest expression of this Islamist perspective on jihad. (Its author, Muhammad ‘Abd al-Salam Faraj was executed along with the actual killers.) It argues that jihad as armed action is the cornerstone and heart of Islam; the neglect of jihad has caused the current depressed position of Islam in the world. ... *The Neglected Duty* is explicitly messianic, asserting that Muslims must “exert every conceivable effort” to bring about the establishment of truly Islamic government, a restoration of the caliphate, and the expansion of Dar al-Islam; and their success is inevitable. [36]

Holy war is also the type of jihad that dominates the modern expansion of the Wahhabi form of Sunni Islam and the Iranian form of Shiite Islam. Islamic doctrine teaches that holy war is not aggressive. Rather it is Islam’s way of bringing the freedom of submission-to-Allah’s-commandments to people who are slaves of the laws of mere humans. Jihad is thus a “gift” to Disbelievers.

Whether the jihad we see worldwide is considered defensive or holy war depends on the individuals waging it. It doesn't take a very large dose of Quranicly-inspired testosterone to rationalize that America and Americans have acted against Islam—despite our religiously-tolerant society—and thus should be the subject of defensive jihad as bin Laden teaches. Likewise, Ahmadinajad has already delivered the written ultimatum to President Bush [37] demanding conversion to Islam in his opening round of holy war against us. With this formality behind him, Iran can now justly attack the US and any of its citizens and assets anywhere in the world, and probably any of its allies.

Islam apologists would have us believe that Islamic extremists hate us because of socio-economic reasons or because of America's deplorable foreign policy (and it truly is deplorable). We would then conclude that we can solve our problem with Islamic jihad if we get them jobs and stop being deplorable. There are many reasons why that is not true, but let me keep the focus on the Quran and Islamic ideology with the following examples.

[32] Andrew J. Bostom, *The Legacy of Jihad—Islamic Holy War and the Fate of Non-Muslims*, Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2005, p. 27 - 28.

[33] *ibid.*

[34] Douglas E. Streusand, "What Does Jihad Mean?—Jihad as Warfare in Modern Times," *The Middle East Quarterly*, September 1997, <http://www.meforum.org/article/357>. (This is an excellent, concise discussion of jihad as an ideology, containing some modern perspectives.)

[35] Anwar El Sadat was president of Egypt from 1970 until his assassination in 1981 by the group Tanzim al-Jihad, an offshoot of the Muslim Brotherhood. He promoted peace with Israel after he launched the unprovoked attack against Israel in October 1973 that became the Yom Kippur War, a humiliating disaster for the Arabs. He became enormously unpopular with the Arab world and Islamists, which led to Egypt being expelled from the Arab League.

[36] Douglas E. Streusand, "What Does Jihad Mean?—Jihad as Warfare in Modern Times," *The Middle East Quarterly*, September 1997, <http://www.meforum.org/article/357>.

[37] Letter submitted to President Bush via the Swiss embassy in Tehran on May 8, 2006. [edition.cnn.com/interactive/world/0605/transcript.lemonde.letter/](http://edition.cnn.com/interactive/world/0605/transcript.lemonde.letter/).

## 2) Pakistan

The following excerpt is from an interview with By'atullah Mahsoud, the Emir of the Pakistani Taliban.

With regard to Osama and Al-Zawahiri, I never met them, but I have the utmost love and respect for them, because of their enmity towards the Jews and the Christians. The Muslims must be harsh towards the infidels and compassionate among themselves. These two men reflect this Koranic verse. Their enmity towards the Jews and the Christians is strong, and therefore, I respect them.

We Muslims are united, and we will wage Jihad in Afghanistan and in Pakistan. We will fight Jihad in Palestine, Bosnia, and Iraq as well. This is our religious duty, and in Islam, there is no text that says that a certain place is Pakistan, and another place is Afghanistan. There are no borders in Islam. We fight the Jews and the Christians in Afghanistan out of ideological motives.

We want to eradicate Britain and America, and to shatter the arrogance and tyranny of the infidels. We pray that Allah will enable us to destroy the White House, New York, and London. We place our trust in Allah. Soon, we will witness the miracles of Jihad. I myself have experienced many miracles. Every time I was determined to do something, I prayed to Allah, and he made it possible. Our Jihad is defensive Jihad. Our determination is great, and it is directed entirely against Britain and America. The soldiers of heresy who have come here to oppress the Muslims -- we will respond to their injustice and tyranny. One of the miracles of Jihad will be that sooner or later, we will destroy their countries. [38]

[38] Interview with By'atullah Mahsoud, the Emir of the Pakistani Taliban, which aired on Al-Jazeera TV on January 25, 2008. To read the complete interview, go to <http://www.memri.org/bin/articles.cgi?Page=archives&Area=sd&ID=SP183008>.

### 3) Somalia

Another similar current-day example of Quranic zeal to use violent jihad to establish a worldwide Islamic caliphate is this quote from Abu Mansour Al-Amriki. The (parentheses) are my comments; the [brackets] belong to the translator.

As for the MJY's (Movement of Jihadi Youth) ideology—we adhere to the pure ideology of the mujahideen on the other Jihad [fronts], as we have often heard it [expounded] by Osama bin Laden, Ayman Al-Zawahiri, and Abu Mus'ab Al-Zarqawi. ... We stress that we strive to establish an Islamic Caliphate stretching from East to West. [This shall be achieved] after we expel the [Ethiopian] occupier and kill the apostates. We will [strive towards this goal] while adhering to the Koran, to the Sunna and to the Salafi creed, with the Koran in one hand and the sword in the other. [39]

Lest you might think that “Islamic Caliphate stretching from East to West” has some local bounds, in an earlier paragraph, the same American, Abu Mansour Al-Amriki, states, “...the MJY strives towards a global goal that includes the establishment of a worldwide Islamic Caliphate stretching from East to West.”

[39] Quote from Abu Mansour Al-Amriki, an American who provides military training for mujahideen (jihad warriors) in Somalia. It appeared on January 1, 2008 on the Islamist website [www.ekhlaas.info](http://www.ekhlaas.info) and can be found translated at <http://www.memri.org/bin/articles.cgi?Page=archives&Area=sd&ID=SP183808>.

### 4) Children

To capture the minds of young Muslims, the state schools provide jihadi education. Here is a Kuwaiti fourth-grade test question [40] where pupils were asked:

In their war against the enemies of Islam, the jihad warriors need:  
A) Aid in lives, money, and weapons.

- B) Submission of complaints to the superpowers.
  - C) Spreading the news about them in newspapers, radio, and magazines.
- According to the textbook, the correct answer is A.

Remember that this is not a madrasah, one of the famed schools in most Muslim countries that teach only the Quran, hatred, and jihad. This is standard, public, elementary education in Kuwait. And this was after the curriculum had been revised to reflect less of an intolerant, anti-Western attitude. Very few Muslims are willing to criticize the established Islamic education system. This is just an example of the kind of indoctrination in jihad and other hostility toward Disbelievers that is being taught in Kuwait, a country that Americans spilled their blood to protect and that we call an ally in our “War on Terrorism.”

But the fourth grade is too late to begin teaching a total program of hate. Hamas, for example, solves that problem by broadcasting a TV children’s show, *Pioneers of Tomorrow*. A new character has recently joined the cast of *Pioneers*, Assud the Bunny. Assud’s return from “the diaspora” followed the martyrdom death of his brother, Nahoul the Bee, on the show. Nahoul himself replaced Farfour, the Hamas mouse, who was killed by an Israeli soldier on the show in June 2007. The following are excerpts from Assud’s debut episode. [41]

Child host Saraa Barhoum: “Dear children, let me welcome on your behalf our new friend, Assud. Allah be praised, our friend Assud has returned safe and sound to his land, to Palestine, after he emigrated to a different Arab country – a country which is not this noble homeland, dear children.”

[...]

Assud: “Mom, I want to ask you something.”

Mother: “Go ahead.”

Assud: “Where is Nahoul? I haven’t seen him for such a long time.”

Mother: “He went for a walk, and he’ll soon be back, Allah willing.”

Assud: “Where did he go? Who goes out at night?”

Mother: “What do you want me to do... He’ll be back soon, Allah willing.”

Assud: “Father, where is Nahoul?”

Father [whispering to the mother]: “How long can we keep what happened to Nahoul from him?”

Father [to Farfour]: “You are a believer, and our God ...”

Assud: “What happened to Nahoul, father?”

Father: “Allah be praised, you are a believing Muslim, and you know that we place our trust in Allah ... Your brother Nahoul got sick ...”

Assud: “What hospital is he in, father?”

Father: “He’s not in any hospital. He died a martyr’s death, Allah have mercy upon him.”

Assud: “No, father!” [weeps]

[...]

Assud: “Just like Nahoul took Farfour’s place when he was martyred, I will replace Nahoul, Allah willing. I will bring smiles and joy back to the children of Palestine, and the children of the whole world – the Arab and Islamic world, Allah willing.”

[...]

Saraa Barhoum: “Yes, Assud, we will continue in the path of Nahoul and Farfour, Allah willing. We will not let them down, Assud.”

[...]

Saraa Barhoum [to girl in the audience]: “Is there anything you want to share with us?”

Girl: “Arnoub [‘Rabbit’]?”

Saraa Barhoum: “His name is Assud [‘Lion’].”

Girl: “How come you are called Assud, even though you look like a rabbit?”

Assud: “Because a rabbit is not good. He’s a coward. But I, Assud, will get rid of the Jews, Allah willing, and I will eat them up, Allah willing, right?”

Saraa Barhoum: “Allah willing.”

We can see from the quotations of CAIR (end of Section C.5), the Pakistani Taliban (Section D.2), and the Movement of Jihadi Youth (Section D.3) that the ideologies exhibited in the Quran and the Hadith are not just irrelevant ancient ideas. They actually drive Islamic beliefs and actions even today on every continent. And Section D.4 illustrates how Muslim children are indoctrinated into the ideology of hate and death at an early age, not just in madrasahs, but in the state public educational systems.

[40] Islamic Education - Part I, p. 61. The entire article can be viewed at <http://memri.org/bin/articles.cgi?Page=archives&Area=ia&ID=IA22405>.

[41] Hamas, *Pioneers of Tomorrow*, a TV children’s show which aired on Al-Aqsa TV February 2-9, 2008. The complete translation of the program can be read at <http://www.memri.org/bin/articles.cgi?Page=archives&Area=sd&ID=SP184108>.

## E. APOSTASY

Apostasy is the sin (and crime according to Sharia law) of a Muslim rejecting Islam. The Quran condemns apostasy, but Islamic scholars find the punishment stated therein to be ambiguous. The Hadith (the teachings and traditions of Muhammad), however, clearly proclaims the death penalty in many places. The following are two of the references from the Hadith. [42]

Bukhari Volume 9, Book 83, Number 57

Narrated Ikrima:

Some atheists were brought to Ali and he burnt them. The news of this event, reached Ibn Abbas who said, “If I had been in his place, I would not have burnt them, as Allah’s messenger forbade it, saying, ‘Do not punish anybody with Allah’s punishment (fire).’ I would have killed them according to the statement of Allah’s Messenger, ‘Whoever changed his Islamic religion, then kill him.’”

Bukhari, volume 9, Book 83, Number 58

Narrated Abu Bruda:

Abu Musa said....Behold there was a fettered man beside Abu Musa. Muadh asked, “Who is this (man)?” Abu Musa said, “He was a Jew and became a Muslim and then reverted back to Judaism.” Then Abu Musa requested Muadh to sit down but Muadh said, “I will

not sit down till he has been killed. This is the judgment of Allah and his messenger,” and repeated it thrice. Then Abu Musa ordered that the man be killed, and he was killed. Abu Musa added, “Then we discussed the night prayers ...”

The apostasy death punishment is the state law and is routinely carried out in Saudi Arabia, Iran, Sudan, Mauritania, and the Comoros Islands. In other Islamic countries, death, torture, persecution, and harassment are usually delivered informally by vigilantes or family members or are officially carried out under the guise of laws against “insulting Islam” or “creating sectarian strife.” There is also evidence that conversion from Islam would be dramatically higher if it were not for the threat of apostasy retribution, especially among women. [43]

Charges of apostasy continue frequently right up to the present. A recent Middle East Media Research Institute article says:

On March 24, 2008, the reformist Arabic website Aafaq posted an op-ed by Dr. Abd Al-Hamid Al-Ansari, former dean of Islamic law at Qatar University, about a fatwa [44] issued in Saudi Arabia denouncing, and calling for the killing of two Saudi writers for articles they had published in the Saudi newspaper *Al-Riyadh*. The fatwa, issued earlier this month by prominent Saudi cleric Abdul Rahman Al-Barrak, declared the two writers *takfir*—that is, that their views constituted apostasy from Islam, making them infidels (*kuffar*) and subject to the death penalty if they did not repent and retract their views. A few days after the fatwa was issued, a group of 20 Saudi clerics published a signed letter supporting it. [45]

Another twist to apostasy maintains that any Muslim who rejects any Islamic principle is an apostate according to Ibn Warraq: “Any verbal denial of any principle of Muslim belief is considered apostasy.” [46] Thus, for example, Shiites and Sunnis can call each other apostates and justify jihad against each other, as has happened in Iraq, Iran, and elsewhere. Such a broadening of the definition of apostasy also implies a death penalty to any Muslim who criticizes any sect of Islam or the Prophet. And these death penalties are not idle threats, either in the West or in Islamic countries.

Ibn Warraq went on to say:

Under Muslim law, the male apostate must be put to death, as long as he is an adult, and in full possession of his faculties. If a pubescent boy apostatizes, he is imprisoned until he comes of age, then if he persists in rejecting Islam he must be put to death. Drunkards and the mentally disturbed are not held responsible for their apostasy. If a person has acted under compulsion he is not considered an apostate, his wife is not divorced and his lands are not forfeited. According to Hanafis and Shia, a woman is imprisoned until she repents and adopts Islam once more, but according to the influential Ibn Hanbal, and the Malikis and Shafiites, she is also put to death. In general, execution must be by the sword, though there are examples of apostates tortured to death, or strangled, burnt, drowned, impaled or flayed.

Apostates are not safe even living in the West. Ayaan Hirsi Ali left Islam and has spoken often about her books, *Infidel* and *The Caged Virgin*, in the US and in Europe. She has been forced to live under 24-hour protection and in hiding. [47] Her good friend, Theo Van Gogh, was a Dutch filmmaker who was murdered in 2004 by a jihadist, Mohammed Bouyeri, for producing a film about women's rights in Islam that was deemed offensive to Muslims. The studio then made the politically correct decision to not release the film, thus encouraging further jihad.

Closer to home, in 2007 a UC Irvine student identifying herself as "OC Apostate" (she had recently left Islam in which she was raised) was forced to shut down the blog in which she criticized Islam's intolerance for fear that members of the campus Muslim Student Union would harm her family in retribution for her apostasy. She explained:

I started a blog as a way to express myself. Word finally got around that it was me who was writing it and my family got threats that if I didn't shut up something might happen. I didn't want them to suffer for something I had done. So I deleted everything. ... There is no room for ex-Muslims in a Muslim society. The punishment for being an apostate is death. [48]

[42] <http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/fundamentals/hadithsunnah/bukhari/084.sbt.html#009.084.057>

[43] Paul Marshall, "Apostates from Islam: The case of the Afghan convert is not unique," *The Weekly Standard*, April 10, 2006, Volume 011, Issue 28, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/012/059fpgm.asp>.

[44] A *fatwa* is a religious opinion on Islamic law issued by an Islamic scholar. In Sunni Islam a fatwa is non-binding; whereas in Shi'i Islam it may be binding, depending on the status of the scholar.

[45] "Former Qatar Dean of Islamic Law Dr. Abd Al-Hamid Al-Ansari in AAFAQ Article Responds to Fatwa Calling for Two Saudi Writers' Killing," Middle East Media Research Institute, Special Dispatch Series, No. 1888, April 7, 2008, <http://www.memri.org/bin/articles.cgi?Page=archives&Area=sd&ID=SP188808>.

[46] Ibn Warraq, panel discussion on "Apostasy, Human Rights, Religion and Belief" held at the 60th Session of the UN Commission on Human Rights, Geneva, April 7, 2004, <http://www.jihadwatch.org/dhimmiwatch/archives/001590.php>.

[47] Steven Emerson, "Fighting Global Islamist Ideology the Key to War on Terror," IPT News, April 10, 2008, <http://www.investigativeproject.org/article/643> (This article summarizes his testimony before the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.)

[48] "The Muslim Student Union at UC Irvine," *FrontPage Magazine*, April 03, 2008, <http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/Read.aspx?GUID=71E533E2-AE2F-487B-9B41-3A36FF1C5308>.

## F. ISLAM IS INCOMPATIBLE WITH WESTERN CIVILIZATION

If Islam is to become compatible with Western democratic traditions and if we are to accept Islam as an integral part of our culture, Muslims must question two fundamental beliefs: 1) that the Quran is the literal, unalterable word of Allah and 2) that Muhammad is the perfect example

for Believers. This would open both the Quran and the Hadith to criticism and modern interpretation. From these two beliefs flow violent jihad, women's inferiority, apostasy, and hatred of non-Muslims.

We have heard the following so often from such diverse sources that we feel it must be true: "The problem is not Islam. The overwhelming majority of Muslims are peaceful and tolerant. It's just that radical, militant extreme that has hijacked Islam for their own violent, political agenda." But that is not true. The problem is Islam. Not just radical Islam, or Islamofacists, or Islamists, or militant Islam, or extremists, or Salafists. The problem is Islam. [49]

The problems are so deeply ingrained in the Islam ideology that it would be very difficult to solve the problems without fundamental change to the ideology. There may be some actual "moderate Muslims" who have somehow invented an alternative Islam to match their peaceful desires, but this is the real fringe element of Islam.

Let's put political correctness aside for a moment, if we can, and look at this objectively. If there is a small, radical, violent element that is corrupting the true message of Islam, wouldn't you think there would be a massive upwelling of the supposed Islamic majority to condemn the "lies" of jihad, women's inferiority, apostasy, and hatred of non-Muslims? Wouldn't they seek to reclaim their religion? But this upwelling hasn't happened. Many American imams (two of whom I have discussed this issue with) are quick to "condemn all forms of terrorism done in the name of Islam." But terrorism is not the issue. Jihad, as a fundamental principle and duty of Islam, is the issue. Terrorism is a result of jihad. Terrorism is simply one strategy of implementing jihad. And if it's jihad, Islam teaches that it's justified and not even considered to be terrorism. The ability of persons of zeal to rationalize is unbounded.

Jihad, as an ideological and religious principle, is totally at odds with a free and peaceful society. Jihad can be easily justified by claiming that the victims are not really innocent or that someone is an aggressor if they choose to fight when confronted with the demand of "convert or submit." It is common among Muslims to maintain that acts of violence toward Disbelievers are not really terrorism but jihad against occupiers of Muslim land, defilers of Islam, or oppressors of Muslims. In a similar way, they say suicide bombing is not really suicide (condemned by the Quran) but is martyrdom (lauded by the Quran and the only sure way of going to heaven).

Muslims take any defilement of Islam, Allah, or the Prophet very, very seriously. Look at the worldwide chaos among Muslims caused by a couple of uncomplimentary cartoons of Muhammad, [50] by the Pope's criticism of some ancient caliph, and by naming some teddy bear Muhammad. Muslims are not bashful about letting someone know when they have defiled Islam in some way. And yet there hasn't been one demonstration by free Muslims condemning either Islamic jihad or this hypothetical minority of militant Muslims who are supposedly lying about sacred scriptures and misrepresenting the basic principles of Islam. So what's going on with these one billion Muslims who are silent about worldwide jihad but incensed about cartoons?

The answer is one, or all, of the following: 1) most Muslims agree with violent jihad against Disbelievers, 2) most Muslims are afraid to speak out against this radical element, or 3) most

Muslims are psychologically conditioned to never speak out against any Muslim or to criticize Islam. Any one of these answers would compel a condemnation of mainstream Islam.

This incompatibility discussion has focused on four elements of Islamic doctrine: jihad, gender discrimination, apostasy, and hatred of the Disbeliever. There is, however, another element of Islam which is cultural rather than doctrinal in nature and which actually draws a higher-contrast line between Islam and the West than do the doctrines. This is the long-accepted Western principle of separation of church and state. Islam still adheres to the typically medieval concept of the unity of church and state. The West slowly weaned itself of that social evil culminating in the foundation of the USA, for which separation is a central issue. It's bad enough that Islam reveres the above four undemocratic doctrines, but then demanding that civil law and practices adhere strictly to the religious doctrine and authority puts Islam well outside what can be accepted by Western Democracies as a compatible culture.

Until Muslims put jihad, gender discrimination, apostasy, hatred of non-Muslims, and church and state unity on the table for open debate, they can never become a congruent part of Western society or even compatible with a peace-seeking world. If American Muslims, with their wealth, their education, and their freedom, do not force this debate, who will? And if American Christians do not demand that American Muslims take this responsibility, who will?

[49] Many Westerners maintain that “the problem” is the conflict between Israel and Palestine. This has some credibility because that is the issue that seems to be most often voiced by Muslims as being the big hurdle to be overcome. First of all, one would not expect Muslims to admit that there are fundamental deficiencies within their religion that prevent a peaceful relationship with the rest of the world. It is much more acceptable to blame the problem on some external force being applied to them that is beyond their control, i.e., Israel. Second, if the conflict with the Jews were miraculously settled with all Palestinians and Jews satisfied with the outcome, would that make any significant difference in the relationships between Islam and the West?

[50] Not one mainstream media outlet in the USA or UK has ever published any of the cartoons, “out of respect for the Prophet.” More likely out of respect for the profit. It was fear and political correctness that drove the media not to reprint the Muhammad cartoons, not some imagined sensitivity. Dollars defeat journalistic integrity again. We have a right to see the evidence supporting worldwide cartoon jihad, not just read about it.

## **G. MUSLIMS IN AMERICA**

Islam is a serious problem in Western democracies. We can see it in Europe because Europe is well ahead of America in the Islamization process and is at least our equal in political correctness. Most Americans, however, react in horror if you suggest that ordinary American Muslims are part of “the problem.” That may be because these horrified people do not really understand the basic nature of Islam. Rather they simply see ordinary fervent Muslims struggling with the same social, health, economic, workplace, and family problems we all face. But this sameness does not illuminate the underlying differences and dangers.

Islam is the most autocratic of all the major religions. Wahhabis, who overwhelmingly dominate Islam in the Middle East, Europe, and the Americas, are especially fundamentalist. American Muslim immigrants and converts are, or have been, taught that fidelity to Allah supercedes everything else and defines their every action. That's okay as long as Allah doesn't ask them to take sides between their god and their country. It may be that most American Muslim converts have not even considered this possibility when joining Islam. It may also be that most Muslim immigrants have also not considered this future conflict when coming to America for its economic benefits. Their lack of foresight will not, however, mitigate the conflict if it arises. They are captives of an ideology which has erected huge barriers, both physical and social, to rejection or even criticism of their religion or its hierarchy. Whatever we might think of the millions, past and present, who have stood in the path of Islamic expansion, Muslims themselves are the most unlucky victims of Islam.

## 1) Cultural Jihad

A hybrid type of holy war, cultural jihad, has developed which is more effective in Dar al-Sulh (state of Islamic weakness) lands such as Europe and America. The attitude of political correctness rampant in the West make us particularly susceptible to cultural jihad. The cultural-jihad strategy is more subtle and preys on, and is served by, the tolerance and freedoms of the host country. But the end effect on the host country may be similar to that of holy war. That end effect is that we Disbelievers must be saved from our enslavement by human-made laws and be brought into the fold of Islam to live under the laws of Allah (i.e., Sharia Law). It is the duty of all Muslims (but not each Muslim) to carry out this jihad "until persecution is no more, and religion is all for Allah." (See Section C.5.)

The cultural jihad approach is to foster feelings of guilt in Disbelievers for not being perfectly tolerant and for not unconditionally embracing the Islamic culture as equal to their own. Thus the strategy is to instigate situations in which Disbelievers respond in a way which can be criticized by those with a politically-correct agenda.

An example of cultural jihad is the recent flying-imams incident. On November 21, 2006, six imams boarded US Airways Flight 300 at Minneapolis bound for Phoenix. The imams had attended a conference sponsored by the North American Imam Federation in Minneapolis and were returning home. After a long delay, the six imams were escorted off the plane in handcuffs by the Minneapolis Police, whence they were questioned and released.

Here is what witnesses say happened according to the November 28, 2006, Washington Times:

1) Three of the imams "were praying very loud" in the concourse and repeatedly shouted "Allah" when passengers were called for boarding.

2) The six imams switched from their assigned seats to a pattern associated with the September 11 terrorist attacks and also found in probes of U.S. security since the attacks—two in the front row first-class, two in the middle of the plane on the exit aisle and two in the rear of the cabin.

"That would alarm me," said a federal air marshal who asked to remain anonymous. "They now control all of the entry and exit routes to the plane."

The imams who claimed two first-class seats said their tickets were upgraded. The gate agent told police that when the imams asked to be upgraded, they were told no such seats were available.

3) The imams spoke in Arabic and English, criticizing the war in Iraq and President Bush, and talking about al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden.

4) Three of the imams asked for seat-belt extenders, which can be used as weapons, although two flight attendants told police the men were not oversized. Rather than attach the extensions, the men placed the straps and buckles on the cabin floor, the flight attendant said. [51]

None of these actions is illegal, nor is it likely that any one action would cause the pilot to ask for security intervention. When taken together, however, they raised suspicions to a very high level. “That’s like shouting ‘fire’ in a crowded theater. You just can’t do that anymore,” said Robert MacLean, a former air marshal. “They should have been denied boarding and been investigated. It looks like they are trying to create public sympathy or maybe setting someone up for a lawsuit.”

That is precisely what has happened. The Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) filed a suit against US Airways for racial discrimination and religious intolerance. They later added to the lawsuit the passengers who contacted security about the situation.

It is likely that this whole episode was designed and executed for public attention to be a cause for crying discrimination. But this conspiracy may have even darker motives. Janet Levy of FrontPageMagazine writes:

...there may be other purposes at work here as well, namely, a campaign to undermine our focus on viable and possibly dangerous groups and populations by dismissing it as nothing more than prejudice, small-mindedness, and stereotyping. In this way, our very vigilance as a nation is under attack from a form of “cultural jihad,” that seeks to use our own values against us. [52]

Such attempts to intimidate Disbelievers and weaken not only their resistance but their view of themselves, are commonplace in Europe where both violent and cultural jihad have been successfully waged for many years.

Ms. Levy also wrote about Omar Shahin, one of the six imams:

In examining the Nov. 21 incident more closely, we find that among those removed, Shahin heads a particularly intriguing organization. Founded in 1971, the ICT’s [Islamic Center of Tucson] \$1.5 million mosque was funded largely by the Saudi government through the North American Islamic Trust, a Saudi-backed Wahhabist group that controls a majority of the most radical mosques in North America.

According to Washington-based terrorist expert Rita Katz, the Islamic Center of Tucson included what was “basically the first cell of Al Qaeda in the United States.” The connections between Al Qaeda and the ICT include Wael Hamza Jalaidan, a

former ICT president, believed to be an Al Qaeda founder, and Hani Hanjour, who attended the mosque while a student at the University of Arizona and who later flew American Airlines Flight 77 into the Pentagon on 9/11. Wadih El-Hage, a personal assistant to terrorist leader Osama Bin Laden, was active with the ICT in the late 1980's where he is alleged to have established an Al Qaeda support network, according to the FBI. In 2001, El Hage was convicted by a federal judge in New York of planning the 1998 bombings of the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania.

Besides nurturing ICT activists who have gone on to become bone fide terrorists, the Islamic Center of Tucson has played a prominent role in raising money for terrorist front groups. The ICT raised money for the Holy Land Foundation, whose assets were frozen by the U.S. Treasury in 2001 for alleged ties to terrorist groups. Following the treasury action, ICT Imam Omar Shahin continued to defend the organization and its "charitable" intent. Further, Shahin had been a representative of KindHearts, an organization that made contributions to Hamas-related groups and was also shut down by the U.S. government for alleged connections to terrorist causes.

The great majority of Muslims are Salafists, Wahhabis, Mahdis, Kharijis, or other fundamentalist sects; and most of them take jihad very seriously and dedicate themselves (at least communally) to its fulfillment. CAIR is continually pressuring our religiously tolerant society for not just legitimacy, but for special status as a "victim" of religious discrimination. If they can prey on our tradition of religious tolerance and make Disbelievers feel guilty about not accepting their primitive ideology, then they will be in a stronger position to make further demands on our legal and cultural systems to favor Islam rather than simply tolerating Islam. America's liberal academic establishment is particularly susceptible to cultural jihad since this kind of jihad appeals to their reverence for ethnic diversity, multiculturalism, and America's melting-pot tradition.

American Muslim organizations like CAIR and hundreds of radical mosques are largely funded, directed, and manned by agents from Saudi Arabia and other Persian Gulf countries. CAIR is the preeminent Muslim culture and rights organization in America. It is the most recognized organization and claims to represent all Muslims. CAIR's annual dues from members in 2006, however, were only \$59,000 while its budget was \$3 million. [53] The New York Times said that CAIR was "partly financed by donors closely identified with wealthy Persian Gulf governments." [54]

So far, US Airways has treated this suit very seriously and has not settled with CAIR. US Airways has, in fact, requested a jury trial. [55] Though the Islamic principles behind this law suit may seem silly and juvenile to a rational person, these are not just children we can dismiss. These are zealots, and they have power, and this is a war. And it is just as serious as the Cold War. Sadly, nearly all the power they possess has been bestowed on them by our childlike consumption of oil, which has continued and grown irrespective of the "wakeup call" delivered with 9/11 Jihad.

[51] "How the imams terrorized an airliner," *The Washington Times*, November 28, 2006, [http://www.washtimes.com/national/20061128-122902-7522r\\_page2.htm](http://www.washtimes.com/national/20061128-122902-7522r_page2.htm).

[52] Janet Levy, "The Minneapolis Six Sabotage Airline Security," *FrontPageMagazine.com*, November 28, 2006, <http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=25694>.

[53] The Fred Thompson Report, "Good News about CAIR," ABC Radio Networks, June 20, 2007, <http://www.aberadiionetworks.com/article.asp?id=427045&SPID=15663>.

[54] Neil MacFarquhar, "Scrutiny Increases for a Group Advocating for Muslims in U.S.," *New York Times*, March 14, 2007, <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/03/14/washington/14cair.html>.

[55] Audrey Hudson, "US Airways, airport seek trial in imams' suit," *The Washington Times*, January 4, 2008, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20080104/NATION/928787937/1001>.

## 2) Pressure Toward Islamization

Actions like the forgoing are examples of the efforts of Islamic organizations to get Americans to feel guilty about resistance to perceived special treatment of Islam. But Islam, like all other ideologies, is driven by individuals. This section will discuss the "conquer America" movement which many jihadists believe is the most important holy war target, and how individual Muslims, including American citizens, both converts and immigrants, may be a threat to our constitutional heritage.

Violent jihad is not likely to Islamize America unless the attack is so horrendous that it cripples our highly leveraged economy. That is possible, but unlikely. If 9/11 Jihad was supposed to advance the holy war against America, it was a failure. It galvanized Americans and made us more patriotic. It caused many Americans to honestly consider the merits and demerits of Islam. Books on Islam have become far more popular than ever would have been the case without the attack. And these books present an overwhelmingly negative image of Islam when juxtaposed with Western Democracy. If jihadists continue to pursue violent jihad in America, they will decrease their probability of success. The most fundamental jihadists, however, are stuck with the violent jihad model since it is the way Muhammad taught early Muslims to successfully conduct holy war.

There are jihadists, however, who are much more adaptable. They know that Americans are not soft militarily or physically but that America's vulnerability lies in its obsession with religious tolerance and political correctness. They have used these attributes and will continue to exploit them.

In June 1991, Siraj Wahaj, [56] a convert to Islam and recipient of some of the American Muslim community's highest honors, became the first Muslim to deliver the opening prayer in the U.S. House of Representatives. He appealed to the Almighty to guide American leaders "and grant them righteousness and wisdom." A year later he told an audience of New Jersey Muslims that if only Muslims were more clever politically, they could take over the United States and replace its constitutional government with a caliphate. "If we were united and strong, we'd elect our own emir and give allegiance to him."

Recalling the declarations of the founder of the respected Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) and of the early militant Muslims of the 1920s in Section C.5, we see that jihadist sentiments are neither new nor rare in America. My message is not that there are

jihadists everywhere, but simply that there are jihadists in America. And further, it is difficult for Disbelievers to sort out who is a jihadist and who is peaceful Muslim. In fact it is unknown whether the jihadists comprise twenty percent of American Muslims or eighty percent. The important point is that we cannot judge Muslims based on what they say to Disbelievers but what they say to other Muslims.

The motto of the Muslim Brotherhood, widely believed to be the most powerful political organization in the Muslim world today, translates to:

Allah is our objective. The Prophet is our leader. The Quran is our law. Jihad is our way. Dying in the way of Allah is our highest hope. [57]

[56] Daniel Pipes, "The Danger Within: Militant Islam in America," Commentary, November 2001, <http://www.danielpipes.org/article.php/77>.

[57] Zeyno Baran, "O Brotherhood, What Art Thou?" Hudson Institute, April 16, 2007, [http://www.hudson.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=publication\\_details&I'd=4868](http://www.hudson.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=publication_details&I'd=4868).

### **3) Early Steps Toward Islamization As Elements of Jihad**

This section and Section 4 are somewhat hypothetical, and since I am not a degreed soothsayer, my vision may turn out to be dead wrong. The value of my hypotheses, though, are to show some possibilities of how Islamic doctrines coupled with external events can empower a small Muslim minority during the escalation of some future historical confrontation.

We must appreciate the difference between the duties of individual Muslims and the duties of Muslims as a community. Following the Five Pillars is an individual duty. Jihad (defensive or holy war) is a communal duty. Thus a Muslim may honestly say that he does not practice violent jihad. He may also honestly say, as we discussed near the beginning of Section F, that he does not believe in terrorism. How many Muslims, comfortably exploiting a nominally peace-loving society like the U.S.A., would even have the courage to say they believe in holy war? At the extreme end of the jihad spectrum, consider how long the nineteen jihadi hijackers plus those in their support network lived in the West without betraying their motives before they attacked America in 2001.

But let's look at the peaceful Muslims in America who follow the Five Pillars and attend mosque and have many of our traditional American values of love of family, love of country, and love of baseball. They are Americans. They have, however, sworn their allegiance and their very identity to Allah in a way that few other religions demand. But Allah has not yet called them to choose between Islam and America. That may not happen to the present generation, or it might never happen. It could more easily occur after Islam in America is politically much stronger, for example when they reach a larger fraction of the population or a greater political representation, or when Islam is fully accepted by Americans as part of our American culture.

Muslims have thus far made only small demands on our society, e.g., foot baths at universities, time off to pray during the work day, rooms set aside for Islamic prayer, access of imams to

recruit prison inmates, etc. These seem like small requests to a culturally and religiously tolerant people like Americans.

But at some point in the future, their political strength or confidence could encourage them to make demands which are unconstitutional and erode away basic American values, such as legal recognition of certain elements of Sharia Law (the strict legal doctrines developed by Islamic scholars based on the Quran and the Hadith) or special tax or public funding privileges for Islam. They may demand that parts of Sharia Law be accepted as complementing U.S. legal code for specific groups of Muslims in certain geographical places of Muslim concentration like Dearborn, Michigan, Toledo, Ohio, or Northern Virginia. This kind of step would be unconstitutional but could be voted into local law and affirmed by a politically-correct Supreme Court.

This is precisely what is happening today in the U.K. [59] The head of the Church of England has called for the selective application of Sharia law in Britain in the interest of “social cohesion.” On February 7, 2008, Dr. Rowan Williams, the Archbishop of Canterbury and symbolic head of the worldwide Anglican Communion, issued what amounts to a capitulation to the encroachment of Islam and an accommodation to Sharia. A BBC News article said:

Dr. Williams argues that adopting parts of Islamic Sharia law would help maintain social cohesion. For example, Muslims could choose to have marital disputes or financial matters dealt with in a Sharia court. He says Muslims should not have to choose between “the stark alternatives of cultural loyalty or state loyalty.”[60]

But adoption of new loyalties is an inherent part of immigration. Muslims should, of course, be able to seek counseling or mediation based on any cultural tradition they choose. The law, however, must not be amended except by established means and with established constitutional limitations and must apply to everyone equally. For example, laws relating to divorce and inheritance must not be amended to accommodate Sharia law for special groups of Muslims.

Once small legal inroads are made, American Muslims may be instructed by their imams to actively support demands for more substantive changes. That is when American Muslims would have to choose between the fundamental values of America and the fundamental teachings of Islam.

Since Islam requires unconditional submission to Allah above every other consideration, and since it is the most dogmatic and autocratic of the major religious ideologies, Believers must follow the dictates of Islam. Such dictates are usually in the form of the demands of imams, many of whom have been sent here from Saudi Arabia. To not submit means to suffer intimidation and humiliation or even physical consequences as happens in many other countries. That would be the real beginning of the Islamization of America. Our foreign policies, immigration laws, and Bill of Rights would be the targets. These would begin to shift in tiny steps toward favoritism of Islam and integration of Sharia Law into American jurisprudence.

This is, of course, a very hypothetical scenario. But I am merely trying to make the potential threat less abstract with specific examples of what could happen. There are many ways that

Islamization can take place, and just as many ways that it can fail to take place. If we want to understand these possibilities, we must become students of Islam and of modern European history. Europe can teach us much about the threat, and Europe will likely even become a part of that threat as it moves down the path of Islamization ahead of us.

Predicting the future is both difficult and thankless. But however difficult the task and politically incorrect the conclusions, we must try to look ahead. The consequences of just letting history happen to us are simply not acceptable.

[58] The Five Pillars of Islam is the term given to the five duties incumbent upon every individual Muslim. The Five Pillars are: profession of faith (shahadah), ritual prayer (salah), alms tax (zakah), fasting during Ramadan (sawm), and pilgrimage to Mecca (hajj).

[59] Janet Levy, American Thinker, “The Fallacy of Shared Values,” March 1, 2008, [http://www.americanthinker.com/2008/03/the\\_fallacy\\_of\\_shared\\_values.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/2008/03/the_fallacy_of_shared_values.html).

[60] BBC News, “Sharia law in UK is 'unavoidable'”, February 7, 2008, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/7232661.stm>.

#### 4) The Future of Europe and America

This table illustrates where the United States lies relative to Europe and some other countries by showing the percentages of the populations that are Muslim: [61]

U.S.	0.6 %
China	1 - 2
Australia	1.5
Norway	1.8
Canada	1.9
Denmark	2
United Kingdom	2.7
Germany	3.7
Switzerland	4.3
France	5 - 10
Netherlands	5.5
Russia	10 - 15
India	13.4
Israel	16
World	21 (Christian 33; Hindu 13; Buddhist 5.8; Sikh 0.35, Jew 0.23)
Bosnia and Herzegovina	40
Lebanon	59.7
Indonesia	86.1
Egypt	90
Iraq	97
Pakistan	97
Iran	98
Turkey	99.8
Saudi Arabia	100

Based on this small minority in America, many Americans who understand the incompatibility of Islam with the West still believe that it is irrational to project that Islam could ever dominate America. They may be absolutely right. But I will now discuss one way that the small Muslim minority can be greatly leveraged. And that relates to developments in Europe in the next half century.

Europe is far more vulnerable to Islamization than America because of: 1) its proximity to the Middle East, 2) its greater dependence on the Middle east for energy, 3) its huge and growing Muslim population, 4) the class system in Europe which attempts to maintain the swarthy immigrants in a lower class than “real” Europeans, 5) its struggle to maintain population stability in its productive sector to support its growing retired population, 6) the growth of European culture self-deprecation since WWII, and 7) the blindness, denial, and paralysis caused by political correctness.

Fortunately America has serious problems with only the last two—a growing tendency to undervalue and even deprecate the strengths and benefits of American culture, which leads to celebrating diversity instead of celebrating unity; and a reverence for political correctness, which prevents the free and open discussion of problems that touch on racial, ethnic, or any other group differences.

But whatever problems Europe may have in dealing with Islam, those problems and their consequences will not remain exclusive to Europe. Our cultural and economic ties to Europe are far too close. As happened twice in the last century, problems in Europe have a way of drawing America into war.

Ultimately Islam will openly and violently try to take power in one or more European countries. At that point America will be faced with the problem of how to form a foreign policy toward a European Union which is being torn apart by civil war between Islamic revolutionaries and traditional governments. This is a very real possibility in the time frame of thirty or forty years, especially if Turkey is admitted to the EU and acts as a portal for even more mass immigration of Muslims into Europe. The European demographics in the above table have all occurred during the last 35 years. It is more likely that this trend will accelerate than decelerate.

In the event of European civil war, America would have to choose between:

- 1) supporting our traditional EU allies—the consequence being that oil or other resources would be withheld from America by non-EU Islamic countries or
- 2) supporting European Islamic revolutionaries—the consequence being that American oil spigots would stay open and American hegemony would be maintained. But support for the revolutionaries would also help create Islamic dictatorships in the EU, though they would surely be called republics.

Twentieth-century American foreign policy has focused on maintaining the easy profits of American corporations and the economic hegemony of America. Thus it seems likely that our decision would be to opt for choice #2 and the short-term benefits to American business of supporting the Islamic revolutions. We would probably not worry too much about facing a much

greater European Islamic threat down the road. After all, the standard wisdom is that America will be able to negotiate deals with the revolutionaries and their Middle Eastern Islamic sponsors to safeguard, and even enhance, America's world economic position. And American policy makers, who tend not to be students of history, especially Islamic history, will rationalize that the Islamic revolutionaries will honor the terms of these deals when they gain power. This is the reality of an America dominated by special interests rather than by the common good.

These events could be greatly influenced by strong pressure from American Muslims and Islam apologists. Once a few small appeasements are accepted, increasingly larger appeasements can be demanded. This is how World War II evolved in Europe. This is how the Islamization of Europe is evolving today. It may be a slow process, but many Muslims see themselves as just a small link in the long chain of building the new worldwide caliphate.

In a Friday sermon that aired on Hamas' Al-Aqsa TV on April 11, 2008, Yunis Al-Astal, Hamas Member of Parliament and cleric, told worshippers:

Very soon, Allah willing, Rome will be conquered, just like Constantinople was, as was prophesized by our Prophet Muhammad.

Today, Rome is the capital of the Catholics, or the Crusader capital, which has declared its hostility to Islam, and has planted the brothers of apes and pigs in Palestine in order to prevent the reawakening of Islam. This capital of theirs will be an advanced post for the Islamic conquests, which will spread through Europe in its entirety, and then will turn to the two Americas, and even Eastern Europe.

I believe that our children, or our grandchildren, will inherit our jihad and our sacrifices, and, Allah willing, the commanders of the conquest will come from among them. ... we prepare them for the mission of saving humanity from the hellfire at whose brink they stand. [62]

There is a huge difference in philosophy and motivation between a fanatical 1400-year-old political ideology struggling to regain the glory of its past and the mandate of its god (Islam) and a fat and corrupt culture seeking to maintain today's child-like consumption rates and next quarter's corporate profits (the West). The West may have the weapons, but Islam has patience and zeal. In some ways it may appear to be an uneven contest, but I believe it is too close to call.

[61] CIA World Factbook - Field Listings - Religion

<http://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/fields/2122.html>.

The numbers for the U.S. are quite uncertain since there are no official records kept by religion.

[62] "Hamas MP/Cleric's Friday Sermon: We Will Conquer Rome, the Two Americas, and Eastern Europe," Middle East Media Research Institute, Special Dispatch No. 1895, April 14, 2008, <http://www.memri.org/bin/articles.cgi?Page=archives&Area=sd&ID=SP189508>.

## H. CONCLUSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS

1) **ISLAMIC REFORMATION** — What is the likelihood that Islam will, or can, reform to the point where it can coexist in peace and prosperity with Western cultures? Many say that Islam

can experience a reformation just as Christianity did after Martin Luther nailed his 95 theses to the door of the Wittenburg Castle Church in 1517. The analogy, however, is not compelling since the Protestant Reformation was aimed at purging the Catholic Church of its extra-Biblical excesses (e.g., indulgences) and returning to its Biblical roots. That might correspond to Islam rejecting the Hadith and accepting the Quran as the only source of doctrine. Not only is that unlikely, but that still wouldn't make Islam compatible with the West as we have seen from the discussion of Quranic text in Section C above. An Islamic reformation would have to go much deeper and reject or reinterpret many verses of the Quran. That seems totally antithetical to the Islamic ideology.

**2) CONFLICT WITH ISLAM**—Everything I have discussed is from a political/philosophical/ideological point of view. So how does all this relate to the daily lives of ordinary Muslims living, working, playing, dying in America? It may be that many Muslims will never see any conflict between Islam and America. Sufis, for example, somehow pick and choose Allah's commandments so that they claim perfect peace and harmony with Believers and Disbelievers alike. The problems are that such sects are an extreme minority (less than one percent) and their doctrinal leaders and doctrines still don't sound very tolerant.

I don't know what normal American Muslims (predominantly Wahhabis, the most fundamentalist Islamic sect) will do when presented with an extreme situation such as demands by their imams to support Islam by taking sides in expansion of Islamic Sharia Law in America. It is certain that many Muslims, when confronted by this test of faith, will put Allah above their American values and join the jihad for Islamization of America. Two big questions are: (a) does my term "many Muslims" mean ten percent or ninety percent and (b) what will the remainder do who don't join the jihad—watch silently as they do now or demand some changes in Islam? These are two immensely important questions.

If Europe really does engage in a struggle between Islam and Europe's traditional governments for political domination of the continent, then America will be forced to take sides. Whether the European struggle is open warfare or open social conflict (demonstrations, riots, assassinations, suicide attacks), we in America will have to make choices. The direction those choices go will depend on: (a) how politically strong the Muslim contingent in the US is, (b) how many Americans view Muslims to be as peace-loving as any other Americans, (c) how many Americans see Muslims as being victims of discrimination by our culture, and (d) an American educational system that has taught several generations of American students that Muslims seek only to better themselves in the eyes of *our* God. If there are no more large-scale, Islamic-jihad attacks against America, our special-interest-pandering political leaders will be very susceptible to pressure for appeasement.

**3) POWER, MONEY, AND OIL**—The proven reserves of oil and natural gas in the Middle East, which is roughly half of the world's total, has a value, at today's prices, of about 280 trillion dollars. For comparison, that is about twice the value of the world's total financial assets—stocks, bonds, other equities, government and corporate debt securities, and bank deposits. The leverage this immense wealth gives to Islam in any kind of confrontation with the West is beyond estimation.

Now juxtapose that mind boggling wealth against the realities of a declining America in which: a) business leaders use power to make money, b) political leaders use money to buy power, and c) most of the money used by politicians comes from business. The consequence of these three realities is that virtually every political decision is primarily driven by power and money and only incidentally by the common good.

Now consider an environment in which: a) world energy demand is outstripping energy supply, b) the value of the U.S. dollar is plummeting, c) American military might is stretched thin, d) the Chinese navy is growing rapidly and threatening our traditional oil suppliers and supply routes, e) Chinese ownership of U.S. assets is rising toward the two trillion dollar level, f) corporate “America” has essentially moved offshore thus relieving it of whatever patriotic duty it traditional had, and g) Americans are tuned in to reality TV. To this environment add an Islam flush with oil and dollars, and thus power, confronting an America, with its business focused on next quarter’s profits, its politicians focused on the bidding of business, and its citizens focused on entertainment.

For all those readers who think the West is so overwhelmingly strong against a primitive medieval religion, join the Twenty-First Century where energy trumps armies, and patience and zeal outperform next quarter’s earnings. Appeasement becomes America’s strategy. Ruin becomes her destiny.

**4) TRADING OIL FOR NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY** — In January 2008, both French President Nicolas Sarkozy and U.S. President George Bush were in Saudi Arabia begging for more oil. Nicolas Sarkozy signed an agreement with United Arab Emirates, Libya, and Algeria to share French nuclear technology saying, “The sharing of civilian nuclear (technology) will be one of the foundations of a pact of confidence which the West must forge with the Islamic world.” [63] George Bush, however, arrived empty-handed and left with Saudi Oil Minister Ali Al-Naimi’s rebuff: “If you want more oil, you need to buy it.” [64] This must have caused George Bush to have an epiphany, because when he returned to King Abdullah four months later with a fresh plea for more oil, he also promised to share nuclear technology. The world was then rewarded with a promise of another 300,000 barrels of oil per day (0.36% of world consumption). Saudi Arabia later cut those promised barrels to 200,000. It appears that Western countries will be competing with each other about who will bestow nuclear favors on the Islamic world in return for the favor of being allowed to purchase oil at the market price. This is just one example of how power, money, and oil mix. And the advantage goes decidedly to Islam.

**5) A COMMON GOD** — It is philosophically dangerous for American Christians and Jews to accept that the god of Islam, Allah, is the same as the god of Christianity, Jesus, or the god of Judaism, Yahweh. Not only is Allah doctrinally different from Jesus and Yahweh, but as we have seen in Section C.1, Allah is different in its basic character. It is not in the character of Jesus or Yahweh to lead anyone into sin to further their punishment. Yet this is what the Quran teaches about Allah. We must be careful not to accept the proposition that we all worship the same god. That implies a cultural and religious fraternity between Believers and Disbelievers in Islam that just does not exist.

**6) PHILOSOPHY OF RELATIVISM** — The American, educational community is doing a great disservice to Americans by projecting a sanitized view of Islam to American youth. The reason for their bias is not clear, though it probably relates to the liberal ideologies of moral and cultural relativism and the aversion to judging others. Moral and cultural relativism is one of the core beliefs of modern liberalism. The philosophy of relativism maintains that all moral values and all cultures are equal, though they may be quite different; and as equals, even the most evil values and cultures should be treated with the same respect as our own. The consequences are: (a) there are no absolute standards or values, (b) every society and every custom is to be tolerated, (c) the more exotic (where exotic often equates to outrageous) the culture, the more venerated it is, and (d) diversity trumps goodness. Relativism is the basic reason that liberals are unable to ever say, “This is good, that is bad.” But the whole evolution of hominids, and every other species, is founded on survival. Every hominid for millions of years has had to judge friend from foe and good from evil. If you are not willing to make such judgments, right or wrong, you are not a survivor. Relativism is the philosophy of evolutionary losers.

Young people deserve the unvarnished truth about Islam, and about everything else. They must be given the tools to make objective, fact-based decisions for themselves about what they will and will not support. Adults owe them facts, not hopes. We must not continue to allow Islamic propaganda organizations, such as the Council on American Islamic Relations, which is staffed by Wahhabis trained in Saudi Arabia, to “advise” book publishers and our teachers about what principles of Islam are taught to our elementary and high school students, as is going on today. America and Europe have many non-Muslim scholars of Islam who would be far more objective in that role.

**7) ISLAMIC SPAIN** — Some popular writers about Islam maintain that the Muslims who conquered Spain had a superior culture to those of the Visigoths and the Franks. There may be some degree of truth in those claims, though judging the relative values of two medieval, religion-based societies is difficult. But some writers even maintain that we would be better off today if Charlemagne had not stopped the Muslim invasion in southern France. One might make that claim armed only with the knowledge of 778 AD. But we know now how it all turned out. We know that Christian Europe finally threw off the shackles of religious domination and evolved into a tolerant, secular society that long ago eliminated most religious doctrine from the function of the state. We also know that, for whatever reason, the same has not happened in any nation dominated by Islam. How can we take seriously such arguments which fly directly in the face of historical fact?

**8) JIHAD** — Jihad is not just a personal struggle for goodness. Violent jihad dominates the Quran and the Hadith, though there are a few references to personal, peaceful jihad which imams can quote to peace-loving audiences they wish to recruit or deceive. Violent jihad comprises 97% of the jihad references in the Bukhari Hadith, which is one of the two primary Hadith sources. Violent jihad also totally dominates the writings of Islamic scholars over the centuries. In Islam, jihad means war.

**9) VIOLENT JIHAD** — Violent jihad and other anti-democratic Islamic principles do not belong to just the distant past when it was the means by which Islam conquered the world from India to Spain. In fact there has been a rebirth of holy war principles in recent history resulting

from four surges in Islamic fundamentalism: (a) the popularization of Wahhabism beginning in the late nineteenth century, (b) the formation of the Muslim Brotherhood in 1928 after the dissolution of the Ottoman Caliphate, (c) the surge in Wahhabi growth due to the great oil-based wealth that we continue to bestow on the Arabs in the name of American hegemony starting in the 1970s, and (d) the latest surge in Islamic fundamentalism resulting from the Islamization of Europe, from the defeat of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan by the Mujahideen (jihad fighters), and from America's disastrous foreign policy over the last half century.

**10) HATRED** — Islam teaches hatred of Jews and Christians and all other Disbelievers. Only Muslims can be the friends of Muslims.

**11) OPTIMISTIC VIEW OF ISLAM** — It may be emotionally comforting to maintain that Islam really is a religion of peace. It may be satisfying to project our own values of tolerance and good will into our Muslim neighbors who appear to be so much like us, struggling to get along and to make a living in America. But basing our social and political decisions on hope may have very adverse consequences if our optimism turns out to be wrong.

**12) THE LANGUAGE DIFFERENCE** — The language difference puts Westerners at a serious disadvantage in understanding modern Islam. Middle Eastern imams, scholars, leaders, and other spokespersons may advocate hate and violence to their local audience and then speak to the Western media in tolerance and brotherly love. The Middle East Media Research Institute is a free, nonpartisan, translation and analysis service in Washington, DC, founded in 1998 to bridge this gulf. I can think of no better way to stay informed about Middle Eastern opinions than through MEMRI. You will also be surprised at how many brave intellectuals in the Middle East are critical of the Arab and Muslim culture. [65]

**13) 9/11** — We call it 9/11. We have given the Islamic Jihad Attack on America an antiseptic name that offends no one and reveals neither victim nor villain. And it's perfect for politically-correct Americans who shun blaming and abhor judging. It embodies a globalized social order which would rather wound itself than exhibit any disrespect for some of its multicultural "friends." No matter that many of these "friends" openly espouse the annihilation of all Western culture and the replacement of Western democracies with Islamic theocracies. The tolerance that forms the very core of our society teaches us to respect their aggressive and primitive worldview as simply different from ours. Different, but equal. Less than equality would be thought judgmental. We thus embrace Islam as an expansion of our own culturally-diverse heritage.

**14) TRUTH VS. POLITICAL CORRECTNESS** — The evolution of Western society in this Age of Enlightenment is based on the reverence for truth. Western science tirelessly seeks out errors in our worldview to better understand and utilize that world. But in the last half century, we have taught ourselves that that makes us no better than those who cling to a reality driven by an ancient, sacred scripture which twists reality and life decisions around a medieval religious dogma.

Political correctness is not just a social eccentricity to be poked at by comedians. It commands that War on Terrorism be the accepted euphemism for War on Islamic Jihad. But we cannot

prevail against an enemy we are afraid to name. Future historians may call political correctness the Achilles' heel of the West.

**15) CAN ISLAM REFORM?** — The ultimate question is: Can Islam reform itself? I believe the answer is no. The problems with Islam are at the very core of the ideology. And even if more tolerant times evolve, the basis of dominance, hatred, and intolerance is still there in Islam's sacred texts for any firebrand to ignite.

[63] ABC (Australia) News, "Sarkozy begins three-nation Gulf tour in Saudi Arabia," January 14, 2008, <http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2008/01/14/2137591.htm>.

[64] The Wall Street Journal, "Beseeching the Saudis," May 17, 2008, [http://online.wsj.com/article/SB121098095970700095.html?mod=googlenews\\_wsj](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB121098095970700095.html?mod=googlenews_wsj)

[65] [www.memri.org](http://www.memri.org).

## I. CLOSING

The purpose of this paper has been to present the reality of Islam as an ideology. Many say Islam is not a threat because of the huge difference in the economic, military, and moral power of the West over Islamic societies. One can make a compelling case for this view. Many others say Islam is a great threat to Western societies, one reason being that Westerners are so complacent in their hegemony and Muslims are so extremely zealous. One can also make a compelling case for this view. Such opinions can be debated by people far more expert in these fields than I. My point is simply: Islam is not a religion of peace. Islam is a violent, tyrannical, and aggressive ideology that seeks nothing less than total dominance of every human being on earth. It is over one-fifth of the way there right now.

In a recent testimony before the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Steven Emerson said:

Al Qaeda is clearly the most significant operational terrorist threat to this country, but it must be seen in the context of what drives it—an extremist ideology based on a puritanical interpretation of Islam. The biggest flaw in this nation's national security policy is that it is focused specifically on countering acts of terrorism and not countering the Islamist worldwide ideology that has spawned al Qaeda. [66]

Notice that he purposely used the words, "*puritanical* interpretation of Islam." He did not say, "*extremist* interpretation." We must stop thinking of the evil within Islam as simply an extreme element. That would mean that the bulk of Islam is good, and all we have to do is destroy or reform or somehow marginalize this small, extreme element. That is absolutely false and is leading us in the wrong direction. The fundamental principles of Islam in their pure form are evil.

[66] Steven Emerson, "Fighting Global Islamist Ideology the Key to War on Terror," IPT News, April 10, 2008, <http://www.investigativeproject.org/article/643>. (This article summarizes his

testimony before the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Steven Emerson is Executive Director of The Investigative Project on Terrorism, an organization he founded in 1995 following the PBS broadcast of his documentary film “Jihad in America.” Since 9/11 Jihad, Emerson has testified before and briefed Congress dozens of times on terrorist financing and operational networks of Al Qaeda, Hamas, Hezbollah, Islamic Jihad, and the rest of the worldwide Islamic militant spectrum.)

paul86duke  
yahoo