

Auntie Does Dawa: Yet More Islamopuffery from Australia's ABC As We Hear About Naïve Infidels Listening to Smiling Muslims Telling Them Lies for Islam

A wise commenter over at Robert Spencer's Jihadwatch once remarked that Islam comprised thuggery plus image management.

This year has seen – notably in Israel with the stabbing jihad ongoing, but also in Syria and Iraq as the beleaguered Christian remnant can testify, and in the Infidel West, to wit, Cologne and Brussels and Nice and the USA (Muslim mass-murder at the gay nightclub in Orlando, Florida) and even in Australia (Muslim stabbing murder of two hapless backpackers; Muslim attempted stabbing of a man in a park walking a dog; Muslim attempted murder-by-fire of customers waiting in a bank), and then we could add the activities of Boko Haram and other Muslims in Northern Nigeria and of assorted Muslim mobs in Pakistan – multiple examples of Muslim thuggery, all of it fully in accord with the Sunnah of the murderous warlord who founded the cult.

Naturally enough, some Infidels who have been paying at least some attention to such of these events as get reported, start to become just a tad wary of the proudly-uniformed Allah Gang members whom they encounter in their daily life.

And so we get the Image Management. Worried infidels are warned against the cardinal sin of "Islamophobia", "Islamophobic", and urged to "Meet a Muslim", a sweetly-smiling elegantly-and-exotically-garbed soft-

spoken Muslim who will tell them in soothing tones that there is nothing, nothing at all to worry about, and that everything -the misogyny, the murders – has nothing to do with Islam, and will then adopt an injured tone and insinuate that, if anything, it is **Muslims** who should be pitied and flattered and given extra special consideration, because they are so afraid of the mean old Infidels who are so oddly and baselessly prejudiced against them, those poor persecuted little Muslim petals. If you have the stomach for it, click on the link for the story I am about to discuss, and look – just look – at the photos of the falsely-smiling Muslims, half of them exquisitely-made-up hijabettes fluttering their eyelashes, and the wide-eyed and uninformed Infidels happily swallowing down all the nonsense-and-lies that they are being fed. And then think of the scene in the Disney version of the “Jungle Book”, where Kaa the snake is singing Mowgli to sleep as he envelops him in his crushing coils.

And so to our report, from Georgia Hitch and Elise Pianegonda, neither of whom, I am willing to bet good money, has ever even glanced at one page of the Quran, let alone the Sira or the Hadiths, nor examined any of the trenchant critiques written by former Muslims such as Ibn Warraq, Wafa Sultan, or Ayaan Hirsi Ali.

<http://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-12-06/canberrans-meet-a-muslim-in-bid-to-remove-stigma-from-religion/8095072>

“Meet a Muslim: Canberrans Urged to **Break Down Barriers**”.

Every time I hear this line about ‘breaking down barriers’ – which always, always focuses **not** on the barriers, such as the rule that Muslim females cannot marry a non-Muslim man, that Muslims have and keep inexorably in place against Infidels, but on any sign of resistance offered by non-Muslims against Islamisation – I think of the Arabic term futuhat, ‘opening’, the term that in Islamic texts can refer to Muslim invasion of Infidel lands, ‘opening’ them up for Islamisation. It’s all

about removing the barriers from the Infidel side only; there must be no resistance to the expansion of Islam, no questioning, no complaints. – CM

'In a bid to remove stigma from the religion and its followers, Canberrans are being encouraged to "meet a Muslim" and ask anything they've been wondering about Islam.

But none of the uninformed or underinformed seems to have thought to ask about the wife-beating verse (4.34), or about little Aisha and just why it is that child 'marriage' is so prevalent and often so fiercely defended in so much of the dar al Islam, or about the concept of the dar al Harb and the dar al Islam, or about al Wala wa al Baraa and Quran 48.29 with its grim statement that those who follow mohammed are 'harsh to the unbelievers' and compassionate only amongst themselves, or about Mohammed's declaration that "I have been made victorious by terror", or about the apostasy law that causes so many ex-Muslims to live in fear and in hiding under changed names (or else with an armed bodyguard everywhere they go), or the blasphemy law that is so murderously in effect in Pakistan and animated the riots in response to Danish cartoons and in response to a truthful – if ill-made – film about Mohammed, and inspired the murderers of Theo Van Gogh and of a room full of French cartoonists; or about the many many verses that decry any real friendship or alliance with unbelievers, and the permission to lie to protect and advance Islam. Or the story of the Khaybar Oasis, and the rapes of Safiyya and Rayhana, and the many, many Quran verses that ooze and incite hatred and aggression against Jews qua Jews. Oh no, none of that came up, at all. Nobody asked questions about that. Nobody seems to have brought along a Quran full of bookmarks, or a copy of the Sira, similarly bookmarked, and read things out loud, and then, having mentioned muruna and darura and taysir and mudarat and taqiyya and tawriyyah, remarked casually that, given such a proliferation of technical terms to do with strategic deceit, why should Infidels even waste

their time listening to 'explanations' that are most likely nothing but Jihad of the Tongue? – CM

'The first event was held in the national capital on Monday night, where a group of Muslim representatives (all very carefully presented, and no doubt very carefully selected, and carefully 'primed' beforehand – CM), did their best to answer questions from more than a dozen Canberrans.

None of whom came equipped as they should have been. For some idea of what that might mean, one might read Hugh Fitzgerald's "Ask a Muslim Girl" article.

<https://www.jihadwatch.org/2015/12/hugh-fitzgerald-the-ask-a-muslim-girl>

"We've always wanted to do an event like this only because we've realized how powerful basic human interaction can be". – Organiser, Saba Awan.

Suuure. But then why does the Quran and why do the Hadiths repeatedly tell Muslims not to form genuine, lasting friendships or alliances with non-Muslims? Why is there a Hadith that says, "We grin at some people, though our hearts hate them"?, in a context that clearly indicates that the hated people are non-Muslims, hated for being kuffar, and the people offering fake grins, are the Muslims? – CM

"What really pushed us that bit further was a poll that came out in September that showed 49 percent of Australians supported a ban on Muslim immigration, and for us that was a huge shock to the system".

I bet it was! It frightened you because it indicated that, if only a small additional percentage of Aussies joined that 49 percent, and it tipped over into 50-plus percent, Muslim immigration into Australia – the hijra, the immigration-invasion, the process of infiltration and subversion that is intended to conclude with the Islamisation of Australia (for

more, see Patrick Sookhdeo, 'Faith, Power and Territory', and 'Islam in Britain', and Sam Solomon, "Al-Hijra: The Islamic Doctrine of Immigration" – might be stopped. Or even reversed. And then the expansion of Islam, Islam, Islam would be curbed, in Australia. Horrors! And hence, this transparently obvious attempt at a bit of image management, dawa, and downright Lying For Islam, to try to fool Aussies into thinking that Islam is **not** dangerous, that the global Jihad currently in full swing (by various methods, including not only open and violent jihad of the sword, but also jihad of the womb, pen, purse and tongue) on all inhabited continents has nothing to do with Islam, and that the influx of Muslims into Australia – despite the deadly fruits already evidenced and the ever-proliferating plots that ASIO and the AFP are run ragged trying to keep on top of – must continue unabated. – CM

"We thought, 'If that's what people are saying, we have to do something about this".

"We can't get mad about it or upset about it (because we are as yet in Australia too few and weak to resort to open violence to impose Muslim dominance over the non-Muslims– CM) but we need to reach out and speak to people."

In other words: we will tell a lot of soothing lies and play the victims for all we are worth, in hopes of suckering as many gullible Infidels we can, into thinking that our Death Cult, our Religion of Blood and War, petrodollar turbo-charged and bent on Total World Domination, is Nothing To Worry About.

And now the ABC reporter asks one of the naive Infidels: "Why did you come along tonight?"

Rachel, "I think it's important for people to build relationships with people who aren't the same as they are".

Question for Rachel: Have you ever heard the terms "Dar al Harb" and "Dar al Islam"? What do they mean, and what is the

relationship between them, according to classic, historic, orthodox Islamic doctrine? According to Joseph Schacht, in his book 'An Introduction to Islamic Law', "The basis of the Islamic attitude towards unbelievers is the law of war: they must be either converted, or subjugated, or killed". How do you propose to "build relationships" with people in whom such an attitude has been inculcated toward all such persons as yourself? – CM

"As a teacher, we say we're lifelong learners... and it would be good to get some factual information, because there's a lot of what, I think, is inaccurate". – Peter.

What, precisely, is that information that you deem 'inaccurate', Peter? Have you, yourself, ever read an – Islamically-approved – translation of the Quran, one of the many versions done by English-speaking converts to Islam? Or the standard commentary upon such? Or either the Muir or Guillaume translations of the canonical "Sira", the life of Mohammed? Let alone picked up a copy of the Bukhari or Muslim Hadith collections? Would you say, Peter, that the formidable French sociologist Jacques Ellul must have got it all wrong, when he stated that Islam was "fundamentally warlike"? That Sir Winston Churchill got it all wrong when he referred to Islam as "the religion of blood and war"? On what basis do you, Peter, take it upon yourself to assume *prima facie* that anyone expressing misgivings about Islam must be in error? And if you had read Coptic-American scholar Raymond Ibrahim's discussions of Islamic deception, or some of the work of ex-Muslim Nonie Darwish, you might realize that, as a infidel, you might just possibly not get honest answers to any awkward questions you happen to ask of a Muslim. Would you expect to be told the truth about Scientology, by a signed-up Scientologist? – CM

"I'm interested in how these guys deal with and reconcile how the conservative, or right-leaning views, in Australia, affect them and some of the intra-Islamic community politics'. –

Luke.

Dear Luke: please research the history of interactions between Sunnis and Shiites, past and present. Do some research on the current treatment of, say, Copts – an indigenous non-Islamic people-group – by the dominant Muslims, in Egypt; or the current treatment of non-Muslims in West Papua, Bangladesh, and Pakistan, and then ask yourself whether Muslims anywhere in the West are suffering anything like what their co-religionists routinely dish out to all non-Muslims qua non-Muslims, wherever they – Muslims – rule. And please get out of your head your prima facie assumption that Muslims are poor helpless victims of baseless prejudice. – CM

“What have your experiences as a Muslim in Canberra been?” (this the reporter, handing the Muslim a perfect opportunity to cry victim. But before we proceed, let’s play a little game. Let’s replace that word “Muslim” with “Jew”, “Buddhist”, “Sikh” or “Hindu”. Would it even occur to anyone to have to ask the question? And if not, why not? Why are we being inundated with reports about ‘Meet a Muslim’ Events, and “Open Days” at Mosques, and a parade of articles featuring exquisitely-made-up hijabettes trying to make out that Muslims in Australia are just sooo misunderstood, sooo badly treated?

We are not having any ‘Meet a Buddhist/ Sikh/ Hindu/ Jew/ Taoist’ Events; we are not being exhorted – even by political leaders – to attend special Open Days to be held at synagogues, gurdwaras, temples and shrines, in order to dispel all our unaccountable and negative misconceptions about Judaism, Sikhism, Buddhism, Hinduism, Taoism, etc. Why is it so imperative that we Meet the Muslims? Why do we need all this Islamopuffery?

The reporter then takes a photograph of a smiling Muslim male, Rayeed Rahman, with that very special ear-to-ear grin, and gets the response, “By and large Canberra is awesome but [discrimination] is there”.

"I've found that there's this idea here that Muslim women who wear headscarves are in some way oppressed".

Actually, mister, t's the message the Slave-Rag wearers are sending about the status of the "easy meat" or "uncovered meat", all of us unislamically-dressed females, that is what I don't like. Here's Daniel Greenfield discussing the subject in an article entitled "Free to Molest".

<http://www.frontpagemag.com/fpm/263991/burkini-about-sexual-violence-against-women-daniel-greenfield>

*"...the clothing of Muslim women is not a personal fashion choice. Muslim women don't wear hijabs, burkas or any other similar garb as a fashion statement, or even an expression of religious piety. Their own religion tells us exactly why they wear them: "O Prophet! Tell your wives and your daughters and the women of the believers to draw their cloaks (veils) all over their bodies that they may thus be distinguished and not molested" (Koran 33: 59). **It's not about modesty. It's not about religion. It's about putting a "Do Not Rape" sign on Muslim women. And putting a "Free to Molest" sign on non-Muslim women...."***

"How do you respond when the media shows Muslim women who are oppressed?"

(This to a perfectly-made-up Egyptian Muslim female; who proceeds at once to deny and evade the subject – CM).

"My experience coming from Egypt, my people are campaigning against that [oppression].

Really? Shall we discuss honour murders, FGM (which is rife in Egypt, because of the prevalence of the Shafiite school of Sharia which declares the cutting-out of the clitoris to be obligatory), and the rampant and entirely Islamically-orthodox kidnappings, sexual abuse and forced 'conversion' to Islam of Coptic girls and women, many of them underaged?

Shall we mention ex-Muslim Nonie Darwish's book on sharia, "Cruel and Usual Punishment", and how she – as a girl and young woman raised in a Muslim family in Muslim Egypt – observed and experienced the outworking of specifically Islamic concepts and rules to do with marriage and sexuality?
– CM

"There is patriarchy in every country, just like women are fighting domestic violence here, they also do it in Muslim countries".

Shall we discuss Quran 4.34, the wife-beating verse? No other world religion openly and explicitly tells men that if they so much as 'fear' that their wives might rebel, they are to beat them. Then there is the Abu Dawud Hadith collection, Book XI, number 2142 – "The Prophet (peace be upon him) said: A man will not be asked as to why he beat his wife". Here is another classic article, by one 'Spengler, discussing wife-beating and the sharia versus western law.

http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle_East/LE25Ak01.html

Spengler notes – "The practice of wife-beating, which is found in Muslim communities in western countries, is embedded too profoundly in sharia law to be extracted. Nowhere to my knowledge has a Muslim religious authority of standing repudiated wife-beating as specified in Surah 4.32 (sic: 4.34) of the Koran, for to do so would undermine the foundations of Muslim society. By extension, the power of the little sovereign of the family can include the killing of wayward wives and female relations...". – CM

"Why do women wear headscarves?"

*Why? Because they will get into trouble if they don't (Muslim girls and women have been **killed**, within the west, for refusing to wear hijab) and also in order to set themselves off over against the infidel sluts and whores around them. See the Daniel Greenfield article already mentioned, above,*

with analysis of Quran 33.59, about being distinguished from non-Muslim females and therefore not “molested”. See also N Maruani’s outline and summary of the views of French-resident ex-Muslim or dissident, Chahdortt Djavann – a strong advocate of the French hijab ban in schools and burka ban on the streets – on the subject of the slave rag / sharia badge and its significance as political statement.

<http://www.jpost.com/Opinion/Op-Ed-Contributors/Outlaw-the-hijab>

“She [Djavann] writes that the veil cannot be presented as a personal choice, disregarding centuries of Islamic history... it is inappropriate to probe the motivations of every young girl wearing the veil, when what is at stake is a political agenda. Djavann explains further, “The veil has never been innocent or innocuous. It has always signified the submission of women to men and the denial of legal rights to women in Islamic countries.” More... “It [the veil] constitutes a constant call to order by Islamic law.”...“the veil is the symbol, the flag and the keystone of the Islamic system”.

Just bear those words in mind – the words of a woman who experienced forced veiling when Iran went Sharia under Khomeini – as we listen to the rote response of a perfectly-made-up hijabette, whose picture in the article is captioned with the words, ‘Hafsah Faouk said she wore a headscarf to be closer to God’.

“I don’t judge other Muslim women who don’t wear it, or think they are less dedicated because it is a personal choice. For me it was the next step to take to show my dedication to God (sic: to the allah of Islam; the Biblical God is willing and able to hear a woman’s prayers whether she is covered-up or not – CM). But for me I made the decision to wear it to be closer to God”.

To ‘Allah’, who won’t listen to a Muslim female who is over

puberty and not veiled. In the Abu Dawud hadith collection, Aisha is represented as saying "The Prophet... said: Allah does not accept the prayer of a woman who has reached puberty unless she wears a veil" – Book 2, Hadith number 641. – CM

Next, our ABC reporters give us a picture of a cheesily-grinning Mohammedan male, who informs us: "As someone who doesn't like shaking women's hands, I do it out of respect".

"Having said that, I don't want to make people feel uncomfortable because that's not respectful (suuuuure you don't; but the behaviour of so many, many Muslim males toward non-Muslims in general and non-Muslim females in particular, world-wide, is so appalling, and so completely in accord with the general contempt for and aggression toward the filthy unbelilevers, that is inculcated in the core texts of Islam, that I will reserve the right to treat your protestations with a heaping tablespoonful of salt – CM) so often I will just shake their hand. Ultimately, though, **the way one person acts doesn't represent the rest.**

That statement is unintentionally revealing. What if it is you, Mr Khalid Abdo, smiling and shaking hands in Australia where the Ummah doesas yet have the upper hand, where Muslims are not yet free to treat non-Muslims as Quran, Sira and Hadiths prescribe, whom we ought not to naively regard as a representative ? – CM

"On headscarves, unfortunately women bear the burden of discrimination in non-Muslim countries. As men, we feel guilty".

In what way, pray, are Muslim females, proudly displaying their sharia badges, their Allah gang membership uniform, suffering a 'burden of discrimination' in non-Muslim countries? I don't see that they are suffering anywhere near the sort of thing that non-Muslim women in Cologne in Germany suffered at the hands of mobs of Muslim males, at New Year's,

this year. I don't see that they are being targeted for kidnapping, rape and forced conversion to another belief system, as are the Hindu and Christian girls of Pakistan. I don't see that Muslim underaged girls, in the West, are being preferentially targeted, as Muslims, by multiple gangs of Infidel males, for 'grooming' and pimping as de facto sex slaves. In Australia, it was not gangs of Infidel males preying upon underaged Muslim girls and gang-raping them; it was the reverse, gangs of Muslim males targeting underaged Infidel girls. – CM

"Do you think Muslims impose their values on society?"

Answer to that? – denial and evasion. And, of course, no acknowledgement of the traditional definition of Islam as "the religion of domination". – CM

"Diana Abdel-Rahman said it was sad that people believed Muslims were trying to introduce Sharia law in Australia.

She implies that this belief is unfounded. It is, however, based on awareness of the public statements made by not a few Muslims, in the course of the past ten years and more; not to mention, awareness of the extent of the halal certification racket, and the spread of 'sharia finance', and the continual accommodation of Muslim demands for this and that. – CM

"Our culture is different how than it was ten years ago, and it will be different again in ten years.

Why the ten-year increments, miss? And in what ways, specifically, will it be different? – CM

*"I was talking to a young man" (says this Muslimah – CM) about this the other week, who said immigrants were changing Australian culture. I told him our culture is always changing, and **often** has nothing to do with who is coming to the country, or what their religion is."*

That is not an answer; it is an evasion, a deflection. Note that weasel-word, "often". For a reality check, see ex-Muslim Patrick Sookhdeo, "Islam in Britain", in conjunction with his analysis of the Islamic drive to conquer and hold this-worldly turf, "Faith, Power and Territory"; and another ex-Muslim, Sam Solomon, 'Al Hijra: The Islamic Doctrine of Immigration', in which the process whereby Muslims impose upon and Islamise a host society is set out, step by step. – CM

"It's all talk and somehow it gets picked up. It's this hearsay, it gets regurgitated over and over. Same with Sharia law, who said they wanted to introduce it? Have they actually tried to implement it".

"It's really sad, when you hear these things, especially from politicians."

But would any discussion with Buddhist, Jews, Hindus, Sikhs or Taoists even have to involve the asking and answering of questions of this sort? And if not, why not?

*And since Ms Abdel Rahman has airily dismissed the idea that any Muslims, in Australia, might be pushing for dominance and for the imposition of the sharia, let's conclude by bringing to mind the words of a pious Muslim jihad gang boss, Abdul Nacer Benbrika (Abu Bekr), who led a gang of jihad plotters, on Australian soil, some years ago. In November 2005 he was interviewed on the ABC and this is what he said – and every word of it is consonant with the programme clearly set out in the Islamic texts and followed to the letter by many, many Muslims throughout the history of Islam: **"I am telling you that my religion doesn't tolerate other religion. It doesn't tolerate. The only law which needs to be spread, it can be here or anywhere else, has to be Islam."***