

Conspiracy Theorists, "Radicalisation," Demography

Conspiracy-theorists are circulating the expected videos showing that the Charlie-Hebdo attack was a CIA-Mossad affair, could not possibly have been done by Muslims, and that business of "we have avenged the Prophet" and all that allahu-akbaring were simply the usual attempt to deceive the world. It is essential to the mental stability of many Muslims not to recognize to others exactly what is in Qur'an and Sunnah, or sometimes even to themselves, for if they did, the question that would be asked of them, and that they would have to ask of themselves, is this: how can you continue to consider yourself a Muslim? And their brains skitter away at the thought of being asked, or coming to the point where they have to ask: why am I a Muslim?

What is "radicalisation"? Everyone uses this word, but no one ever explain what they mean. Not a single interviewer has stopped an interview to say: What do you mean by the word "radicalisation"? Here is what it doesn't mean: it does not mean that those who have been "radicalised" have been given made-up passages that they are told are "really" part of the Qur'an but had heretofore been hidden. It does not mean that the Hadith stories, which show Muhammad to have wanted killed those who mocked him, have been made up to mislead impressionable Muslims. What "radicalisation" means is that Muslims are taken in hand by other Muslims, who direct and focus their attention to the most dangerous and bloodthirsty passages in the Qur'an, the most disturbing (to non-Muslims) of the Hadith, and to those parts of the Sira, showing what Muhammad, the Perfect Man, wanted to be done, that are most likely to encourage not only hatred of Infidels, but the desire not to patiently employ other methods of Jihad, but to want to immediately and directly participate in violent Jihad,

against “hypocritical” and “false” Muslims (such as the Shi’a are for the takfiris, as they are called in Iran, of the Islamic State) and against non-Muslims everywhere. There is nothing in the “radicalisation” that is required outside of what is to be found in Qur’an, Hadith, and Sira. What needs to be explained is that “radicalisation” is the default position of Muslims; the lack of interest or enthusiasm of some to so participate is not grounds for complacency, because the texts remain, the attitudes remain, and what holds Muslims back in the West is often nothing more than prudential considerations, or those of self-interest. Besides, those who don’t participate – they are called “moderates” – can at any time, or their children or grandchildren can at any time – become “self-radicalised” and act upon that “radicalisation” which is nothing more than Islam, undiluted, not on the rocks. The goals of those who are “radicalised” are no different from the goals of other Muslims. It’s the same duty to wage Jihad, only differing in the choice of instruments. The Slow Jihadists of Fatah, for example, do not differ from the Fast Jihadists of Hamas in the desire to destroy the Infidel nation-state of Israel, The difference is in means, not ends.

Not all Muslims are in a state of constant fury. But so what? Even those who appear to be just getting on with their lives – thus giving us all an ill-founded sense of relief – demonstrate, if you press them, an unwillingness to concede that they should not be trying to replace, wherever they conflict with Muslim aims, the Infidel laws and customs and understandings, as Churchill might have it to make a point about the use of prepositions, “up with which they now must put.” Many show, if pressed, that they believe it is right, it is just, for them to try to get the non-Muslims among whom they have come to live not to require Muslims to adapt, but to change their own laws to adapt to Islam and the Holy Law of Islam, that is Sharia. More than a few are maddened by the refusal of Infidels to give in, to think that some part of the world does not belong, by right, to the “best of peoples,” the

Muslims. And in coming to these countries, and in having huge families – Coulibaly was one of 10, his girlfriend Bouumediene one of 7, and the Kouachi brothers two of five, but in that case, the family's relatively small size – for Muslims – can be explained by the early death of both parents. Meanwhile, in France, non-Muslims are not even replacing themselves.