

Sticking to the Details

Each day brings news of fresh problems – even horrors – that are the result of the Muslim invasion of Europe. Millions of Muslims have been attempting to enter Europe – 1.1 million have managed this year to settle in Germany alone. Many of these migrants are from Syria, and many others pretend to be from Syria. They are all described as “refugees,” a word intended to evoke sympathy and to shut down the critical faculty of those who might dare to question the wisdom of this mass invasion. Most of the migrants are Arabs, but there are also Pakistanis, Afghans, Somalis, that is, assorted Muslims from all over. All of them carry, undeclared in their mental baggage, an ideology that offers a Total Regulation of Life and Compleat Explanation of the Universe. They have been suffused, since childhood, in an ideology that uncompromisingly divides the world into Dar al-Islam and Dar al-Harb, the Lands of the Muslims and the Lands of the Infidels, and a state of permanent war, if not always open warfare, must exist between the two. They are raised up in an ideology that divides mankind in two: the Believers and the Unbelievers, of all kinds. It is the Believers who have a natural right, as the “best of peoples,” to dominate the world, and the Believers have a duty, too, to participate in the struggle, or Jihad against Unbelievers, so that ultimately Islam will everywhere dominate, and Muslims rule, everywhere.

These Muslim migrants have not made things easy for the Infidels in whose lands they have been settling. They have, for example, very different views from non-Muslims on how women should behave and how they should be treated. They find that Western women, in their hijabless state, are akin to “meat” that is on display, there for the taking, by Muslim men. And take they do – which is why more than 70% of those imprisoned for rape in the Scandinavian countries are Muslims, though they make up 2-3% of the population. In Cologne, nearly 500

German women were assaulted by Muslims in a single night. The other night, in Dortmund, there were similar attacks, with a Muslim man insisting that "German girls are just here for sex." Muslim predators who took advantage of young girls and turned them into sex slaves to service gangs of Muslim men in a dozen British cities and towns were merely showing their contempt for Infidel women, and this to us monstrous behavior did not violate but rather fit their worldview of how Muslims can treat Infidels. And the attacks on Infidel men – just the other day a 15-year-old Lithuanian boy was stabbed to death in Sweden by an Arab enraged that the boy dared to protect a girl that Arab had been molesting – are also part of this story. The frequent attacks on inoffensive Jews by Muslims in France tell us something about the Muslim version of interfaith outreach, as does the mass murder of Christians by Muslims in the Islamic State. And then there are all the Muslim terrorist attacks all over Europe – from the killings of Pim Fortuyn and Theo van Gogh in Amsterdam, to the bombs at the Madrid subway station of Atocha, to the bombs on the London Underground and London buses, to the mass murder of innocents at a Parisian newspaper office, and cafes, and restaurants, and dance-halls, and kosher grocery stores. What are we to make of all this? Anything? Nothing?

Muslim migrants have nowhere exhibited an interest in learning about, much less conforming to, Western ideas about the equality of the sexes, about the equal treatment of people of all faiths or none, about freedom of speech and conscience. But they are convinced, and do not hide their conviction, that they are in Europe as by right, and cannot, will not be dislodged. To quote Tariq Ramadan, "We are here. We are here to stay. It's over." This is the note of triumphalism, of "just you try to get rid of us. We're not leaving but are going to take over." And as the Muslims will continue, by hook or crook, to try to enter Europe, and within Europe will try to make it to the countries that offer the most generous benefits, their presence will inevitably change, by sheer

force of numbers, the societies within which they settle, but into which they do not integrate. Rather, it is the non-Muslims who are expected to change in order to fit into this new society.

Yet those who sound the alarm are attacked, declared sweepingly to be “Islamophobes,” a word designed to inhibit not only legitimate criticism, but even any tentative investigation of Islam. What, after all, did Donald Trump do that was so beyond the pale? He merely said that we ought to halt Muslim immigration “while we figure out what’s going on.” Do we all know “what is going on”? Clearly we do not all know “what is going on” – after all, we are allowing into our countries large numbers of people who grew up suffused in a faith that teaches them to despise, and to be hostile to, non-Muslims. The refusal to discuss this matter calmly, and to inform oneself appropriately by studying the texts of Islam, and by reading the non-Muslim scholars who devoted their lives to the disinterested study of Islam (C. Snouck Hurgronje, Joseph Schacht, Antoine Fattal, Henri Lammens, K. S. Lal, Ignaz Goldziher, Sir William Muir, St. Clair Tisdall, Arthur Jeffrey, Samuel Zwemer, Georges Vajda, David Margoliouth), the ignoring of the testimony provided by such defectors from Islam as Ayaan Hirsi Ali, Nonie Darwish, Ibn Warraq, Wafa Sultan, Magdi Allam – this is a colossal dereliction of duty on the part of those who presume to protect and instruct us. Where in the Western world has the Muslim immigration not led to expenses and insecurities and a general civilisational confusion? Those who claim, and are prepared to discuss in detail the evidence supporting this claim, that the large-scale presence of Muslims has led, in Western Europe, to a situation that is far more unpleasant, expensive, and physically dangerous for both the indigenous non-Muslims and for other, non-Muslim immigrants, cannot simply be waved away with a contemptuous smirk. And sometimes instead of a smirk, or a cry of debate-ending “Islamophobe,” a statement is made of such breathless idiocy that one doesn’t quite know what to

say. The recent remark of Germany's ambassador to the Vatican, Annette Schavan, was such a statement. She asserted that "there are warmongers who embrace religion. But that does not mean that religion promotes war. Religion has the great power to bring peace...Islam must be part of the solution." Could it be that not all religions are identical, that Islam – Qur'an and Hadith and Sira – is suffused with "warmongering" and cannot possibly be "part of the solution" to the very "problem" its adherents alone have created?

In answering these absurd remarks and tendentious charges, it is always a good idea to quote, to bring to your opponent's attention, and to force him to recognize and, if possible, answer, the superior detailed knowledge you offer in response to his one-word – "Islamophobia" – dismissal. Don't simply respond in vague kind, but stick closely to details, quoting chapter and verse from the Qur'an. Bring any of more than 150 Jihad verses into the discussion. For example: 2:190-191, 9:5, 2:191, 3:112, 5:33. Keep repeating them, so that those who think they can get away merely by invoking "Islamophobia" have to respond. Mention little Aisha, the massacre of the prisoners at the Battle of the Trench, the attack on the Jewish farmers of the Khaybar Oasis, the murders of Abu Afak and Asma bint Marwan. Always stick to the same handful of stories. Force your opponent to recognize and admit to these episodes in the life of Muhammad, the Perfect Man (*al-insan al-kamil*), the Model of Conduct (*uswa hasana*). And if he fails to do so, point out that failure to others who may be listening and looking for enlightenment. Refer, whenever you can, and quote from, the celebrated Western scholars of Islam, and wonder aloud why some think – like your opponent – that they can speak about Islam without having done the necessary work, without having even recognized the existence of these scholars they ought to, but did not, consult. Hold your opponent's baseless dismissals up for inspection and ridicule, but on the basis of those details that come from three sources: the texts of Islam, the Western scholars of Islam,

and the Defectors from the Army of Islam.

You will be ready with those enlightening eye-opening details about Islam – meant not just for your opponent, but for the broader public that is listening, or eavesdropping. Your opponent – used to relying on smirks and single-word dismissals instead of coherent debate – will not. And that is exactly the result you want.

First published in