

Those Muslim “Refugees”

The murders in Paris on November 13 did not halt the invasion of Europe by the forces of Islam. Muslim masses are still on the march toward Europe, by the hundreds of thousands this year alone, joining the tens of millions of Muslims already in Europe who came during the last few decades. These Muslims arrive as “refugees” claiming a “right of asylum.” They claim this right because they are fleeing something. What is that something? It’s the chaos and cruelty, the internecine violence, of Muslim peoples and polities. Many Muslims would like to flee these places. Were they able to make the connection between the chaos and cruelty and Islam itself, that would be one thing. But they do not make that connection. They do not flee from Islam itself, but bring it with them in their mental baggage.

Some of those “Muslim refugees” take Islam very much to heart, others perhaps not quite as much. But many non-Muslims to whom we look for guidance – writers for The Guardian, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Hillary Clinton – are quite definite in their dismissal: they continue to assure us that “the attacks in Paris had nothing to do with Islam.” What you think of that assertion? What texts were in the minds of those killers in Paris? What models of conduct did they have in mind? When someone tells you that Muslims in the Islamic State, or Al Qaeda, or just plain-vanilla Muslims, when they carefully quote the Qur’an, or adduce a hundred Hadith, to explain and justify their behavior, don’t you worry a little bit about their grasp of Islam? Don’t you wonder why they continue to hold up for inspection and discussion such prompters of hostility and hate toward non-Muslims as Qur’an 9.5 and 9.29, among more than one hundred “Jihad verses,” and in addition to the Qur’anic passages, many hundreds of “authentic” Hadith from authoritative (*sahih*) collections, especially those by Al-Bukhari and Muslim, offering the words

and deeds of Muhammad himself, so full of malevolence toward Infidels?

Is the desire to flee violence enough to earn, for Muslims, both Sunni and Shi'a, right of entry into non-Muslim lands, into the heart of the civilization of the West? Are we not a little too quick with our compassion, a little too willing to welcome, a little too incurious about the ideology of Islam? Millions of Muslim refugees have fled Iraq and Syria for such neighboring Muslim countries as Jordan and Turkey. Do they not have such places still available to them? And are there not vast areas in many other Muslim countries where they ought reasonably to find or expect refuge? Why must the Infidels of Germany, or Sweden, or France be expected to admit them into their Infidel midst? Why must they go to Germany, or Sweden, or Norway? For Shi'a, there are still plenty of places – Iran or Hezbollah-controlled parts of Lebanon, to start with, and still much of Syria, and Baghdad, and southern Iraq – where Shi'a are in control and where other Shi'a could find security. And Sunni Arabs who want to flee the violence of Iraq and Syria have Turkey and Jordan, to which so many have already fled, and instead of being made Europe's responsibility, the refugees could be asked to knock on the doors of Saudi Arabia, the Emirates, Kuwait, Qatar, all of which have need of foreign workers, and none of which have to date taken in more than a handful of those Muslim refugees who might serve as those workers.

Why don't we ask the obvious question: why do 800,000 Muslims seek refuge just in Germany alone this year, and none of those 800,000 seek refuge closer to home? Why aren't those Muslim refugees requesting admission to Kuwait, Qatar, the Emirates, Saudi Arabia? And why aren't Kuwait, Qatar, the Emirates, Saudi Arabia, requesting those Muslim refugees to come on in, because they are needed?

Remember: Muslims are taught – all Muslims, not just members of the Islamic State or Al Qaeda – that they have a duty to

conduct the struggle, or Jihad, to remove all obstacles to the spread and then the dominance of Islam, so that ultimately, all over the world, Islam will dominate and Muslims rule. Now given that, why should any non-Muslims anywhere make that Jihad easier? Or why should Europeans pretend that that solemn duty of Jihad is an islamophobic figment, or try to convince themselves that thoroughly modern Muslims don't take that duty to heart? This is a policy that could please only a Pollyanna – or a Hillary Clinton.

Now there is a category of people fleeing Syria and Iraq who, unlike Muslims, really are without any place of refuge in the Middle East (save, of course, for these people possibly settling in the “West Bank” in an exchange of populations, where they would be traded for Muslim “Palestinians”). We call these people “Christians.” Assyrians and Chaldeans in Iraq, Catholics and Orthodox and Armenians in Syria, Copts in Egypt – these people, to varying degrees, and at various times (sometimes more, sometimes less) have suffered the same fate at the hands of Muslims: attacks on their churches, disruption of their ceremonies, kidnapping and forced conversion and rape and enslavement of their women, murder of their menfolk. But the Muslims who seek to enter Europe neither need nor deserve that refuge, for there are vast areas of the Muslim world that could be open to them.

These Muslim “refugees” are obviously interested in more than just a refuge...

Continue reading at