



The Essence of Islamic Discourse

A political essay by

Avi Sion

The Essence of Islamic Discourse

[Islam's favorite 'arguments'.](#)

[Some reflections on current events.](#)

[Prospects.](#)

[The Left of the West.](#)

According to the testimony of a police informant, the terrorist Abu Khalid Abdul-Latif (aka Joseph Anthony Davis), referring to the murder of 13 people at Fort Hood, Texas, by another terrorist a couple of years earlier, argued a fortiori as follows (presumably in English): “If one person could kill so many, three attackers could kill many more!” He intended “to storm a Seattle military recruitment center with machine guns and grenades,” but was arrested before he could carry out his plot¹.

Evidently, although Islamic terrorists, and the ‘theoreticians’ of Islam who encourage them, are mentally deranged, suffering from severe dysfunctions of their emotional and rational faculties, they are quite capable of making inferences within the framework of their deadly belief-system. Just as the Nazis or Communists were capable of reasoning to some extent, enough to produce their tanks and concentration camps, so today’s Islamists are able to manipulate mobile phones and hi-tech guns. This is reason in the service of madness.

Everyone, or almost everyone, has the capacity to reason to some extent – but the question is always: to what extent? Obviously, people whose commitment to reason is very tenuous and circumscribed, consisting of occasional ad hoc reasoning acts, cannot rightly be called rational. Only people whose commitment to reason is firm and consistent can rightly be characterized as rational. This brings us to the issue of the essence of Islamic discourse: is it rational or irrational? Although, as we have seen, Islam has a tradition of genuine logic, it must be said that the overarching ‘arguments’ of Islam, the principal means of its propagation, are and have always been violence and threats of violence, and lying and pretending. We shall now expose this fact.

Islam's favorite 'arguments'. In any study of the logic of a particular culture, it is important to draw a distinction between its essential means of discourse, through which the culture is principally formed and sustained, and the relatively incidental aspects of its discourse. The logician cannot merely list forms of argument, without critical consideration of their effective hierarchy. His analysis must aim for the essence of the matter. Let us, then, be frank. The essence of Islamic discourse is, evidently, violence and the threat of more violence, and lying and pretending. Comparatively, all other forms of argument used in Islam pale into insignificance. It is not an accident that Islamic discourse today is so charged with anger, hatred and aggressiveness – these qualities are already manifest in Islam’s founding document, the Unholy Koran. Today’s Islamic discourse is just reviving and mimicking the tone and tactics exemplified in the Koran.

The primary ‘argument’ of Islamic logic is—**physical intimidation**, i.e. the explicit or implicit threat of violent reprisal if you disagree with Islam in any significant way. This ‘might is right’ argument is evident in many statements and stories in the Koran and the hadiths (the oral traditions of Islam)², and in consequent Islamic law (*Sharia*), and the

¹ He was “arrested in June 2011 and indicted the following month.” This information is drawn from a report by Reuters on Dec. 6, 2012.

² See examples at: wikiislam.net/wiki/List_of_Killings_Ordered_or_Supported_by_Muhammad.

consequent behavior throughout history and today of Islamic régimes and groups³. The physical intimidation argument is used on Moslems (e.g. apostates risk execution, so-called honor killings are tacitly encouraged), and against non-Moslems when these are under their power (Jews and Christians are forced to convert or at least pay ‘protection money’ (*jizya*) or be executed, while other non-Moslems⁴ must either convert or face death). When non-Moslems are not under their power, they threaten them with deadly riots or terrorist acts. Of course, verbal threats have no persuasive power if not backed up by actual violence now and then.

And it works! Witness the way today most Western governments, academics and journalists are cowed into praising Islam and disapproving of anyone who criticizes it. Of course, these people do not admit themselves as intimidated; their mentality is that of people with the ‘Stockholm syndrome’. They are hostages who are so thoroughly cowed that, instead of turning their wrath on the thugs victimizing them, curse and oppose the heroes who try to resist and oppose the thugs. Such people think that denial, passivity, appeasement and accommodation will save them – whereas it is precisely such timid responses that will cause their perdition and enslavement to the proponents of this evil doctrine, which aims at world domination and totalitarian control of everyone’s life, and not incidentally intends to attempt another Holocaust of the Jews⁵.

Another ‘argument’ of Islamic logic is—**deception**, i.e. Moslems lying and pretending so as to gradually subdue their potential victims without their true intentions and identity being evident⁶. They may lie by commission (*takkiya*) or by omission (*kitman*). This non-violent tool of persuasion is used in conjunction with that of violence and threats of violence, so as to psychologically allow the submissive victims (who may already be characterized as *dhimmis*, the name given to second-class citizens in a Moslem state) to maintain an illusion self-esteem. In this context, the predators pose as innocent victims of those who resist them and appeal to the scared portion of their prey for protection against the resisters⁷.

One of the most successful acts of deceit in recent times has been the cunning redefinition of ‘terrorism’ by Moslems (and their ‘leftist’ sympathizers), as referring to acts of violence aimed at civilians, or at least with civilian casualties (even if they are incidental to a military operation). But this is not the essence of the matter. What distinguishes terrorism is that it involves *the initiation of violence*, or even the initiation of a threat of violence. It is the use of

³ Such violent tendencies are admittedly apparent in all the major religions at different periods of history; but what distinguishes Islam is that that it has them still *today*, in the 21st century, and *in a big way*. So much so, that it is a direct threat to world peace and security, affecting everyone’s lives and liberty daily. See the arguments at: [wikiislam.net/wiki/Are Judaism and Christianity as Violent as Islam%3F](http://wikiislam.net/wiki/Are_Judaism_and_Christianity_as_Violent_as_Islam%3F).

⁴ This refers to non-monotheists – that is: pagans, polytheists, idolaters, Buddhists, Hindus, atheists, etc. When the Moslems conquered India, they exceptionally did not universally enforce the ‘convert or die’ rule, simply because there were too many Hindus around. One blogger (Bill Warner) has estimated that Islam has over the fourteen centuries of its existence caused the death of some 270 million non-Moslems, including 120m Africans, 60m Christians, 80m Hindus and 10m Buddhists: www.politicalislam.com/tears/pages/tears-of-jihad/.

⁵ Islam is as rabidly anti-Semitic as Nazism was, one of its oft-declared ultimate goals being the mass murder of all Jews on this planet. A hadith has Muhammad saying that “the last hour” will not come unless the Muslims fight the Jews and kill them all (*Sahih Muslim*, book 41, no. 6985). There are many Muslims today just aching to carry out this genocidal programme, judging by declarations published (in writings, recordings or videos) on the Internet. Ultimately, all non-Moslems risk persecution, to be sure; but Jews are the most passionately hated.

⁶ See some recent examples at: wikiislam.net/wiki/Muslims_Caught_Using_Deception.

⁷ Read for instance the work of Robert Spencer on this topic, *Stealth Jihad: How Radical Islam is Subverting America without Guns or Bombs*. (Washington D.C.: Regnery, 2008), and look for daily updates on the subject in his website, www.jihadwatch.org, and that of his close colleague Pamela Geller, www.atlsshruugs.com, for examples (see other links there). For a deeper understanding of the essentially political nature of Islam from its inception, do also read Spencer’s works: *The Truth about Muhammad*, *The Complete Infidel’s Guide to the Koran*, and *Did Muhammad Exist?*

violence as an ‘argument’ against people who were not using force against the perpetrators. Thus, a soldier may be a victim of terrorism. When the intended victims are civilian, this is just a greater degree of terrorism. But violence aimed at combating terrorism is not terrorism. There is no ‘moral equivalency’ between thugs and police forces. The issue is always: who started it, really? Islamic terror, although it pretends to be defensive, is always aggressive – simply because it is triggered and driven by a perpetual religious imperative of global conquest. Terrorists usually give pretexts for their heinous acts, but their real motive is always ideological, viz. “holy war” (*jihad*).

The purpose of such redefinition is to blur the distinction between terrorism and anti-terrorism in the public’s mind. Those who murder in the name of Islam are presented as freedom fighters struggling against imperialism and colonialism, or racism, while their victims are depicted as callous oppressors who ‘had it coming’. Using their positions of influence and considerable propaganda skills, Western leftists⁸ help to create and confirm this upside-down narrative. Moreover, anyone who dares to challenge it, demanding truth and justice, is slandered and diabolized as a ‘right-wing extremist’ or ‘Islamophobe’. This is social intimidation, aimed at silencing opponents through fear of disrepute and ostracism. This is also a form of terror, of course—terror being action intended to cause governments and populations to *fearfully* submit to overt or stealthy aggression. Nowadays, even our judges and police are not immune to such insidious pressures, allowing illegal acts from Moslems they would never allow from others⁹.

Note well the inversion: Islam, an utterly oppressive and intolerant, fascistic and bloodthirsty movement is presented as ‘politically correct’, while those who bravely denounce it and oppose it are reviled. Those who do the reviling categorically refuse to admit, or even consider the possibility, that the religious and political teaching of Islam is *the cause* of the crimes of Moslems who engage in jihadi terrorism or other inhumane acts¹⁰. Such people shunt aside all evidence brought to their attention of the criminality of those they passionately defend, preferring instead to ‘shoot the messenger’, i.e. to attack those who present them with the facts. They conceal the facts from people and even make efforts to excuse crimes, so as to grant them no reality. Not psychologically disposed to admit their cowardice, they simply deny its object.

Leftists who perform this sleight of hand are scared stiff that if they acknowledged that Islam is a menace, they would be obliged to do something about it, which would stir up still more trouble and make yet more demands on them. They apparently think that if they are sweet to the fundamentalist Moslems, they will be spared from their wrath. As a result, ‘Islamization’ is proceeding apace, unhindered, indeed aided by them. Europe and North America are hurtling towards what promises to be one of the darkest, most horrific periods in human history. When the Moslems come to power, as could happen within a few short years at the rate things are going, the leftists will be among the first victims of their cruel tyranny. The leftists’ collaborationism will certainly not save them, since their ideology is objectively incompatible with that of Islam. They will be remembered by those they helped to come to power as ‘useful idiots’.

⁸ Let us call the non-Moslem de facto defenders of Islam ‘leftists’, for we need to give them some name, and most (though not all) of them come from the left side of the political spectrum, i.e. they incline towards socialism or communism.

⁹ And as everyone knows, when the law is not equitably enforced, the end of the rule of law is in sight. When Moslems commit violence or threaten it, the authorities blame their victims and turn a blind eye to the aggressors. Seeing such criminals treated with kid gloves by the authorities, ordinary citizens feel more and more unprotected, and naturally some of them are eventually tempted to take the law into their own hands.

¹⁰ For example, the increasingly common kidnap and gang-rapping of non-Moslem children or youths to “groom” them for sex-slavery or prostitution.

Physical intimidation and deception are ‘arguments’ in the sense that they are used to make others submit to certain demands or adopt certain beliefs and practices. But of course, they are not *rational* arguments¹¹. People resort to such irrational means when they believe reason to be incapable of moving their respondents, because these lack the requisite intelligence or honesty – or when they have no rational arguments to offer them. Moslems, believing that Islam is Divinely-ordained, think that all people who refuse to submit to its dictates must be stupid or evil. But of course, their blind faith in Islam is not rational justification for the violent and dishonest means they use to propagate it. Therefore, it is they, rather than the victims of their intolerance, who are deficient in intelligence and/or goodness.

The logical flaw, the contradiction, in the Islamic rationalization is that you cannot force or trick a volitional being into being moral, since morality depends on the *free* exercise of freewill. An act of will performed under coercion or ruse cannot constitute a moral act; people must *choose* to be moral. It is therefore unthinkable that God enjoins forcing or tricking people into (allegedly) moral behavior. Moreover, if Islam does not believe in human freewill, as seems to be the case, it cannot claim to be an instrument of morality. If human behavior is, as Islam apparently advocates, predestined (Moslems often say *maktoob* – meaning, ‘it is written’), then there is logically no such thing as good or bad. Then anything goes, i.e. force and trickery are not reprehensible, although not morally justifiable. Thus, underlying Islamic use of coercion and ruse is a profound contempt for humankind, a denial of human dignity. Either way, Moslems who indulge in such practices, and those who effectively support them, cannot claim to be defending morality.

Islamic logic does also make use of rational or rational-seeming arguments in circumscribed contexts, but its overarching arguments – the arguments through which it has taken power and continues to spread – are the said irrational ones. These are very powerful arguments – even I, as I write these few lines, wonder whether some mad-as-hell Moslem fanatic will try to murder me when I publish them, or whether some people in authority subject to the Stockholm syndrome will try to suppress their publication. People who submit to such fears, and allow others to intimidate or fool them without reacting, effectively rush headlong like lemmings to their own destruction. Where there’s no will, there’s no way. By refusing to confront the ongoing world jihad head on, by first acknowledging its religious source and motive and then reacting as necessary, they hasten the realization of the nightmare global dictatorship it aims for.

Some reflections on current events. If things go on like this, future historians will say that the super-powerful West was defeated by a mere handful of Islamist terrorists in a single day, on September 11, 2001. True, the Americans and some of their European allies at first responded forcefully to the aggression, by attacking Afghanistan and later Iraq. But under pressure of their mainstream media, their defiance and determination soon flagged, and they chose instead a course of resolute self-deception and self-paralysis. They opened the way to their own total defeat, by refusing to even name their enemy (Islam) let alone take all necessary action to decisively neutralize him. They now behave like prey frozen with fear, ready meat for the ruthless predator.

Such fearfulness is contrary to logic, which teaches that before one can solve a problem, one has to acknowledge its existence and identify its true nature; then one must respond accordingly, or face defeat. The lessons of history are clear on this point: denying reality and refusing to act in accordance with it is a sure way to self-destruction. A danger won’t go

¹¹ They are fallacies. Forcing and threatening force are traditionally referred to as the argumentum *ad baculum*. Lying and pretending might be classified as *ignoratio elenchi*, in that they aim at disinformation. Those who use such means think that they have ‘won the argument’ if they have succeeded in killing or cowering or fooling their opponents.

away by being carefully ignored; it will only grow and grow. The enemy advances step by step; each step is too little to make much of, but the advances soon add up. This is clear with the now proverbial Munich agreement of 1938, between Chamberlain and Hitler¹².

The policy of appeasement and accommodation towards Islam started with U.S. President George W. Bush, even though his opponents paint him as a warmonger. Bush was of course only reflecting American ‘public opinion’, which was well orchestrated by the major (mostly leftist) media. These same forces soon replaced Bush with the more photogenic and likeminded Barack Hussein Obama. Even if Obama claims to be a Christian, the fact remains that he is a Moslem according to Islamic law, because his father was one. Moreover, he had some Moslem education in his youth (in Indonesia), and has never publicly renounced Islam¹³. Indeed, instead of denouncing its brutality and hegemonic ambitions, he loudly praises it. He does not seem very concerned with the persecution of Christian and other minorities in Moslem lands. But most importantly, his behavior since he became U.S. President (in 2009) shows he has considerable sympathies with Moslem causes both nationally and internationally. Thanks to his policies, the Islamic grand project is moving forward on all fronts.¹⁴



The election of an Islam-friendly President after 9/11 was surely no ‘accident’, but a statement by the people who brought him to power that they were duly impressed by that mega terrorist act and similar expressions of hatred, and wished to express their ‘friendliness’ to those responsible. I am not suggesting that Obama was a ‘Manchurian candidate’ injected by pro-Moslem conspirators; his is more likely a lone-wolf plot. But I am saying that his election was uncannily timely, effectively allowing the cowed portion of the American public to send a message of capitulation and abject submission to their aggressors¹⁵. It is significant

¹² But looking back further, consider the feeble response of Montezuma, the Aztec emperor of Mexico, who could muster an army of some 300,000 men, to the invasion by a Spaniard force of *only some 600 men* led by Cortés in 1519-20. Reflecting on this enigma, in his account of the episode, Hammond Innes wrote: “Moctezuma’s policy was one of appeasement, but now he must have begun to realize that the road of appeasement is a long one that leads finally to degradation.” Moctezuma sought “to buy time and wait upon events;” “but the door of appeasement, once opened, is not easily shut.” And: “The wretched king was now so deeply involved with the Spaniards that he was apparently willing to buy peace at any price.” *The Conquistadors* (London: the Book Club Associates, 1972): Pp. 148, 149, 151.

¹³ Which is perhaps why we almost never hear Moslems accusing him of apostasy.

¹⁴ For a detailed exposé of Obama’s Islamic connections and tendencies, I recommend Pamela Geller’s *The Post-American Presidency* (New York: Simon & Shuster, 2010). And of course her website, at: www.atlssh rugs.com. Concerning Obama’s failure to produce a birth certificate and other documents, see: atlssh rugs2000.typepad.com/atlas_sh rugs/obamas_birth_certificate_forgery/; reading these blog posts leaves one with zero doubt that this president is illegitimate.

¹⁵ Needless to say, though alleviating the terrorist threat was an important (albeit largely subconscious) motive for the election of Obama in 2008, it was not the only motive; another was, of course, the desire by many voters to turn America into a socialist state. The latter motive was even more evident with his reelection in 2012, although by then Americans should have been intensely alarmed by his Islamic inclinations.

that those who had doubts about Obama's constitutional eligibility to run for the office of President (due to questions regarding his birthplace and his father's nationality) were never allowed their day in court. Amazingly, no one in the U.S. judiciary was the least curious about what might very well turn out to be *the biggest scam and usurpation of power in world history!* We may well wonder, in view of this, what future there is for the rule of law and democracy in America.

The above remarks are perhaps as much a commentary on the sick 'logic' of Western cowards as on Islamic 'logic'. As regards the latter, physical intimidation and deception have, to repeat, proved very successful. As for rational or pseudo-rational arguments, they are used within Islamic societies for purposes of control, and not as in Western culture for the purpose of discovering truth or developing useful gadgets. Their main use is of course to develop Islamic law, based on the Koran and the hadiths; but these are composed of dogmas immune to rational criticism, forever closed to revision or repeal. Within this limited framework, there may well be some logical thinking¹⁶ – although we must never forget that even if the form is logical, it does not follow that the content is logically sustainable let alone objectively true. The use of some logic does not vindicate the whole enterprise.

Looking at the history of Islamic societies, what is evident is how little they have contributed to the welfare and advancement of mankind. They have, to be sure, made some contributions to philosophy and mathematics way back in the Middle Ages, following their encounters with Greek and Indian thought. But their rationalism, creativity and productivity soon petered out, for the simple reason that their founding doctrine is essentially reactionary and repressive. Without freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and freedom of conscience (choice of this or that faith or even of non-faith), human welfare and progress are impossible. Logic can only properly function within a free mind, in a free society. To mention one statistical index – consider how very few Nobel prizes (just two) have been awarded to Moslems for contributions to science or technology¹⁷. It is shocking that a cultural group that is currently at the very back of the class nevertheless wishes to take over the world and rule it. And of course, loot it.

Prospects. As we have seen, Islamic discourse, whether intended for internal or external consumption, consists mainly of violent acts and threats of more violence, and lying and pretending. These are its main 'arguments', through which it has progressed in the past and through which it lately again hopes to take over the world and rule it.

Whether out of intellectual mediocrity or out of moral cowardice, Moslems very early in their history lost their intellectual and other freedoms. They had only themselves to blame. Now, driven by the intense inner suffering their religion causes them, by confining them in one of the dreariest forms of existence ever devised by men, more and more of them want to impose the same suffering on the rest of humanity. People who feel miserable are always looking for

¹⁶ Although in a past essay and in the previous sections of the present chapter I have detailed various logical practices and doctrines found in Islam, and this material is of interest to logic history, it should not be used to dignify Islam as a rational doctrine. Islam remains an essentially emotional doctrine, driven by hatred.

¹⁷ Here, a distinction must obviously be made between Moslems educated in the West and those trained in Moslem countries. Only two Moslems have to date won a Nobel Prize in physics or chemistry, and both were based in the West. Do not be fooled by the image propagated by certain media of rich Arabians with engineering degrees from prestigious American and European universities driving fancy cars and using mobile phones. Arabian wealth derives principally from oil revenues, and thereafter to some extent from commerce; it is not based on scientific research and technological creativity. There are only some 600 universities in the 57 countries with Moslem majorities, for a combined population of 1.4 billion. About six out of ten Moslems are still today illiterate (i.e. cannot even read). Compare these figures to Western ones, or even to those for India and China, and you realize the immensity of the problem these people pose in today's world.

others to blame for their pain, and so are easy targets for hate-mongers. A happy person simply cannot feel the sort of malevolence they are taught.

Admittedly, Moslems are not all the same. As in any religion, the adherents range in degree of commitment from zero to extreme. A few, a very few, born Moslems have the wisdom and courage to criticize and even actively combat Islam¹⁸. Many Moslems are Moslem only in name – their religious practice is perfunctory, if not nil. Many others, no doubt, practice out of conformism, i.e. to signal their inclusion in the society around them. Still others, no doubt, feel an emotional attachment to God, and know of no other way to express it than through practicing the religion they were born into. Some of the preceding may become more devout out of personal need for self-discipline and a purpose in life. Some of those may go much further and become fanatics, driven by the desire to surpass and dominate their neighbors. Evident in the latter are grave psychological problems: lacking a sense of identity, they seek to be acknowledged members of a group; and lacking self-respect they yearn to be feared by everyone.

Clearly, not all Moslems are actual terrorists, or even incipient ones. Some Moslems may well be considered as “moderate,” *not* because normative Islam is moderate, but because they wisely don’t really buy it. However, ultimately the true test of moderation is opposition to extremism. If ordinary Moslems remain silent and passive in the face of the jihadists’ excesses (to put it mildly), they become effectively accomplices. It is primarily their responsibility to loudly condemn and resolutely eject from their midst the bad apples, who are enemies of all humanity. In any event, some Moslems, though not themselves actual terrorists, do ideologically or financially positively support terrorism, or at least secretly take pride in the actions of the terrorists; these certainly cannot be called “moderate,” even if there is no visible blood on their hands – they are *de facto* accomplices to terrorism. And a big problem for the world right now is that the latter group seems to be growing. Moreover, even if most Moslems do not yet engage in terrorism, the fact remains that most terrorists nowadays are Moslems¹⁹. Since they are people who engage in terrorism in the name of Islam, it is true to say, and it would be a lie to deny, that there is a causal connection between Islam and terrorism.

And indeed if one examines Islamic doctrine honestly, one cannot but be struck by its extreme virulence. Moslems who become terrorists are radicals – people who take the imperative of violent jihad literally and wish to put it in practice fully. Therefore, the doctrine they refer to is *the main cause* of their savagery; it is not merely an accidental conjunct, as wishful-thinking apologists claim. The problem with Islam is not the divinity and religious rituals it advocates – who cares, nowadays? Everyone has a right to believe and worship as they see fit, *so long as they hurt no one else*. The problem with Islam is that its most radical adherents, the so-called Islamists, try to force less convinced Moslems as well as all non-Moslems to believe or do as they want them to. This is the problem – *force*. These people have not yet understood that other people have natural rights to life and liberty, and to their own conscience. That is why Islamists and those who cheer them on deserve to be described as uncivilized. To be intolerant of Islam does not constitute religious or racial intolerance – it is wise intolerance of brutal intolerance; the action and the reaction are morally very different.

Jihadists evidently imagine that God is pleased with their orgies of massacre and mayhem. They could hardly be more stupid. God is surely utterly disgusted by their wanton destruction

¹⁸ See at: wikiislam.net/wiki/Notable_Former_Muslims.

¹⁹ Moslem terrorists have murdered over 20’000 people across the world in the less than twelve years since Sept. 11, 2001. This statistic is given at www.thereligionofpeace.com, which has been keeping track of terrorist acts. This is 95% of all terrorism in the world; there is no comparable figure for any other violent group. See also: wikiislam.net/wiki/Muslim_Statistics_%28Terrorism%29.

of human life and property, and all the more so because it is alleged to be done in His name. God is not vain; He does not need the flattery of criminals. These people must be quite deluded to think that God, Who created this world and humanity out of love, and Who delights in the peace and welfare of His creatures, would condone such insane behavior²⁰. In the Torah of Moses, God commands: do not kill, do not steal, do not covet²¹; do not hate, do not bear a grudge, but love your neighbor as yourself²². A psalm²³ of David urges: seek peace and pursue it. The Mishnaic sage Hillel taught: do not do to your fellow that which is hateful to you²⁴. Likewise, the Talmud teaches that indulgence in anger is equivalent to idolatry²⁵. It also teaches that wisdom departs from an angry sage, and his prophetic powers depart from an angry prophet²⁶. Truly, the angry are mad – anger is madness. God certainly prefers a peaceful “unbeliever” to a murderous “believer.”

Islam has, through the misdeeds of its fanatics, given itself a lasting bad name. These people claim to be fighting for God and religion, but in fact the effect of their cruel deeds is to turn decent people away from religion and even, by association, from God²⁷. Unfortunately, for various reasons already mentioned, Islam seems to be currently waxing rather than waning. I solemnly pray to God that Moslems who take part in this calamitous revival wake up soon, and shake off the ignorance and blind hatred that currently afflicts them, and keeps them very far from spiritual enlightenment and liberation. They need to muster a healthy dose of critical thought, and have the courage to question and reject the many elements of mainstream Islamic doctrine that enjoin propagation by brute force. Do not allow your minds to be poisoned by this ideology. Be honest and think rationally. The antagonistic spirit of radical Islam may have seemed normal a millennium ago, but it is certainly outdated and utterly wrong today. God would surely never enjoin such animosity and ferocity; it is the invention of men craving to kill, plunder, rape, and enslave.

I often reflect that Moslems could learn much from Buddhism, regarding the futility of worldly desires and the value of self-control of one’s passions²⁸. To give an example, briefly: instead of hiding women from the sight of men, so as to avoid illicit sexual relations, they should teach men to control their own lust on the grounds that women are human beings with independent rights. They (the men in power) force the women (all of them) to hide their faces and stay indoors, when it is the men (mostly) who act irrationally. This means that they preemptively imprison the potential victims, and let the potential aggressors wander around with all their sick inner urges intact! This is patently unfair, and a very bad solution to the

²⁰ The Torah decries human sacrifice, e.g. the interdiction of sacrificing children to the pagan god Moloch (Lev. 18:21). But Islam still today entices its sons and daughters to prove their faith by killing innocent people; in view such terrorist tendencies, Islam can surely be characterized as a religion that practices human sacrifice, i.e. ritual murder. The people who thus kill fellow human beings out of selfish desires (for promised material or even spiritual rewards) have not “misunderstood” Islam, as the PC and *takkiya* crowd would have us believe; they have *all too well* understood it and taken it at its word.

²¹ Ex. 20:12-13.

²² Lev. 19:17-18. All the commandments and words of wisdom reproduced here are lessons in morality intended for all mankind, not just for Jews. And the list here proposed is, of course, far from exhaustive.

²³ Ps. 34:14.

²⁴ Shabbat 31a. Or more accurately said: Do not do unto others that which you would not have them do unto you. Notice that the golden rule is *not*: Do to your fellow what you would have them do unto you. It is not an instruction to lay your trip on others, but one to respect the space of others.

²⁵ Shabbat 105b. Anger is comparable to idolatry because it is effectively a denial of God’s control of the world.

²⁶ Pesachim 66b. See also Rashi’s commentary to Num. 31:21.

²⁷ There is Judaism a concept known as *Chillul Hashem* – desecration of the name of God. This is the grave sin of people who commit atrocities allegedly in God’s name, and so turn people off from spiritual pursuits, thinking that such disgusting behavior is where such pursuits inevitably lead. This is based on Lev. 22:32.

²⁸ They should read, for a start, the *Dhammapada*, a treasury of wise insights attributed to the Buddha.

problem at hand. Another example is, of course, that of wrath. Buddhism rightly teaches the ugliness, evil and self-destructiveness of hatred, anger and violence. Yet, Islam goes to great lengths to cultivate these very vices in Moslems, teaching them: to consider themselves as superior to non-Moslems, and to hate them all and especially Jews; to engage pitilessly in “suicide bombings” and other forms of terror, with a view to ultimately conquer and enslave the world for Islam; to kill apostates, heretics and “blasphemers,” i.e. the critics in their midst; to stone, burn, amputate or whip people they disapprove of; to mutilate the sex organs of Moslem women, and to beat and imprison them, so as to tame them and use them at will; to indulge in “honor” killings of relatives, or even of strangers²⁹; so forth. Such inhumane acts are not only permitted, but enjoined by Islam; and they currently frequently occur³⁰. Clearly, Moslems need to cultivate the fine art of self-improvement; and for that, they must practice humble self-scrutiny. This is most easily achieved through regular meditation. If one wishes to become wise, one must be already at least intelligent enough to be able to discern which teachings are wise, and to avoid foolish ones. Buddhist psychology and ethics point the way to self-understanding and wise conduct. I am not, needless to say, advocating that Moslems bow down to Buddha statues. Buddhism is spiritually deficient with respect to such idolatry and, in my view, to its rejection of monotheism³¹. But these are minor sins, to be sure, compared to the major sins of unchecked rage and cruelty common in Islam. When in the Jewish Bible prophets condemn idolatry, their main focus is always on the *misconduct* of the idolaters who in those days practiced human sacrifices, sexual depravity and other immoralities. Buddhism, though idolatrous in some respects, repudiates such lowly practices. Islam, on the other hand, though not idolatrous (though that is debatable, in view of the Moslems’ de facto excessive veneration of Mohammed), countenances some very immoral behavior patterns, as just explained (and of course, this is largely due to their imitation of Mohammed). God has surely made clear throughout the Scriptures of His love of harmonious living, and His profound contempt for troublemakers. This is by far more important to Him than worship, although worship of Him is certainly recommended as highly beneficial spiritually.

The Left of the West. I also fervently pray that Europeans, North Americans and other Westerners soon become aware of the great danger to their civilization and personal freedom that today’s Islam constitutes, and do whatever is necessary to prevent its implantation in the West. In particular, the Leftists who effectively support the current Islamic onslaught need to look in the mirror and ask themselves what motivates them to do this. Up till now, they posed as opponents of religion, “the opium of the people.” Suddenly, they have become its most passionate defenders, so long as it is called Islam. They cannot but fail to see that every concession they make to Moslem demands relinquishes oh so precious freedoms of ours, which it took Western civilization centuries of courageous struggle to win and defend. It is true that the Left yearn for omnipresent world government, but do they really want to end up living in a totalitarian Islamic society?

The political left in the West has, in the past century, and especially since the 1968 cultural upheaval, notwithstanding the collapse of Marxism in 1991, managed to sell itself to the

²⁹ See: wikiislam.net/wiki/Honor_Killing_Index.

³⁰ It could be said that Islamic preachers who encourage Moslems to hate, kill, plunder, destroy, enslave, rape, etc. their non-Moslem neighbors, and even engage in various crimes and depravities against other Moslems, are cunningly exploiting the lower natures of their fanatic disciples. The fanatics respond enthusiastically, because they perceive in the call of Islam opportunities to engage in all sorts of obviously vicious deeds *with a good conscience*. That is surely one aspect of their motivation, one of the twists and turns in their sick psyche.

³¹ Needless to say, that is their own business: it does not give Moslems a moral right to engage in violent acts against them.

public as 'progressive'. This fantasy image has attracted a great many people with very conventional minds, who saw in adherence to its values a quick and easy way to feel and to seem avant-garde, intelligent and firmly on the moral high ground. Leftists are essentially dull and narcissistic people, which is why they have great difficulty facing reality and stopping to cling to the dogmas they have built their identity around. One can only hope and pray they will wake up and get wise before it is too late. Oh, have pity on your children! Consider that they will lose all human rights, and be at the mercy of merciless barbarians. If you do not take stock of what is happening and do something about it in time, our civilization is very likely to collapse and be replaced by a truly horrible régime – namely, the global Caliphate that many Moslems so fervently yearn for and some of them kill for. If (God forbid) this historical disaster occurs, it will have done so, not because of cultural or moral inferiority by the West, as the Islamic supremacists claim, but because of the West's absurd self-delusion, self-abasement and lack of political will in the face of open and covert aggression.

© Avi Sion, 2013.

This essay is drawn from Avi Sion's larger work:
A Fortiori Logic.
All rights reserved.
This essay may be freely disseminated,
but not commercially exploited.