

Political correctness forbids America to speak the name of its enemy

**excerpted from the September 2010 edition of *Christian Crusade Newspaper*
now in our 58th year of publication ~ www.ChristianCrusade.com
Billy James Hargis II, publisher ~ Keith Wilkerson, managing editor**

We live in a nation that will not name its enemy.

“For the first time in its history, the United States is trying to wage and win a war without accurately identifying the enemy or its motivations for seeking to destroy us,” warns foreign policy expert Frank Gaffney. “That oversight defies both common sense and past military experience, and it disarms us in what may be the most decisive theater of this conflict: the battle of ideas.”

Gaffney is a graduate of the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University. He was an aide to Democratic Senator Henry Jackson in the 1970s. During the Reagan Administration, Gaffney was Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear Forces and Arms Control Policy.

“Such a breakdown may seem incredible to veterans of past military conflicts,” writes Gaffney. “Imagine fighting World War II without clarity about Nazism and fascism, or the Cold War without an appreciation of Soviet Communism and the threat it posed.”

“We now live in a nation that will not name its enemy,” writes columnist Alan Caruba. “Homeland Security wants to eliminate terms like Islamic *jihād* or terrorism from its vocabulary lest we offend some of the people trying to kill us.

“Pretending they don’t exist is an invitation to attack.”

“Yet today,” agrees Gaffney, “the civilian leaders of this country and their senior subordinates – responsible for the U.S. military, the intelligence community, homeland security and federal law enforcement – have systematically failed to fully realize that we once again face a totalitarian ideology bent on our destruction.”

In 1988, Gaffney founded the Center for Security Policy, a conservative national security and defense policy think tank.

“That failure is the more worrisome since the current ideological menace is arguably more dangerous than any we have faced in the past, for two reasons. First, its adherents believe their mission of global conquest is divinely inspired. Second, they are here in the United States in significant numbers, not just a threat elsewhere around the world.”

What, then, is this ideology?

“It has been given many names in recent years, including political Islam, radical Islam, fundamentalist Islam, extremist Islam and Islamofascism. There is, however, a more accurate descriptor – the one its adherents use. They call it ‘*shari’a*.’

“Perhaps the most important thing to understand about *shari’a* is that it is authoritative Islam,” writes Gaffney, “which presents itself as a complete way of life – cultural, political, military, social and religious, all governed by the same doctrine. In other words, this comprehensive

program is not simply the agenda of extremists hunkered down in caves in Afghanistan or Pakistan. Neither can its directives be attributed to deviants hijacking Islam.

“Rather, *shari’a* – which translates from Arabic as ‘path to God’ – is actually binding law. It is taught as such by the most revered sacred texts, traditions, institutions, top academic centers, scholars and leaders of the Islamic faith. Fortunately, hundreds of millions of Muslims around the world do not wish to live under a brutally repressive, woman-demeaning, barbaric and totalitarian program. Such Muslims are potentially our allies, just as those who do adhere to *shari’a* are our unalterable foes.

“The immutability of *shari’a*-adherent Muslim hostility toward the rest of us derives directly from the central tenet of *shari’a*,” warns Gaffney. “Muslims are explicitly required to seek the triumph of Islam over all other faiths, peoples and governments.

“The ultimate objective of *shari’a* is the establishment of a global Islamic state – Sunni Muslims call it ‘the caliphate’ – governed by *shari’a*. The means by which this political outcome is to be achieved is called ‘*jihad*,’ which is usually translated as ‘holy war.’

The West wants to close its eyes

The Western world has tried to ignore *jihad* for too long, says Caruba. “Bombings in Spain and in England, riots in France, fear throughout the Netherlands are all a portent of worse to come if militant Islam has its way. Even Russia has not been exempt.

The root of the constant unrest in the Middle East, says author Haim Harari, “is that this entire Muslim region is totally dysfunctional by any standard of the world. These 22 countries, with all their oil and natural resources, have a combined Gross Domestic Product smaller than that of Netherlands, plus Belgium and equal to half of that of California alone.’

“There is no such thing as human rights throughout the Middle East,” says Caruba. “The social status of women is negated by Islam to that of mere chattel.”

Harari notes that there are “millions of decent, honest, good people who are either devout Muslims or are not very religious, but grew up in Muslim families.

“The problem is the vast silent majority of these Muslims are not a part of the terror, but they also do not stand up against it.’

“Add to this the ceaseless lies and propaganda to which they are exposed from birth about the world and its events, and it becomes easier to understand why they have little real understanding of the world outside the Middle East.

Harari says there are four elements of the Islamic war against the West. The first is the use of suicide murder as an instrument of terror. The second is the endless tide of propaganda told inside the Middle East. The third element is the oil money that enables the Muslim militants. But Harari cites the most essential factor as “the total breaking of all laws” in pursuit of *jihad* – world conquest.

“While the present administration seeks to encumber efforts to find these enemies within our borders,” says Caruba, “to provide legal assistance to those sworn to kill us, to threaten the interrogators who secured information about future attacks, and to close down the Guantanamo facilities where they are detained, our enemies do not feel bound by any laws, international or domestic.

“The problem is that the civilized world is still having illusions about the role of law in a totally lawless environment,” says Harari.

Shari'a considers *jihad* to be the personal obligation of every faithful Muslim capable of performing it – man or woman, young or old, notes Gaffney. They can forgo the violent form when it is deemed impracticable.

In such circumstances, the struggle to spread worldwide Islam can be pursued through what author Robert Spencer calls ‘stealth *jihad*.’ Adherents to *shari'a* call it ‘*dawa*.’

Dawa is being attempted here

Examples of *dawa* abound in today’s Western societies, notably Europe and increasingly in the United States.

“They include the demand for symbolic and substantive accommodations in political, economic and legal areas,” writes Gaffney, “for example, special treatment or rights for Muslims in the workplace, in public spaces and by government, the opportunity to penetrate and influence operations against government at every level and the insinuation of ‘*shari'a*-compliant finance’ into the West’s capital markets.

“If stealth *jihad* seems less threatening than terrorism,” says Gaffney, “the objective is exactly the same as that of violent *jihad*: the subjugation to the *Dar al-Islam* or ‘House of Islam’ of all non-Islamic states that, like the United States, make up the *Dar al-harb* or ‘House of War.’

“Those who seek to impose *shari'a* through non-violent techniques – notably in the West, the organization known as the Muslim Brotherhood – are our enemies every bit as much as those who overtly strive to defeat us by murderous terrorism.

“Many Western elites, including the Obama administration, have been seduced by the seemingly benign quality of the Muslim Brotherhood. In fact, we know from the 2008 prosecution of the Holy Land Foundation – the largest terrorism-financing trial in U.S. history – that the Muslim Brothers’ mission in the United States is ‘a kind of grand *jihad* to destroy Western civilization from within.’

They know that by masking their ideological agenda as a religious program, they can use Western civil liberties and tolerance as weapons in their stealthy *jihad*. For this strategy to succeed, says Gaffney, they must suppress any discussion or understanding of the true nature of *shari'a*.

“Adherents to *shari'a* insist that their law prohibits any slander against Islam or Muhammad. Under such a catch-all restriction, virtually any kind of conversation about – or critique of – Islam can be considered impermissible if Muslims find it offensive.

“Particularly in Europe, the ever-present prospect of violence, like that which followed the September 2005 publication of Danish cartoons poking fun at Muhammad, is generally sufficient to induce self-censorship.

“In this country, the application of such prohibitions seems unthinkable, given the guarantees of free speech enshrined in the Constitution’s First Amendment.

“Unfortunately, the Obama administration last year co-sponsored with Egypt a relevant and deeply problematic resolution in the U.N. Human Rights Council, promoted for years by the Organization of the Islamic Conference, a group of 57 Muslim-majority nations that stridently embraces *shari'a* and seeks to legitimate and promote its advance around the world.

“The resolution calls on members of the United Nations to prohibit statements that offend Islam. It also calls for criminal penalties to be applied to those who make such statements.”

Such laws would make writing

or publishing this article illegal

“To a stunning degree, U.S. leaders have been effectively conforming to *shari’a* slander laws for some time now,” says Gaffney. “For instance, presidents George W. Bush and Barack Obama have both repeatedly described Islam as a ‘religion of peace,’ without acknowledging the requirement for *jihad* its authorities demand, pursuant to *shari’a*.”

“At the Muslim Brotherhood’s insistence, the Department of Homeland Security and the State Department have barred the use of perfectly accurate terms like ‘Islamic terrorism.’ The U.S. government has also embraced the Muslim Brothers’ disinformation by translating *jihad* as nothing more than ‘striving in the path of God.’

“Under the Bush and Obama administrations,” notes Gaffney, “the favored name for the enemy has been ‘violent extremism’ – a formulation that neither offers clarity about the true nature of our foe nor lends itself to a prescription for a successful countervailing strategy.

“Even when al-Qaeda is identified as the enemy, it is almost always accompanied by an assurance that its operatives and allies have ‘corrupted’ Islam.

“Ignored, or at least earnestly obscured, are two unhappy realities: such enemies are implementing *shari’a*’s dictates to the letter of the law, and they have millions of fellow adherents around the world who view Islam’s requirements the same way.

“One of the most egregious examples of this practice of unilateral disarmament in the battle of ideas is the January report of the independent review of the Fort Hood massacre, co-chaired by former Army Secretary Togo West and former Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Vernon Clark,” writes Gaffney.

“Their 86-page unclassified analysis purported to dissect an event allegedly perpetrated by U.S. Army Major Nidal Malik Hasan – a medical officer whose personal business card described him as ‘Soldier of Allah,’ whose briefings justified murder of his comrades in the name of *jihad*, and who shouted the Islamic martyr’s cry ‘*Allahu Akbar!*’ or ‘God is great!’ as he opened fire, killing 13 people at Fort Hood.

“Incredibly, the words ‘Islam,’ ‘Islamic terror,’ ‘*shari’a*,’ ‘*jihad*,’ and ‘Muslim Brotherhood’ were not used even once in the report,” says Gaffney.

It is just too politically incorrect

Such things are not said aloud, particularly under the Obama administration.

“Such political correctness,” writes Gaffney, “or willful blindness up the chain of command, doubtless caused Hasan’s colleagues to keep silent about his alarming beliefs, lest they be punished for expressing concerns about them.

“Now, reportedly, six of them have been designated as the scapegoats for what is manifestly an institutional failure. The painful truth,” says Gaffney, “is that however we rationalize this sort of behavior, our *shari’a*-adherent enemies correctly perceive it as evidence of submission, which is the literal meaning of the word ‘Islam,’ and what *shari’a* demands of everyone, Muslim and non-Muslim alike.

“Indeed, *shari’a* offers non-believers only three choices: conversion to Islam, submission (known as *dhimmitude*) or death. Historically, *dhimmitude* was imposed through Muslim conquests. In more recent years, tolerant Western nations have increasingly succumbed to *dawa*, stealthy *jihadism*, backed by more or less direct threats of violence.

“That trend,” advises Gaffney, “worrying as it is, may be giving way in this country to a new campaign: *jihad* of the sword. The past year saw a fourfold increase in the number of actual or attempted terrorist attacks in the United States.

“Four of the nation’s top intelligence officials have testified before Congress that it is certain new acts of violence will be undertaken in the next three to six months. Worse yet, a blue-ribbon commission has calculated that the probability of the use of weapons of mass destruction somewhere in the world by 2013 is now over 50 percent,” notes Gaffney.

“Is this dramatic upsurge in violent *jihad* directed at the United States unrelated to our behavior? Or does it reflect a growing calculation on the part of our *shari’a*-adherent enemies that violence against the United States is now, once again, practicable?

“Either way, the time has clearly come to make a far more serious effort to defeat both the violent and stealthy forms of *jihad* being waged against this country. If we are to do so,” says Gaffney, “America will have to start by telling the truth.

“Our enemy is not ‘violent extremism,’ or even al-Qaeda alone,” he says. “Rather, it is the millions of Muslims who – like the Muslim Brotherhood, al-Qaeda and their allies – adhere to *shari’a* and who, therefore, believe they must impose it on the rest of us.

“We are at war with such individuals and organizations. Not because we want to be. Not because of policies toward Israel or the Middle East or anything else we have pursued in recent years. Rather, we are at war with them because they must wage *jihad* against us, pursuant to the dictates of *shari’a*, the same law that has guided many in Islam for some 1,200 years.

“What is at stake in this war?” asks Gaffney. “Look no further than the American Legion’s *Americanism Manual*, which defines Americanism as ‘love of America; loyalty to her institutions as the best yet devised by man to secure life, liberty, individual dignity and happiness; and the willingness to defend our country and flag against all enemies, foreign and domestic.’”

That would not be allowed

“Such values cannot coexist with *shari’a*,” notes Gaffney, “which demands the destruction of democratic nations like the United States, its governing institutions and liberties. *Shari’a* would supplant them with a repressive, transnational, theocratic government abroad and at home.

“The extraordinary reality is that none of this – the authoritative and malevolent nature of *shari’a*, its utter incompatibility with our civilization, and its adherents’ determination to force us to convert, submit or die – is concealed from those willing to learn the truth.

To the contrary, the facts are widely available via books, the Internet, DVDs and mosques, both here and overseas. In 2005, U.S. Army General Peter Pace, then-chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, called on his troops to expose themselves to precisely this sort of information: ‘I say you need to get out and read what our enemies have said.

“Remember Hitler,” advises Gaffney. “Remember he wrote *Mein Kampf*. He said in writing exactly what his plan was. We collectively ignored that to our great detriment. Now, our enemies have said publicly, on film, in books and pamphlets and on the Internet, that their goal is to destroy our way of life.’”

Major Stephen Coughlin, a lawyer and Army Reserves intelligence specialist recruited by the Joint Chiefs to be their expert on the doctrine and jurisprudence of *jihad*, took Pace’s admonition to heart. He wrote a master’s thesis titled ‘To Our Great Detriment: Ignoring What Extremists Say About *Jihad*.’

Coughlin explicitly and repeatedly warned military leaders of the enemy’s “threat doctrine.”

How did they respond?

He was far too politically incorrect to be tolerated under the Obama administration.

“Engaging in such analysis, let alone acting on it,” writes Gaffney, “was powerfully discouraged in January 2008 when Coughlin was dismissed.”

It seems his writings offended a Muslim Brother then working for Deputy Secretary of Defense Gordon England.

“We are today confronted by the cumulative effect of a sustained and collective dereliction of duty, one that is putting our country in extreme peril,” warns Gaffney.

“Our armed forces – like their counterparts in the intelligence community, Department of Homeland Security and law enforcement – have a professional duty to know the enemy and develop appropriate responses to the threat. If this dereliction is allowed to persist, it is predictable that more Americans will die, both on foreign battlefields and at home.

“The American people also need to become knowledgeable about the threat of *shari’a* and insist that action be taken at federal, state and local levels to keep our country free,” says Gaffney.

“This toxic ideology, if left unchecked, can destroy the country and institutions that are, indeed, the best yet devised by man to secure life, liberty, individual dignity and happiness.”