

Islam as Victor of Western Value Relativism

By Michael Mannheimer

A Critical Discourse on Pure Tolerance

The *clash of civilizations*, the collision between cultures, forecast by Samuel P. Huntington, has long since become an [obvious] fact in modern-day Europe, finding its clearest expression in the confrontation of Islam with the remnants of European Christianity. This collision not only is echoed in form of terrorist attacks but also in form of a bitter fight of ideals between two systems of values that could hardly be more opposed to each other, namely the archaic- totalitarian value system of Islam and the one represented by post modern European Enlightenment.

In the wake of this quarrel, the world of Islam has already achieved considerable partial success thanks to [something we might call] value indifference coupled with blind tolerance exhibited by European political elites which has already lead to a process of disintegration of both Europe's ethic-religious foundations and sphere of rights. By the end, Islam may well emerge as victorious should Europe fail to rethink its occidental Christian roots.

Universalism of Human Rights

For a long time it seemed that in the world at large questions and discussions concerning guidelines as to right and wrong conduct had principally been answered and thus concluded. Starting out with the Magna Charta, established in 1215, followed by the Bill of Rights in 1689 and later by the American and French Constitutions in 1788 and 1791, respectively, the codifying of modern concepts of values regarding right and wrong finally lead to the Universal Human Rights Declaration proclaimed by the United Nations as well as by the Conference on Security and Co-Operation in Europe Final Act. The concepts of values expressed in those above-mentioned codes were considered universal and of unlimited validity for every human being, regardless of time, location and culture.

The equality of all people before the law, regardless of faith, ethnic origin, age, colour or gender, the freedom of assembly, thought and speech as well as the inviolable dignity of the individual guaranteed by constitutional law were the corner stones of a universal and undividable system of values agreed to as part of the United Nations' Charta on 26 June 1945 with a voting result of 48:0, however, eight nations abstained at the time: the Eastern Bloc, the USSR, Saudi Arabia and South Africa. I shall elaborate on this at a later stage.

The most important intellectual basis for these universal standards of human rights is based on the contemplations of German philosopher Immanuel Kant as to the question of whether an ethical foundation valid for all human beings and for all times [possibly] exists, and if so, how must it be formulated? Kant's famous formulation, known as the "Categorical Imperative", finally made its way into man's history of legal and ethic understanding. In principle and until this day, Kant's ethic formula shapes the UN's foundation of a legal standard for conduct:

'Act only in such a manner so that the maxim of your will could at the same time serve as a principle for universal legislation.'

Basically, Kant's Categorical Imperative is a linguistic elaboration of the proverb

'do unto others as you would have them do unto you.'

Hence, neither a thief would agree to theft becoming universal right, nor would a murderer suggest that murder become legally accepted since the murderer would not want himself to be killed and the thief could not possibly want to be a victim of theft.

Critics of the *Declaration of Human Rights* argue that it would not altogether differ from the [concepts] put forward by totalitarianisms - both governmental as well as religious - and would, therefore, be nothing more but a relative or arbitrarily defined system of values as far as its universal demand is concerned. However, these critics ignore a small detail which distinguishes the Universal Declaration fundamentally from those brought forth by totalitarian systems of values. It is the principle of reciprocity as part of Kant's Categorical Imperative which necessitates a comparison [in the sense of compatibility] of a specific standard of conduct with all those affected by it. Thus, this principle helps to avoid standards of conduct proposed by single individuals or by a radical minority to become the foundation for legislative if they are not simultaneously accepted or wanted by the general public.

In contrast to totalitarian systems demanding that each person "think and act as I want or else...", the categorical imperative asks: "How can you and I find a common ground for our thoughts and conduct without harming ourselves and each other on a basis which is wanted by both of us?"

Totalitarian systems force people to accept their system of values regardless of whether they agree with them or not. In contrast, value systems based on the categorical imperative in search for a definition as to right and wrong conduct confront each individual with the question as to how he or she wants to be treated (principle of reciprocity) before a standard of conduct becomes a universal principle of rights (legislation). The implication here is of a two-fold nature: to act towards any other person in such a manner that the other is not harmed [as a result of this action], and on the other hand to act in a manner that reflects the way in which oneself wishes to be treated. According to this formula, someone who is determined to force one's own dogma upon another must automatically raise the question of whether it would be desirable if the situation were reversed. On the basis of reason, this can only be answered with 'no'. At the same time it highlights the fact that any dogma or ideology ordering its members to force the system of values in question upon others is - viewed in the light of Kant - in the wrong.

The plausibility of the categorical imperative - both logical and in terms of content - was accepted by a majority of the then-global community in the middle of the 20th Century as basis for universal and indivisible ethics.

Value Relativism as Political and Religious Reaction

It is exactly this very principle of universality and indivisibility of values that became valid for the first time in history on a world-wide basis in the context of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights formulated by the UN, and which advocates of so-called value relativism fight in the West.

It is important to note that this clientele originates from mostly Left-inspired campuses, the very forces that once upon a time took up the cause of indisposable rights and in the name of which no war against the old, feudalistic and absolutistic systems was shunned.

Moreover, they represent the same forces that in 1949 objected to the vote of the universal validity of the UN-Charter. Without exception, the states that finally abstained were totalitarian dictatorships such as the USSR, the Eastern Bloc, Saudi Arabia and South Africa.

From the point of view of value relativists, absolute values could not possibly exist but only those [values] that could be defined as relative to a particular way of life within a given society. No culture, so it was said, had a right to impress its values upon another claiming universal validity. No matter how sensible this argument might sound at first, it turns out to be a malicious one after closer examination. This problematic nature becomes clear by looking at the following - intentionally constructed - example. Let us suppose a culture as part of a global alliance were obliged - for religious reasons - to perform human sacrifice as part of its fundamentalist religious obligations. This case would immediately pose an insolvable problem to advocates of value relativism. According to their philosophy, they would have to grant this culture freedom [of religious practise],

but this would at the same time make a case for allegations of supporting barbarism. However, if value relativists demanded a prohibition of human sacrifice, they would not only fundamentally violate their own principle but had to admit the incredibility of their position.

Due to the above-mentioned, discussions such as these are rare among value relativists since their battle is actually less of a philosophical nature than of a political kind. The battle is aimed at the Western system as such which is likened to capitalism and colonialism. In wake of the student revolution at the end of the 1960's, the expression 'Eurocentrism' was coined by Western intellectuals, most of whom were associated with the Left. What was to be expressed was nothing more than a new Western 'colonialism of values' after the West had lost its actual colonies. This time - according to the accusation - in form of utilizing cultural ethics in the attempt to re-colonise the world with its system of values intrinsically made up of the old capitalist hegemony.

Behind all this hid, as usual, the insatiable Western capital, forced to win new markets in the Third World as a result of market saturation in the West. To achieve this, the rest of the world would first have to be won over to embrace the idea of a global market with international custom – and trade barriers removed in favour of Western - and specifically American – capital. The demand of the West – and, therefore, of capitalism – to establish democracy as well as universal standards within the constitution of any given Third World country was generally not viewed by left-wing critics as an 'act of charity' but rather as a malicious means by which capitalism were to gain permanent control over governments and markets in the Third World.

In the context of this general criticism, everything deriving from the West was questioned and made subject to relativism. Democracy and human rights had their place, if at all, merely as compatible models among others. It was hardly of interest to advocates of value relativism as to whether or not these other models harnessed totalitarian, anti-democratic or misogynist elements. Discussions were held at a purely formal level, contents were hardly questioned. In the case of e.g. Iran, there was no examination as to whether criteria such as tolerance, equality of all people, including equality of men and women, freedom of religion were guaranteed at all. In the opinion of value relativists, this kind of questioning was simply not deemed justified since discussing these points were seen as interference with matters concerning another religion, and it is exactly this kind of interference which is not desirable according to value relativism. To put it simply: value relativists invited people to come to Europe by the masses but refused to check their religious and philosophical backpack for hazardous contents because their immigration agenda was of quite another nature. Joschka Fischer [Minister of Foreign Affairs 1998-2005: 'I am discovering more and more that I've remained a Marxist' (Fischer 1998)] discloses the political intentions behind the politics of mass immigration. The book with the 'appropriate' title: 'The Risk called Germany' 1994* was summarized by the 'Welt' as follows:

"Germany must be curbed from without, and from within made heterogeneous through influx, i.e. quasi diluted."

Source: Die Welt, Februar 2005

In other words: the ultra Green politician had as little trust in the democratic spirit of his own people that he saw the necessity of 'prescribing' it a demographic i.e. homeopathic dilution in form of mass immigration in order to sideline it.

This is an unprecedented process in European history alongside the fact that this kind of politics was not rejected but rather rewarded by German voters when the Red-Green Coalition won the election in 1998 under Schröder ('Yes, I am a Marxist!').

Jürgen Trittin, former Minister of the Environment appointed by the Green Party (first time in the history of the FRG), and - like Schröder and Fischer - representative of the student movement of 1968 and follower of the Frankfurter Schule, disclosed in an interview with the Frankfurter Allgemeine Sonntagszeitung (2 Jan 2005):

"I have never sung the national anthem, even not now that I am Minister."

Source: Frankfurter Allgemeine Sonntagszeitung, 2 Jan 2005, p. 6

What young left-wing politicians obviously learnt from the old cadre is that an anti-German attitude seems to qualify for much. Franziska Drohse^{**} gave the following politically correct statement in front of a running camera in August 2008:

‘German nationality is something I do not refer to as positive, I even fight it at the level of politics.’

Source: Cicero online, August 2008

All these statements are typical of value relativists who have over the course of time taken positions of high esteem and prestige in the field of politics, jurisdiction and the social sphere, [and worse still], have let their anti-German words follow deeds with fatal consequences for Germany *and* Europe.

* English title given by translator to the best of her knowledge

** Franziska Drohse: Federal Chairwoman of the Jusos (Young Socialists) in 2007 and former member of ‘Rote Hilfe e.V.’ (‘Red Aid’, transl.) which is observed by the Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz (Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution.) as a ‘left extremist organisation’.

Collision of Cultures

Historically, the opening of Europe’s boundaries is unprecedented and has welcomed anyone regardless of education, qualifications, and independent of how backwards the culture or the religious system of the country of origin. The economic blossoming of Europe on the one hand and the cultural and economic backwardness on the other hand formed a concoction that gave rise to Millions of immigrants from mostly Islamic countries coming to Europe. More often than not, many of them came from countries that were centuries behind Europe in terms of education, science and technology as well as social structures. They came into a culture of learning and knowledge by which they felt hopelessly overwhelmed, last not least since a great portion of them were illiterate. Occidental analytical thinking, religious tolerance, wide-spread atheism and agnosticism, European culture of critique and scepticism were so foreign to these people that they felt as if they had been placed on a far off planet from one instant to the next. Instead of the familiar atmosphere of large-sized families and clans, they found nuclear- or small-size families, Millions of unmarried men and women, i.e. ways of life that would have been deemed unacceptable in their home countries. Equality of the sexes, acceptance of homosexual partnerships, people publicly hugging and kissing each other, lightly dressed women, liberal public showing of sexual contents in the media to them was unheard of. It was a cultural shock for most of these immigrants, especially to Muslims.

The increasing Islamization of Europe and its Lack of Power

In the wake of the uncurbed, ongoing immigration that started in the 1960’s with approximately 1 Million Muslims alone coming to Europe each year, it is not surprising that their customs and habits are increasingly taking root. Especially Muslim immigrants have brought with them backward orientated social patterns marked by thoughts and conduct based on ancient patriarch structures. More than is the case with Europeans, their women are physically abused. At a 3-10% rate of Muslim population in Europe, 40-80% of all women seeking shelter in women refuges are Muslim. Polygamy and veiled women have become a common sight whilst thousands of mosques are mushrooming virtually everywhere. Entire parts of European cities have lost their original character with parallel societies developing that follow their own set of rules. In France alone, we find hundreds of so-called ‘no-go areas’ which are by now carefully avoided by indigenous French, and even fire brigade perform service only under police protection. Similar conditions prevail in Holland, Denmark, Sweden and Norway. Those countries have recorded cases of rape to an unprecedented extent. The rapists being mostly Muslim immigrants, the victims are mostly

indigenous girls and young women.

In the media, increasingly devoted to their self-inflicted PC censorship, crimes committed by individuals with migration background are mentioned in an obscure manner making it hard if not impossible for readers to obtain relevant information as to the offenders' ethnic and religious origin.

European intellectuals readily eager to severely criticise the West for any violation of human rights at any possible occasion are strangely muted and display a great deal of understanding when it comes to Muslim immigrants violating these very laws. Furthermore, we find such cases generously supported whenever religious aspects are involved. Under the pretence of 'religious freedom', ungraspable acts of crime have been tolerated due to PC. Moreover, there are clear indications that crimes committed by immigrants are deliberately mentioned on the sideline or even ignored completely. According to publishers who were asked about this, replied that the first and foremost reason were to protect immigrants from the 'wrath of the indigenous public'. This is, however, a questionable and spurious argument: because firstly, it fails to meet the obligation to provide information. The second reason being a one-sided, selective attitude as it prefers the reporting of harsh criticism of the West, yet at the same time turns to proclamations of tolerance and meek-mindedness towards foreign cultures and religions that must – apparently – be protected.

Many representatives of the media that once glorified 'left-winged-heroes' like Stalin, Mao, Che Guevara and Fidel Castro, by casting a favourable light on them despite their atrocities, do likewise with Islam today.

Dealing with the figure of Mohammed as such necessitates a variety of critical reports and analysis. His relationship to women, sexual contact with children, his orders for the elimination of critics or apostates of Islam as well as his wars fought against 'disbelievers' provide enough material for decades of study. The majority of present-day media is once again failing terribly in refusing to recognize the conquering, dehumanizing and totalitarian aspects of Islam. Instead, journalists hide behind euphemisms and adhere to a way of reporting that could not be further from reality. Value relativism seems to have an almost hypnotizing influence on a vast number of journalists, politicians, 'good-people' in awe of multiculturalism and others who have obviously given up, consciously or unconsciously, their clear judgement to a drug called Islam that puts an end to their analytical thinking. Willingly or unwillingly, they are contributing to the destruction of their societies, be it through ignorance, cowardliness or perhaps through quiet sympathy for a religion that is inherently anti-West, anti-American and anti-Israeli.

Increasing Influence of Sharia Law in Europe

Europe is paralysed by its confrontation with Millions of immigrants that are – contrary to former expectations – unable and often unwilling to integrate. Instead of demanding that immigrants pay heed to European laws as a 'conditio sine qua non', Western societies have successively, in an act of collective anticipatory obedience, which is reminiscent of Chamberlains appeasement politics towards Hitler, adopted ideas and demands of Muslim immigrants. This trend is ongoing and intensifying.

Already at this stage, court decisions are made with regards to Sharia law. In many cases Muslim girls can be kept from physical education classes and adherence to religious obligations allows them to stay away from subjects such as biology and sex education. Moreover, Muslim pupils do not have to join field trips, and this, too, is guaranteed by court decisions. Their children, so Muslim parents argue, cannot be expected to be extensively exposed to an uncontrolled company of 'disbelievers'.

Belgian police officers were ordered to refrain from smoking during Ramadan in order to not offend pious Muslims. Piggy banks were banned from British banks, because it could hurt the feelings of Muslims. The English must no longer sing a traditional song customary before cricket games since

its line referring to the 'green Isle and the green field' could possibly make the Prophet be seen as profane which would, of course, be tactless. Meanwhile in France Imams have more power in certain districts than the police, and Holland is seriously contemplating of introducing Arabic as an official language.

Polygamy is naturally forbidden for European men. In some European places, however, according to court verdicts, Muslims may be married to four women at once. In places where physical abuse has long since been abolished, a Muslim father may beat his daughter half dead whenever he believes she has adopted a life style too western for his liking (Italy). In places where the inviolable dignity of each human being is guaranteed at the level of constitution, the same judges that find a person guilty of violating these laws – if he/she is an indigenous European – grant that Muslim women may only move in public when wearing head cloth, hijab, shadors and even the burka like animals in moveable tents. Many immigrants come from countries where the barbaric practise of sexual mutilation of young girls is customary – a practise that some Journalists in their joy for euphemisms prefer to call 'female circumcision' although a comparison with male circumcision is completely inappropriate. In Holland, a vast number of daughters from Somali and Ethiopian parents are subject to this terrible procedure. Even when Muslims repeatedly claim that infibulation (which is its medical term) is not a Muslim practise, they silence the fact that virtually all infibulations performed world-wide take place in Islamic countries. This is based on a part in the Hadith according to which a female 'circumcisor' was ordered by Mohammed as follows:

'Cut off a little but do not go too far since it is better for the woman, and the man prefers it.'

Source: Hadith without further indication, cited by

www.wadinet.de/projekte/frauen/fgm/studie.de

Here again, European jurisdiction does not interfere. In Holland for example, there is no recorded case of parents ever been convicted for mutilating their daughter(s). On the contrary, when voices were raised calling for regular medical controls of Muslim girls, value relativists argued with the accusation of 'lex Islam': if there was to be such a law, it would then have to be valid for all girls living in Holland according to the principle of equality.

'Thanks to your laws of democracy we shall overthrow you, thanks to your religious laws we shall gain dominion over you.'

Imam of Izmir 1999

Source: Hans-Peter Raddatz, 'Von Gott zu Allah', 1st edition, Munich, May 2001, p. 349

The question one is compelled to ask is: how is all this possible? What enables Islam to undermine the legal system of Europe in this a way? How can Islam manoeuvre around even basic rights that require a majority of two-thirds in European Parliaments if it were to be changed?

The answer is not found in Islam alone. The main part of the work was done by vassals of Western societies, the 'good people', value relativists and all those who hold on to their illusionary conviction that all cultures and religions are equal despite obvious facts that indicate clearly that they are not.

European girls are neither forced to have their clitoris cut off nor their vagina sewn to the point of leaving merely a small opening, and European women are not required to follow a strict religious dress code. By the same token, there is neither a legal call nor a Christian guideline encouraging European males to beat their wives as is customary among Muslim males according to Allah's recommendations found in the Quar'an and specified in sura 4. 'Honour killings', allowing families to cowardly murder their daughters when their lifestyle is deemed 'indecent', have never been part of European culture. Moreover, massive abuse of people or even executions of those following a different faith is unheard of. The idea of eliminating all non-believers is foreign to Christians, Jews or Buddhists in contrast to Muslims who are called upon to feel supreme and thus legitimized to subvert, subject, oppress and even kill non-Muslims as is stated in more than 2000 places of

Quar'an and Hadith. No other world religion orders apostates to be killed due to conversion to another faith or simply because they prefer to be atheists.

Mohammed's explicit order to his Muslims is: 'Kill all those who change their religion!' - an order to fight and kill all 'disbelievers' as well as those who refuse to adopt the Islamic faith. The following three suras are examples chosen from amongst 200 places in the Quar'an and 2.000 citations in the Hadith showing how Mohammed systematically educated his followers about the treatment of 'disbelievers':

Sua 47, 4-5:

'So when you meet those who disbelieve, then smite the necks until when you have overcome them, then make (them) prisoners.'

Sura 8, 39:

'And fight with them until there is no more persecution and religion should be only for Allah..'

Sura 2, 191:

'And kill them wherever you find them, and drive them out from whence they drove you out, and persecution is severer than slaughter..'

English translation by M.H. Shakir

According to these verdicts alone, Millions of people have in the course of history become victims of the Islamic expansion and its 'eternal djihad': 'disbelievers' as well as in-critics. Hans Peter Raddatz, German expert on oriental studies and publisher of the International Encyclopedia of Islam, gave the following summary of Islamic facts:

'In no other religion do we find a sanctioning of violence towards believers of another faith as proclaimed in the Quar'an as the Will of God concerning its codification and practise throughout history, and this is an integral part of its ideology. Last but not least there is no other religious inspirer whose influence as role model not only extends to war waging but to the elimination of the enemy in form of contract killing.'

Source: Hans Peter Raddatz: 'Von Allah zum Terror' ['From Allah to Terror' (title by translator)] p. 71

Those who believe that Raddatz errs about his evaluation, or that his statements referred to historical Islam only, should read the words of the present Ayatollah Ali Chamenei on the subject of tolerance and non-violence:

'Throw away your prayer chain and buy yourself a gun. For prayer chains keep you in stillness while guns silence the enemies of Islam. We know of no absolute values except total submission under the will of Allah the Almighty.

The Christian and Jews say: 'Thou shall not kill!' However, we say that killing comes close to the importance of prayer if need be. Deception, ambush, conspiracy, fraud, theft and killing are nothing but means for the sake of Allah.' Source: quote from one his speeches in 2004

170 Million women, most of them Muslims, are forced to endure a torturous mutilation practise called infibulation. Each day, the outer genitals of around 6.000 girls and young women are mutilated with dull knives, rusty scissors, frayed razor blades and without anaesthetics. According to the UN's report 2005 on the world-wide situation of women, every third child dies every day as result of this maltreatment through of loss of blood, infections or shock.

Every day, due to this custom, 2.000 Muslim girls in Islamic regions lose their lives under unspeakable agony. Strangely though: neither weeping nor complaint is heard from the global Muslim community, no public out cries from Palestinian women beating their chests in lament, no agitated djazira reports and no peace demonstrations in Europe let alone in Islamic countries. But just like with other Islamic abominations - e.g. acts of terror, internal quandaries and fratricidal wars - the global community of Muslims closes ranks despite internal hostilities and because inside-criticism of Islam has been a taboo ever since the days of the Prophet. At any time, however, the

world of 'disbelievers' can freely be criticised, vilified, denounced and – if need be – killed.

Hardly anyone takes notice of the 35.000 "circumcised" female immigrants that have already settled in Germany alone, and the fact is that their number is increasing. In consideration of these facts, cultural relativists in Europe are guilty of ignoring this. The blood of mutilated girls and women, of hundreds of 'honour killings', of murders of apostates and of Muslim women beaten to death in Europe is on their hands. This does not keep cultural relativists from washing their hands of the matter, though. They omit to help and are, therefore, co-responsible and perpetrators, no matter how much one tries to get around it.

European cultural relativism has little to do with the kind of folklore romanticism proclaimed by Claudia Roth (and friends) and is far removed from the principles of enlightenment with its ideas of equality and unity when a blind eye is turned to those ethics and legal contents of what cultural relativists deem worth protecting. Cultural relativists like to depict themselves as protectors of human rights (which is untrue) whilst frequently denouncing critics of e.g. Islam as being racists and xenophobic. With blind tolerance, which is merely aimed at formal criteria concerning equality and religious freedom, cultural relativists omit to examine specific contents of e.g. Islam, and it is them who become grave diggers of those very values they pretend to protect. In *Der Zauberberg*, Thomas Mann appropriately expresses that 'tolerance becomes a crime if it supports evil.'

Muslim males who beat their wives when referring to sura 4, often receive overly mild punishments before European courts. Muslim families killing their daughters because they (the daughters) have discredited the family's 'honour' may reckon with a culturally understanding Western judge. Inside mosques built on European soil, hate speakers raise furious battle cries against the ever 'disbelieving' and 'decadent' West. It is remarkable with how much understanding European comes up in the face of these facts, while indigenous Europeans would be relentlessly prosecuted if they did anything of the kind.

In the face of Islamic intrusion, the enlightened Europe has long since made a political and ideological about-turn: what Islam is concerned, all barriers seem to break down on the premise of 'religious freedom'. Religious rights justified on the basis of Sharia law increasingly erode basic rights which have always been guaranteed by our constitutions.

Islam - which knows nothing of enlightenment in the sense of Voltaire or Kant - has forced modern Europe into its deepest identity crisis ever. The old continent seems to have evaded and partly even forgotten its Greco-Christian roots and has blindly and with hardly any protection opened its gates widely to Islam, its most bitter fiend for centuries. What is currently needed most, though, is a new wave of enlightenment that is – as strange as it might sound - forced upon us by a system that labels enlightenment and human rights as a 'bunch of hocus pocus pronounced by apostles of Satan' (Ajatollah Chamenei).

The demands to be tolerant of dissidents and followers of different faiths resulted in the establishing of a second barrier in order to avoid any possible criticism of Islam. Tolerance is rooted within Christianity and European enlightenment. It is found no-where within the Islamic world which is marked by intolerance and condemnation of any dissidence and different faiths. In the wake of being confronted with criticism in Europe, Muslims demand an attitude of tolerance which they themselves have neither exhibited nor applied in regions under Islamic rule despite claims about alleged tolerance of the Gordoba-Islam in Spain which was – on closer examination- actually neither tolerant nor peaceful. The massacres and pogroms that Christians and Jews in Andalusia were subject to are well- known to those who study this part of history more closely. However, myths are ingrained into the heads of people and for Western friends of Islam the alleged tolerance exhibited by Islamic rule in Gordoba is also written in stone.

Postulations of absolute and unconditional tolerance of dissidents and followers of another faith including the perpetual reference to 'religious freedom' in the West, have yet another cause dating

back to a relatively recent event in history, and this cause is found in Europe's reaction to the catastrophes of WW II.

The result of Hitler's exaggerated intolerance of Jews and other non-Arian ethnicities was answered with: 'No more war' proclaimed by European peace activists, especially in Germany, ('Nie wieder Krieg') alongside 'No more Intolerance'. The two slogans, however, are fundamentally wrong when analysed carefully and must be seen as the central cause of Europe's problem with indifferent immigration policies especially when totalitarian ideologies such as Islam are involved.

It is important to note that the rise of personalities such as Hitler or Mussolini was not caused by intolerance but by its very opposite. The Weimar Republic proclaimed tolerance of any form of ideology, be it right or left. It was, in fact, the Republic's value indifference which paved the way for Hitler's fascism. Exactly as it was back then, value relativism today is too weak and cannot control the enemies of freedom and democracy let alone fight them successfully despite knowledge of the enemies' political intentions. During the Weimar Republic, it was also known from where the thrust against the system came:

'We shall enter the Reichstag in order to seize the very weapons provided by democracy itself. We shall endeavour to paralyse Members of the Reichstag and the idea of Weimar by their own means. If democracy [is as stupid as to] hand(s) us free tickets and expenses for this disservice, so be it ...!'

These words were spoken in 1928 by Joseph Goebbels, the main strategist behind the seizure of power of the Nazis, and they express clearly and precisely his party's relationship to democracy ('Der Angriff' 1928). The words spoken by Tayyip Erdogan, former Mayor of Istanbul and currently Minister-President of Turkey are reminiscent of those spoken by Goebbels 70 years ago:

'Democracy is just the train we embark on until our destination is reached. Let the mosques be our barracks, the minarets our bayonets, the domes our helmets and the believers our soldiers!'

Source: cited by 'Die Welt', 6 Dec 1997 at an election event, 'Recep Tyyip Erdogan: the Islamist as Modernizer' 22 Sept 2004

In my view it is scandalous as to how Goebbels' words on democracy were ignored. Today, Erdogan's words go seemingly unheard with present political elite. History obviously may well repeat itself and lessons are not always learned.

The lessons learned from the Third Reich must, therefore, be formulated as follows:

No more tolerance of Intolerance!

The rise of Hitler during the Weimar republic is not unique, and shows how intolerance finally and inevitably emerges as victor when it is met with blind, radical tolerance. This thesis has proved itself to be as true as a natural law of physics. Historian Karl Dietrich Bracher describes the result of scientific examinations of the subject and why Hitler managed to rise to power:

'Paralysis and decay (disintegration) of a free state system were at last consequences of confused parameters, weakened readiness of defence and illusions of tolerance towards enemies of democracy.'

From: 'The Liquidation of the Weimar republic' by Karl Dietrich Bracher, Villingen 1955

This analysis is not only true of the Weimar republic. It describes exactly the current situation of the failing of Europe in the face of a totalitarian theocracy coming in religious disguise busy at gaining control over Europe.

The political imperative of the parole 'No more war' leads to weakness and even powerlessness if challenged by an enemy who - for the past 1.400 years - has been ready to wage war and utilize other forms of violence in order to achieve its goals.

Zero tolerance of intolerance

Whoever exercises tolerance of an intolerant competitor has to admit defeat on the very outset. This was the case with Hitler and the young Weimar Republic and it was the case with Islam and all Christian and Jewish communities including all regions that were exposed to its conquest. The Middle East, which was once populated by a majority of Christians and Jews, is a perfect example of a region which became completely Islamized within less than 50 years through strategic planning and aggressive energy that was, and is, religiously boosted.

In the year 1980, the 'Pan-Islamic Conference' in Lahore (Pakistan) issued a secret agreement which reads as follows:

'The entire area (Middle East) is to be wholly Islamized by the year 2000. This means that all non-Muslim, be it Coptic Christians in Egypt, or Christians in Iraq, Iraq, Turkey and Lebanon, be completely eliminated.'

Undoubtedly, this agreement is of far-reaching consequences: between the years of 1948 – 2001, the Jewish population within Arabic states was reduced by 91% from originally 855.000 members to 7.800, which signifies a modern and religiously determined form of 'ethnic cleansing' which goes either unnoticed or ignored by Western press, perhaps silenced due to political (or Islamic) correctness. With the exception of Israel, Jews and Christians living in the Middle East have until today nothing similar at their disposal to meet with the aggressive and determined expansion politics of Arab Muslims. We can see repeatedly: in the case of tolerance meeting intolerance, intolerance succeeds.

A further example of Islamic aggression and determination to global conquest is India.

When at the beginning of the 8th century Arabian armies set out on their quest to conquer India with the help of their superior military technology, the first victims were Buddhists. No other great religion is quite as non-violent, pacifistic and tolerant as Buddhism. And yet, within a very short period of time, this pure tolerance led to the extinction of Buddhists on the Indian subcontinent where it used to exist and develop for more than 1.300 years as the only religious community alongside Hinduism. When the Muslims stormed Buddhist villages and burned down their temples, they were surprised with how little resistance they were met. Thousands of peaceful Buddhists were slaughtered, only able to save their lives by converting to Islam - which many of them did. Today, Buddhism has almost vanished from India.

In contrast to Buddhists, Hindi defended their territory bitterly against the Muslim intruders. Millions were killed as the result of Djihad in India but in the end, Muslims were only partially able to establish themselves thanks to Hindu resistance. Yet, as in all other countries where Islam has become a significant minority through intrusion e.g. Serbia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Cyprus, South Thailand, Kosovo, Lebanon, the partial Islamization of India is the cause of ongoing violent and continuous tensions between religions. Furthermore, this led to the splitting up of the subcontinent: Pakistan and Bangladesh emerged as purely Islamic countries and India as a multi religious state. (To a smaller degree this Muslim separation politics can also be observed in Serbia and Kosovo.) Even though the Muslim population makes only 13.4% of the entire population in India, the 137 Million Indian Muslims represent the third largest Muslim population contingency of all Islamic states following Indonesia and Pakistan. The violent confrontation between Hindu India and Islamic Pakistan is continuing. Pakistan which has nuclear weapons at its disposal - is considered the most dangerous and volatile region on earth. If Taliban or Pakistan Muslim fundamentalists (who were able to seize parts of Northern Pakistan) got a hold of these weapons is an inconceivable scenario.

If Hinduism were as tolerant as Judaism or Christianity (I clearly emphasize the difference between the actual religion and the church of the middle ages that was removed from its religious roots), it would have vanished like Buddhism.

But despite historical facts, Islam continues to nurture an image of a religion which spread by peaceful measures. The slogan 'Islam is peace' is an all-time favourite with Islam scholars and is another myth not only believed by Western 'good-people' and cultural relativists but also by most peaceful and unassuming Muslims because, like all other myths, it plays an important part for the identification processes within the world of Islam as well as for the upholding of the Umma, the world-wide Islamic community.

The Islamization of Europe

Let us again turn our attention to Europe: Islam is right in the middle of conquering it with the help of its laws. Whosoever points to this, is accused of 'Islamophobia', a term which was, interestingly enough, developed by the Muslim Brotherhood and is also very popular among cultural relativists who make successful use of it. It is not only outrageous but also revealing that the accusation of being 'islamophobic' sounds like the diagnosis a mental illness since it is typical of totalitarian systems to stigmatise their critics by psychiatric means. During the Soviet regime, critics were sent to psychiatric wards where they were subjected to torturous measures like painful injections or sitting in ice-cold water for hours. In Islamic countries critics are forced into psychiatric wards, too, often until the end of their lives if they are not killed beforehand.

Whenever the accusation of 'Islamophobia' does not work, harder measures are taken. Every Islam critic has to reckon with being stigmatized as racist or accused of being hostile to foreigners, which is pretty much a blackjack argument, and only few can meet it adequately. Criticism of the 'religion of peace' is thereby successfully killed in its germ state.

Udo Ulfkotte, the German political scientist and journalist, knows Islam from his own experience other than most of his colleagues reporting on the subject. He spent more than 12 years in various Islamic countries of the Middle East.

Ulfkotte says: 'I witnessed executions in Saudi Arabia and in Yemen, I saw cut off hands being nailed to city gates. I experienced the separation of societies into classes, women stoned to death and other manifestations of the dehumanizing world view of Muslims.'

His left-orientated opponents have nothing at their disposal to prove him wrong but that does not keep them from pushing him into a far Right, an established means to sideline political opponents, especially in Germany. Another of Ulfkotte's quotes:

'When as a journalist one reports on civil wars and their ethnic conflicts in the Middle East, one is viewed as an expert in Germany. If reports one reports on ethnic conflicts between Germans and foreigners in Germany, one is considered a Right-wing extremist.'

Udo Ulfkotte, Berliner Kolleg, Juli 2007

German-Turkish writer Serap Cileli, author of 'We are your daughters, not your honour!' brings both apathy and mental block [in European societies] to a point:

'Whoever is engaged to fight for the rights of Turkish Muslim women, whoever questions the position of women in Islam opposing forced marriages, honour killings, veiling, the lack of rights, including those of isolated women to speak, is in danger of being accused of hostility to foreigners.'

A false understanding of tolerance and the lack of courage to withstand accusations concerning racism or hostility to foreigners makes people here in Germany afraid to criticize unjust traditions and misogyny that basically violate human rights. By so doing, they fail to put an end to this.'

By perpetually rubbing the issue of tolerance and religious freedom into everybody's face – both

values foreign to the world of Islam – this religion has been spreading in Europe at a speed unknown in previous times. In 1945, there were 600.000 Muslims living in Europe. Meanwhile, we are speaking of 20 Million, their number increasing by 1 Million immigrants per year, and, more often than not, directly to the burden of European social funds. In Brussels, Milan and Oslo, ‘Mohammed’ is already close to spearheading the list of names given to male new-borns, and England is now the first country in Europe where ‘Mohammed’ has definitely become the most commonly given name for male babies. In Holland, 56% of all children and adolescents in 2004 were of foreign parents, most of them Muslims. Statistics for Switzerland forecast a proportion of 76% Muslims in 2040 should the country not change its policy. According to an Austrian study, every third pupil will be Muslim by 2051, and a 2006 study on population development in Germany, carried out by the Islam Archive in Soest (Germany), forecasts 51.72 Million Muslims living in Germany by 2045, a figure definitely reckoned with by leading Muslim representatives. The following vision was formulated by Ibrahim El-Zayat, former General Secretary of the umbrella organisation ‘Muslim Council’ and former Federal Chairman of the ‘Muslim Student Association Germany’ which is said to stand in close relationship to the Muslim Brotherhood:

‘There are approximately 2.5 Million Muslims living in Germany today. By the mercy of Allah we live in one of the world’s richest countries...The future of Islam in this country, Germany, is forged by us; we who have been born and raised here; we who speak the German language and know the mentality of this people...

I do believe that the chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany elected in 2020 might well be a Muslim born in Germany, and that the constitutional judge be a Muslim...This country is ours and it is our duty to positively change it. With the help of Allah we shall turn it into our paradise on earth in order to make it available to the Islamic Umma and humanity at large.’

Source: Ibrahim El Zayat quoted by the Islamic youth magazine ‘TNT’ 1/1996

Similar words were spoken by former Turkish Prime Minister Necmettin Erbakan:

‘It is our goal to settle on the European continent, living there quietly in accordance with the law so that in future the whole of Europe may be Islamic.’

Öger Tours founder Vural Öger, the German-Turkish Social Democrat (SPD) and MEP explained to reporters of the Turkish newspaper ‘Hürriyet’ during dinner with his Turkish friends:

‘That which began under Sultan Süleyman during the Turkish siege of Vienna in 1683 we shall achieve through population, with our strong men and healthy women.’

The 300.000 member- strong ‘Milli Görüş’, which is the second most significant Turkish organisation next to the ‘Türkisch- Islamische Union der Anstalt für Religion’ (DITIB)*, sees the paramount importance in the avoidance of successful integration of Muslims in Germany:

‘Mili Görüş is a shield which represents a shield for our people as not to assimilate into barbaric Europe.’

Quoted in the context of the North Rhine Westphalia report for the protection of the constitution 1996

The newspaper ‘Milli Gazete’ standing in close vicinity to ‘Milli Görüş’ once called the Federal Republic of Germany a ‘land of malice and of disbelief’ and Europeans as

‘idol worshippers, imperialists, capitalists, communists and profiteers.’

Non-Muslims living in other Islamic parts of the world are treated with a similar degree of disrespect. Whatever Islam demands for itself is not granted to others. Ayatollah Khomeini, late Shiite leader of the Islamic Republic of Iran once left no doubt about what was to be thought of non-Muslims:

‘Jews and Christians are likened to the sweat stench of camels and dirt eaters and are the vilest on earth...All non-Muslim governments are creations of Satan to be eliminated.’

The Imam of London, Sheik Omar Bakri Muhammad expressed similar words during an interview

given to the Portuguese magazine 'Publica' concerning the respect for followers of different faiths:

'We do not distinguish between civilians and non-civilians, between guilty and not guilty, only between Muslims and non-Muslims. And the life of a disbeliever is worthless!'

Whilst Western democracies theoretically grant unlimited chances to their enemies to dispose of democracy by vote, democracy does not receive a further chance by its opponents to re-establish itself. Gaza is an example showing exactly what happens if the spirit of democracy is not understood as such but only regarded as a formal walk to the polls. Voting as expression of voters' interests is not merely the purpose but the very means of democracy. It is, therefore, completely incomprehensible when political commentators speak of democratic elections as if they were compatible to elections in England or France. Whoever enables declared enemies of democracy to partake in voting runs the risk of its destruction showing to be a radical advocate of tolerance who has grasped the full meaning of democracy half way.

Carlo Schmid, one of the founders of the German constitution, knew from his own experience that radical tolerance was the cause of the fall of the Weimar Republic. He also understood that in a democratic system limits must be set to tolerance. The following is a quotation from Carlo Schmid before the plenum of the Parliamentary Council in 1949:

'I for my part am of the opinion that it does not serve the principle of democracy that it generates the preliminaries for its removal.'

Tolerance is good but only in the meeting of [other] tolerant forces. In the case of Hitler, whose election in 1933 was to be the last democratic election of the Weimar Republic, 55 Million people were killed before democracy was re-instated in Germany. More lives still were sacrifices to the era of communism, which has not yet been overcome completely (North Korea, China and Cuba).

It is not surprising that 'good people', pacifists and value relativists hardly ever consider the price to be paid if freedom is not fought for, including violent measures. Pacifists seem to ignore the fact that Hitler-fascism was not removed from Europe through peace demonstrations in London, New York or Washington. German concentration camps were neither abolished through dialogues, conferences nor through the Nazis' mere understanding that their doing was wrong. A stop to the Emperor of Japan's totalitarian expansion politics (which was the cause of Millions losing their lives during the 1930's and 40's) was not achieved through dialogues and conferences, neither was the war of the Serbians against parts of what was left of Yugoslavia. History shows repeatedly that military action has always been the only means to rid the world of the wars of evil.

Military strategy, however, offers no solution to Islam as an internalized totalitarianism. Islam as world-wide threat to freedom can, if at all, only be overcome by winning the heads and finally the hearts of Muslims for our humanistic Western value system by stepping up to them in full consciousness of the fact that it offers Muslims a way out of its senseless, self-destructive constraints of social obedience including its deeply inhumane Sharia law.

Naturally, the West would have to again develop a sense of its own value instead of continuing to criticise itself to the point of self-destruction. The West suffers from lack of a healthy sense of self confidence which has to form the basis for winning over Muslims in general and especially those living in the West to embrace a humanistic world view for the long-term future.

It is very likely that Muslim fundamentalists would turn to violent actions in answer to the West advertising its values with this kind of self confidence. But those who forsake to embark on this path and instead continue their appeasement politics have to admit defeat. Freedom has never been for free unlike some pacifists and 'good people' seem to believe. The quote of British philosopher and mathematician Bertrand Russell who once discovered the law hidden behind any risk aversion, is brief and reduced to mathematical precision and may serve all those eternal appeasers, doubters and hesitators:

'Those who never take the smallest risk run the greatest risk in life.'

The above-mentioned path is probably the most suited one in the struggle to overcome this theocratic totalitarianism that has been disguising itself as a religion for 1.400 years in the medium- and long-term future. Muslims must recognize that Islam not only presents a tremendous subordination system for 'disbelievers', but also for Muslims themselves: all men and women forced to inflict suffering unto others in the name of an inhumane religion whilst having to endure its wrongs. Muslims must finally recognize that the Islamic creed does not serve them but only satisfies greed for power and profit exhibited by their clerics and politicians. They are the very engineers of Islam as a perfect idealistic means utilized to achieve their ends.

During the Cairo Conference (1990), Islamic countries established their own version of 'human rights'. Western media gave much of their attention to this event, and it was well documented. Few reports and comments cared to mention that this declaration of human rights had nothing in common with the declaration of the United Nations except its name. In reality the contents of the Cairo Declaration are identical with the primordial conceptions of rights i.e. Sharia law: no equality of men and women, no right to freely choose one's religion or partner in marriage, extremely limited rights for non-Muslims, reaffirmation of physical punishments such as whipping, cutting off parts of the body and stoning and reaffirmation of Islam's claim to world rule.

The Cairo Conference was nothing less than a counter draft to the Western Declaration of Human Rights. The same Muslims demanding the introduction of Sharia law for Muslims living in the West while insisting on value relativism in the US, Europe and Canada for their own advantage, insist on the total and irretrievable universalism of Islamic values being recognized, leaving no room for tolerance of values other than its own. This shows that for Muslim representatives, value relativism is not the goal but merely a means to also establish the supremacist ideology of Islam in the countries of 'disbelieve' according to Allah's orders to his believers as specified in sura 61:9:

'He it is who sent His Messenger with the guidance and the true religion that He may make it overcome the religions, all of them, though the polytheists may be averse.'

English translation: M.H. Shakir

Value relativism is inherently inhumane, violates the principle of equality and tends to foster totalitarian structures under the pretence of 'cultural differences', thus providing an optimized platform for the spreading of totalitarianism.

Value relativism is part of a mindset which is both cowardly and convenient because the very nature of value indifference can only pretend to be tolerant. It neither necessitates a clear stance nor conscious decisions concerning specific values. In so doing, it gives way to inhumane values gaining control and finally becoming victorious.

Victors of values indifference are advocates of a value dominance originating mostly from totalitarian campuses, be it left, far right or religiously-inspired fundamentalism. History has repeatedly shown that only a minority of determined totalitarian advocates is needed in order to quickly topple and destroy a system based on pure tolerance and is destined to end, therefore, in self-inflicted extermination.

This system, which deems all values to be equal, thus disabling itself to protect its own values, becomes 'valueless' and is to be held accountable for the present dilution of post modern, enlightened Europe with its classic understanding of human rights. Democracy is not simply a result of votes. It expresses the democratic attitude of mind by which both society and state system are imbued. For this very reason, the election in Gaza - which led to the coming into power of the Hamaz - was no act of democracy. On the contrary: it was an intended act to abolish democracy by way of religious totalitarianism - the fiend and foe of freedom and democracy.

Should European societies insist on pursuing the path of value relativism instead of beginning to defend the indivisibility and universality of rights as it used to in the past, the Gaza-scenario may well repeat itself and Europe become Islamic at the point when Muslims will have become majority. This is precisely the goal of all Muslim organisations most of whom emphasize this more or less

openly.

Summary

The peoples of Europe who in future wish to live uphold a life of freedom and independence in democratically organized societies must begin to oppose value relativism with its value indifference and begin to reaffirm the universal validity of human rights and the idea of enlightenment. They should also cease to feel satisfied in merely delegating this task to their political elite. In the face of the theocratic totalitarianism called Islam, the elite have largely failed just as failed in curbing National Socialism and communism during the course of the last century. Instead of withdrawing privileges after each act of terrorism, they reward the world of Islam with concessions as to political and legal demands. The outcome is the encouragement of yet more terror.

Each freedom-loving European citizen is called upon in the wake of the Islamic threat. Each individual can become active and contribute to change: through voting, engaging in information activities, be they private or public, be it in form of writing letters to the editor, through cancelling 'Islamophile' print media or through participation in relevant organisations and demonstrations. Every citizen can report state lawyers, judges and politicians if he suspects them of having violated or even bent European law. This describes a peaceful scenario.

Another scenario which is envisioned by an increasing number of analysts and experts on the subject is the probability of political unrest or even civil war in Europe preceding Islam's [attempt] to rise to power and that may well cause the death of hundreds of thousands people.

According to a secret CIA study of the year 2006, civil war is likely to be reckoned with in numerous European conurbations. The study contains detailed indications as to which locations are the first to be affected. Hayden, Head of CIA, is quoted by the renowned Washington Post, saying that a further rise of Muslim population is expected in Europe. At the same time, the birth rate of indigenous Europeans is dropping and the integration of Muslim immigrants will be posing tremendous problems to European states thus increasing the potential of extremists and civil war.

Source: Washington Post, May 2008

Daniel Pipes, the American historian and expert on Islamic studies, concludes that Islam is incompatible with democracy, freedom and liberal values and sees Europe doomed to civil war in the medium-term future. The reasons given by him are the fascination of Europeans with Islam as well as their deeply-engrained guilt complex deriving from the failure to deal with totalitarian systems such as Eastern Communism, National Socialism and Italian Fascism, a lack of appreciation of their cultures as a result of this as well as alienation of their roots.

Even the criminal investigation department in Austria warns about an outbreak of civil war in Europe. Alfred Ellinger, Islam expert and chairman of the Detectives' Association in Austria* writes:

'Let us be realistic. Europe will become a huge battle field for the Islamic order and its enemies.' (...). They (the Muslims) are of the opinion that no heed needs to be paid their host societies, yet the right to political asylum, social benefit, internet and mobile phones are appreciated. Integration or even assimilation to them is unknown. The idea that pluralism and openness prevalent in Europe may have an effect on the understanding of Islam has proven to be unrealistic.

(...) 'A Muslim has no nationality, only his faith.' (Sayyid Qutb, a pioneer of radical Islamism, executed in Egypt in 1966)'

* Bund Österreichischer Kriminalbeamten

Muslims are predestined through the directions given by Allah himself:

‘And fight with them until there is no more persecution and religion should be only for Allah..’

Sura 8:39, English translation: M.H. Shakir

Islamic immigration leaves no room for illusionary multicultural folklore.

Either Europe wakes up or it will cease to exist.

Germany, March 2009

Contact: M.Mannheimer@gmx.net

Translation: Maria Sander

contact: mari.sander@web.de

