THE REAL NATURE OF ISLAM

A Human Rights Solution

MARY ANDREW

1st October, 2020

A while ago, on a BBC daytime TV discussion programme, Professor Richard Dawkins extracted from an imam the admission that the correct punishment under Islam for apostasy is death - which is all you need to know to understand that Islam is a fascistic political ideology, not a matter of voluntary faith, and the enemy of human rights. The imam, uncomfortable about letting slip an inconvenient truth about Islam - and its refutation of the foundational human rights to freedom of speech and belief - disingenuously said that he didn't know why Dawkins cared, since the penalty couldn't be applied in a non-Islamic country like Britain. But of course he did know why we care about the death penalty for apostasy, and that for blasphemy, enforced by terrorism and fear in Europe - and about the thousands of other Islamic atrocities across the world, which continue year on year. We care because we care about all the suffering caused by human rights abuses. And because of a realistic fear among many of us that we too could be forced into submission to Islam.

Both jihad and Islamic laws sanctioning human rights abuses are enshrined in the Shariah, the Islamic code of government, law and social order, rooted in Islamic doctrine. Politicians and press interrogate the ideological roots of the rare instances of far-right terrorism, as they did after the appalling murder of 50 Muslims in Christchurch, New Zealand. But there is an almost surreal determination to avoid the same scrutiny of Islam after Islamic atrocities - and a disproportionate focus on reassuring Muslim communities after any attack perpetrated by Muslims. The official reaction calls Islamic terror "senseless", averts attention from its Islamic features, and denies it has anything to do with "true" Islam. It's based on misinterpretation, the "perversion of a great faith". It's attributed, if not to mental illness, then to "radicalism", "extremism", "Islamism" - the last of which used to just mean the practice of the doctrine of Islam, but is now redefined as an aberration separate from Islam.

You can't do this and be honest about Islamic doctrine, and its exposition in the Shariah. So, from fear and political calculation, no one asks whether Shariah itself is "a perversion of a great faith" - or rather the authentic expression of theocratic evil. Saudi Arabia, one of the world's most egregious abusers of human rights, suppresses all opposition to its government and Shariah, regularly conducts public beheadings (37, and a crucifixion, in one day last year), and commits many other human rights abuses (including the horrifying treatment of migrant workers during the Covid crisis). But almost all of this is ignored, for political and economic reasons, and Saudi Arabia was accepted onto the UN Human Rights Committee, with the shameful support of our government - despite that country's refusal to adhere to the UN's own Universal Declaration of Human Rights, logically the minimum requirement for membership.

The investigation into the worldwide Islamic persecution of Christians (concluding that it now amounts to genocide) has signally failed to identify the root cause of the persecution, and there's the same wilful blindness about Islamic violence against Jews (Koran 9:29 states "Fight

against Christians and Jews until they pay the tribute readily, being brought low.".) and, of course, about "honour" violence and murders of Muslim women and girls, and violence against, and murders of, homosexuals and ex-Muslims. Then there's slave-taking, and the sexual enslavement of non-Muslim women and girls, endorsed in the Koran (4:24 "And all married women [are forbidden] to you save those captives whom your right hands possess"), and in the hadiths - and immutably enshrined in the example of "the Prophet" in the sunnah*, which has direct relevance not only, for example, to the actions of Boko Haram, but to Britain's Muslim rape gang phenomenon. Any horrible aspect of Islam is labelled cultural and distanced from Islamic doctrine.

"I have been made victorious with terror" said the Prophet in the Sunnah (Bukhari 4.52.220). And, under the Islamic principle of abrogation (explicitly mandated in the Koran), the supposedly later, violent and supremacist, verses of the Koran, deemed to date from Mohammed's time in Medina, cancel the supposedly earlier, more peaceful, ones, generally deemed Meccan, which contradict them. So the "Verse of the Sword", Koran 9:5, sometimes known as "Mohammed's last will and testament", mandating the slaying of idolaters i.e. non-believers, unless they repent and convert, is definitive of Islam, cancelling some 120 supposedly earlier verses. There are many other "late" verses mandating "striving", fighting, "in the way of Allah to be triumphant" (9:20), and commending that as the superior form of service to Allah (9:21). Historical research findings refuting the scriptural version of Mohammed and his life - and Koranic Islam, which rejects the Sunnah, and the chronology supporting abrogation - are irrelevant. Only the scriptures, and what mainstream scholars and clerics believe and teach, really count. So abrogation and the example of Mohammed prevail, repudiating peaceful Koranic verses like "no compulsion in religion" or "to you your religion, to me mine" - and hence there is no scope for secularism and human rights in Islam.

Jihadiic violence demonstrates Islam's utter contempt for human rights, and Jihadis kill in order to impose Shariah - with all its integral human rights abuses - on the whole of the "Dar al Harb", or "House of War", that is the whole non-Islamic world. The map of the world shows how far the objective has been achieved, and, but for the victory at the Gates of Vienna in 1683, we could have been living under Shariah for hundreds of years already. But, as Gaddafi observed, there is now a distinct possibility that Islam will take Europe without the need for war (though terror and the existence of fast-growing Muslim populations in Europe are intimidating our elite into appeasement). Demography and democracy could suffice.

We stand to lose our whole civilisation, and its foundational Enlightenment principle of the sovereignty of the individual, and one's ownership of one's body and mind. It took a long time to fully realise this principle, with equal rights for all, regardless of natural differences. But, by hook or by crook, and with many wrong turns along the way, we developed a free and democratic society, in which individuals with different ideas and ways could live in reasonable harmony, respecting the rights of others to their individual choices. Judeo-Christianity's emphasis on the individual soul may have contributed to this (though Christian hierarchies often opposed freedom). And gradually, from Magna Carta on, abuses of the human individual diminished - and we gradually developed a humane set of values (brilliantly articulated in Mill's On Liberty, building on the thoughts of Milton and others), which came to be enshrined in law. We rightly felt we were fighting for freedom and civilised values, as well as survival, in World War II. But those values were only fully realised later, with laws to end unfair discrimination, the legalisation of homosexual sex between consenting adults, and the abolition of the death penalty. A huge amount of injustice and harm was eliminated - tragically too late for Alan Turing, who saved millions of lives in the war by cracking the

Enigma Code, but was convicted of a homosexual offence after the war, subjected to chemical castration, and driven to suicide. This eloquently expresses the vital moral importance of our Western concept of human rights.

So, what's the Islamic, theocratic, perspective on human rights?   The clue's in the word theocratic of course. Islam is about only the will of Allah, and the survival and spread of Islam and the ummah. Like Nazism and Communism, Islam (which has been called "Nazism with a god") is totalitarian and collectivist, with no concept of individual human rights. Its idea of a human right is the right to live under Shariah, free of "man-made" law. In Islam, freedom means freedom to live in accordance with the laws of the Shariah, justice means "justice" in accordance with Islamic jurisprudence, and peace means living in submission to Islam (while barbaric punishments and executions are imposed to maintain that "peace"). So, Muslims tell the truth, according to Islam, when they say it's a religion of peace. And often gull non-believers into thinking that "true" Islam embraces the principles of peace, freedom and justice just as we do, while being well aware of the effect of the confusion.

In 1969, what is now the the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation, which comprises 57 Muslim-majority states, was founded. It asserts that it's "the collective voice of the Muslim world" (some 1.9 billion people), and in 1990 it repudiated the assent of many of its members to the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights (created in 1948), by collectively issuing its own rival Cairo Declaration of Human Rights in Islam, because human rights as we understand them, enshrined in the UDHR, are not Shariah-compliant.

Our secular Western settlement draws a line between the secular and the sacred, as did the Gospel text, "Render unto Caesar what is Caesar's, and unto God what is God's". Whereas Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradawi Ph.D., the world's foremost Sunni scholar and Islamic jurist, has stated that, "Islam is a comprehensive system of worship (Ibadah) and legislation (Shari'ah)." - and, he says, "The call for secularism among Muslims is atheism and a rejection of Islam. Its acceptance as a basis for rule in place of Shari'ah is downright apostasy." And he fully endorses the death penalty for apostasy, declaring, with refreshing honesty, that without it Islam would not exist. There are more than ten Muslim-majority countries whose laws mandate the death penalty for apostasy or blasphemy, making it near impossible for Muslims to reject Islam, or stand up against the Shariah.

In addition to this, the Shariah death penalty for homosexuality is already law in more than ten Islamic countries, and stoning for adultery (in practice, usually of women, some victims of rape) is the law in a number of Islamic countries, and also practised widely across Muslim areas of the world on an ad hoc basis (as permitted under Islam). In Iran, women protesting the hijab have been sentenced to long prison sentences, and to flogging, and some subjected to rape in prison. So it seemed odd when there was recent outrage, including from celebrities like George Clooney, Elton John and Ellen de Generes, when little Brunei announced that it was introducing the death penalty for homosexuality, adultery and rape - upon which action it has now placed a moratorium, probably for economic and diplomatic reasons, but its commitment to which has not been repudiated. Was this ignorance? Or horror that the winds of change might now be blowing favourably for Islam rather than liberal democracy?

There is a plethora of other human rights abuses permitted or imposed under Shariah, including FGM, child marriage and amputations for theft. Muslim women are discriminated against in terms of rights in marriage (subject to beating for disobedience, and there is no concept of rape in marriage), and in divorce, child custody, inheritance, and the worth of their

testimony in court (half that of a man). And though Dr. Qaradawi and some other scholars have advocated an initial "Meccan" approach in Western countries - effectively sanctioning (as does scripture) Muslims temporarily complying with the laws of the lands they are living in (and therefore avoiding rejection), until those lands are won for Islam and the Shariah can be fully imposed - the precepts of Shariah often inspire "honour" violence and the killing of those offending against them. And, as Islam grows in strength, aggressive calls for Shariah also grow. The incremental approach to the imposition of Shariah is exemplified by Qaradawi's advocacy of an interim period for people to get used to the idea of hand-chopping for theft.

And what's in store for non-believers if Islam triumphs in Britain, as it has over so much of the world? Well, the Shariah dhimmi provisions, classically determining the treatment of Christians and Jews i.e. "people of the book" (and some others), provide for "dhimmis" to live an inferior and oppressed life, "taxed and humiliated", with virtually no legal protections, not permitted to have any authority over a Muslim, forced to wear special clothes, and step off the pavement for passing Muslims. They can only worship in existing synagogues and churches, and must not ring any bells, or make any repairs. "Dhimmis" are subject to the death penalty for any criticism of Islam (blasphemy), and for any proselytisation for their faith, and come off worse in any legal dispute with a Muslim. No dhimmi man can marry a Muslim woman, and it's easy to see why, historically, over time, dhimmis convert to Islam to gain full Muslim rights - especially as the jizya tax, levied on all "dhimmis", can be set at truly punitive levels.

Non-Muslims who don't qualify as "dhimmis", atheists or Hindus for example, classically face the choice convert or die - hence the massive Muslim slaughter of Hindus in the conquest of India, until, it seems, it was realised that killing everyone would leave no one to do any work. For, as historian Tom Holland has written, Islamic economies traditionally relied on slavery and dhimmi labour, and still do to a considerable extent (though slavery was officially repudiated under pressure from the West). It seems likely that atheists and Hindus etc. will be treated as dhimmis, as least initially, if Islam prevails in the UK, but there's no guarantee.

There are those who seek a reform of Islam, but, given the Koran's status as the direct word of Allah (communicated to Mohammed by the angel Gabriel), the scriptural example of "the Prophet" himself, and the concept of abrogation, such an aspiration appears to be a vain hope. Islam is Islam (as Erdogan asserted) and Shariah is not a smorgasbord - you can't just pick the bits that are acceptable. It's a detailed, totalitarian political and legal system. Our present Archbishop of Canterbury has rather bravely made public his conclusion that Shariah is incompatible with our system of law, and the values on which it is based (whereas his predecessor wanted to incorporate at least some elements of the Shariah into our law). But sadly, whereas the last Pope expressed concerns about Islam, the present pontiff is a complete apologist for Islam, and huge supporter of Muslim migration to the West. As are many well-intentioned but deluded Leftist liberals, who believe that abolishing borders will bring harmony and justice for all.

There are, it seems clear, many good people who are Muslims, who know little about, or choose to ignore, Islamic doctrine - and there is even a great organisation titled British Muslims for Secular Democracy (which, tellingly, has had to be very discreet about its address). But, as Douglas Murray has said, "more Muslims, more Islam".

The ethos of Islam is "Al-wala' wa-l-bara' (as set out in a hadith), which means love everything and everyone Islamic, and hate everything and everyone non-Islamic. This concept allows true-believing Muslims to do literally anything to advance the cause of Islam, including lying

(taqiyya), and withholding information (kitman). One aspect of Islam that confuses many in the West about the nature of Islam is the apparent peacefulness of the majority of Muslims. Of course, some who are Westernised and unIslamic are genuinely peaceful.   But what needs to be understood is that scripture decrees that most Muslims live peacefully, and that engaging in violent jihad ("striving in the way of Allah") is for only a minority of Muslims - because if all Muslims were involved in warfare there would be a risk that the entire ummah and belief system could be destroyed. And it also means that Muslims can settle in non-Islamic places (hijra) - as Mohammed supposedly did in Medina - be accepted as peaceful, law-abiding, citizens as Islam gains strength there, and avoid being expelled. So the majority of Muslims are required to live their normal lives, whether in Islamic countries or elsewhere - but are required to support, in every way possible, the activities of the minority who engage in violent jihad. And, to advance the cause of Islam, they should incrementally increase their influence and power in the West, through demographic change, politics and "lawfare" e.g. supporting "hate" speech laws, lobbying for laws against blasphemy, and protesting against "Islamophobia", to prevent all honest scrutiny of Islamic practices, and debate regarding Islam.

As the power of Islam grows, Westernised Muslims are increasingly forced to submit to Islam. And some who appear to be Westernised Muslims often later willingly embrace Islam (as did Anjem Choudary), some becoming jihadis, for fear that hell awaits them because of their "sinful" Western ways. Islam teaches that all those who die "striving in the way of Allah" are forgiven all their sins, and instantly transported to the highest echelon of paradise - rather than having to wait, awake, in their graves to be judged at the end of time. Many people point to the fact that many jihadis were living dissolute "Western" lives just prior to committing terrorist acts as evidence that their acts are not connected to Islam, but those very lifestyles can motivate them to commit deadly attacks for the sake of Islam. People are often incredulous and sceptical about this - but the threat of hell, lingeringly and repeatedly described in the Koran, can be burnt into the minds of Muslims who read that book, and have as terrifying a reality to them as the threat of death for apostasy.

But as Dr Bill Warner has said, and many others have agreed, "The (real) problem is not jihad of the sword - it is shariah that annihilates civilisations." With our fast-expanding Islamic communities - and their short generations and high birth-rates (and shrinking birth-rates for non-Muslims) - and also the constant influx of Muslims from Islamic backgrounds overseas - it's not alarmist to speculate that, maybe a lot sooner than we think (because Islam prevails without a Muslim majority), we ourselves could face forced submission to Islam, along with genuinely Westernised Muslims. The Muslim Brotherhood is working to overturn freedom and democracy in the USA, exploiting the very democratic rights and institutions they intend to destroy - and we too could be conquered via the ballot box. Islamic political parties are emerging in Europe (one already in Britain, founded in 1989), and some Muslims are deserting secular Leftist parties, though those parties are still very useful to Islam at this stage. Islam is beginning to show its hand, and its muscle, as we are seeing with unofficial Shariah "zones", highly assertive public worship, and strident protests when Islamic mores clash with Western ones. The multicultural philosophy that prevailed for many years, and still lingers, allowed Islamic practices like forced and child marriage, FGM, polygamy, and the domestic abuse of women, all illegal under British law, to establish themselves here - and also facilitated the massive rape gang phenomenon (which overwhelmingly involves Muslims, and continues to this day). This has already claimed, over a period of more than 40 years, approximately half a million victims (many tortured and some killed), mostly underage girls and young women, usually white, but some Sikh and Hindu. Meanwhile, non-Muslims are

deemed "Islamophobic" for identifying the reality of Islamic abuses, and the Muslim block vote.

Truth-telling about Islam is stigmatised because of Islam's false association with race, simply because most Muslims happen to be non-white. As has been pointed out by a number of people, if a belief system with the tenets of Islam was that of a significant and growing section of the white European population it would be roundly condemned by the entire liberal elite, and its threat fully understood. Alarm bells would be loudly, publicly, sounding. But because of the racialisation of "progressive" thought, sadly much intensified by the advent of the Black Lives Matter protests this year, confusion, and a double standard (as identified by Melanie Phillips), prevail. The red-green alliance between Islam and the Left is well established, based on the principle that my enemy's enemy is my friend - temporarily. And although we have a Conservative government at present, all our institutions have been conquered by the long march, collectivist thinking prevails, and minorities are seen as victims, never the perpetrators, of oppression.

Our liberal elite is wilfully blind about the threat of Islam, and governments fail to face up to the issue. The All-Party Parliamentary Group on British Muslims produced a definition of the term Islamophobia which describes it as a "form of racism...rooted in racism", and seeks to protect all forms of "perceived Muslimness". It has been adopted by most of the main political parties and by many councils, and there is an intention to criminalise criticisms of either Islam or Muslims. It is noteworthy that Sir Mark Rowley, former Chair of the National Police Chiefs' Council Counter-Terrorism Coordination Committee, and National Lead for Counter Terrorism Policing, was among those who rejected the definition, and stated that he feared that it could impede counter-terror work. He added that we had adequate protections in law already for religious faiths. And it's also noteworthy that the Conservative party has so far resisted pressure to adopt and endorse the new definition. (The Scottish Conservative Party has however endorsed the definition.) Any move to do so needs to be vigorously opposed, and our government must be induced to face the imminent threat of Islamic conquest.

The speed of demographic change makes urgent action vital. We could face civil war if nothing is done to halt and reverse Islamisation. But there are measures which could make a huge difference to our future prospects. These could include greatly tightening our immigration and border controls and asylum and citizenship provisions; amending our Human Rights Act to prevent its exploitation by criminals and terrorists, and the Deport With Assurances arrangements obstructing deportations; restoring freedom of speech, and true equality under the law, by repealing "hate" speech and "hate" crime laws etc., and restoring impartiality to policing and courts; removing most religious exemptions under benefits regulations and all under animal welfare regulations; limiting access to most free health care and social housing to settled residents and citizens: segregating dangerous and threatening Islamic prisoners in prisons, and imposing much longer sentences for rapes and other violent crimes; deporting all those convicted of serious crimes, who have another nationality, immediately after release from prison; monitoring all mosques and Islamic schools scrupulously, and closing all those found to be involved in criminal activity immediately and permanently; strictly enforcing the civil registration of all Islamic marriages conducted here, and imposing severe prison sentences on any imams who conduct child marriages; removing all child wives from their illegal and abusive marriages, and prosecuting their "husbands"; identifying and prosecuting cases of FGM; banning Shariah tribunals and the burqa; and teaching all children the worth of British values and fundamental individual human rights, and their historical roots. And, above all, greatly increasing integration, especially of children. And ensuring that the writ of secular

law runs in all Muslim communities - and publicising and protecting the human rights of all women, children, gay people, apostates and critics of Islam. Not doing these things long ago, because of multiculturalism and accusations of racism, is why we are where we are. Absent intimidation and coercion, lots of Muslims will probably leave Islam (as many already do, sometimes at great cost and risk to themselves), or freely oppose Shariah. (With regard to the rape gangs, there are vastly too many perpetrators for it to be possible to send them all to prison. But it is possible to stop the gangs being able to operate, by means of good policing, and by ensuring that all children, including those in care, have proper care and protection.) These measures would greatly weaken the power of Islam, and discourage true-believing Muslims from living in Britain. But apart from such individual measures as listed above, it is essential that an honest, impartial and thorough public enquiry should be established to investigate all aspects of Islam, the Shariah, and Islamic human rights abuses, and publicly reveal the truth about that. On the basis of its results, a challenge could be mounted to Islam's protected status as a religion, because its human rights abuses mean that it doesn't meet the requirements of Article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights for protection as a religion. This issue has never been tested. And after publication of the results of the enquiry the government should make an announcement that, while freedom of individual belief will continue to be protected, and we are all free as individuals to hold and express any beliefs we wish (provided there is no coercion, intimidation or incitement to violence involved), they will be legislating to ensure that no political or legal aspects (including the Shariah) of any claimed faith will be permitted under British law or regulations. The announcement should spell out all the unacceptable aspects of Islam, and that any mosques or schools promoting or practicing such aspects of Islam will be shut down.

Naturally, there is absolutely no stomach at present among our craven political elite for such action and honesty. They are, at least publicly, in complete denial about the nature of Islam. Their fear prevents them from acknowledging the truth and taking action. And this is surely the reason why the government has decided not to release the whole, unredacted, text of the rape gang enquiry report, only a "summary" of its findings. (Dr Emma Hill, a rape gang victim, who was a significant contributor to the enquiry, has revealed that another contributor, consulted for her academic credentials and advice, warned against full release of the findings in case that caused an upsurge of hostility to Muslims.) Our political rulers seem to just hope that everything will somehow eventually come out in the wash, and that they can avoid, at all costs, having to deal with the threat of Islam on their watch. So they shoot the messenger, deploying the nonsense concept "Islamophobia". But there is no more time for delay. All those who know the truth must work urgently to increase the growing public awareness of it, and publicly confront all politicians with it before it's too late.

The way to achieve that is to focus unrelentingly on human rights, the very thing that must be defended, and which no non-Muslim opponent can decry or denounce with any moral credibility. Homer Simpson memorably said, "Alcohol, the cause of, and solution to, all life's problems.". By the same token, human rights are the cause of, and can be the answer to, the existential threat of Islam. Every human rights violation in Islam must be fully exposed. There is a mountain of opposition to the truth at this time, but evidence of Islam's fascistic nature is ever-growing, and must force the truth to be confronted.

Mary Andrew has studied the scriptures and history of Islam over a number of years, especially in relation to its political and legal aspects, and the Shariah code.