Assessing the Velocity, Scale, Volume, Intensity and “Creedal Congruence” of Immigrants in Setting a Nation’s Admissions Policy

David Barnhizer

Available at: https://works.bepress.com/david_barnhizer/101/
Assessing the Velocity, Scale, Volume, Intensity and “Creedal Congruence” of Immigrants in Setting a Nation’s Admissions Policy

David Barnhizer

Table of Contents

Death of the “Melting Pot”

The Rejection of Assimilation and the Rise of “Identity Sects”

Western Europe and the US Face Significant Challenges to Their Creeds and Cultures

The Radicalizing Search for Identity and Meaning

The Velocity, Scale and Difference of Migrant Entry Into Dissimilar Cultures

Assimilation Is Not Easy Under the Best of Circumstances

ISIS, al-Qaeda and The Old Man of the Mountain

What Are the Creedal Values For Which Western Nations Should Expect Commitment from Immigrants and Citizens?

“Warning! Do Not Approach!”

Beyond Non-Assimilation to Cultural Transformation

The Right to Preserve a “Cultural Ecosystem”

The Failure of Multiculturalism

Being Intolerant of the Intolerant

Conclusion and Suggestions
Death of the “Melting Pot”

America represents an attempt to “blend” disparate cultures and creeds through its idea of the “melting pot”. In that model the rich diversity of cultures came together in important ways to share a common set of ideals and understandings that transcended those of the “Old World”. John F. Kennedy wrote about the American “melting pot” in the following words:

What Alexis de Tocqueville saw in America was a society of immigrants, each of whom had begun life anew, on an equal footing. This was the secret of America: a nation of people with the fresh memory of old traditions who dared to explore new frontiers, people eager to build lives for themselves in a spacious society that did not restrict their freedom of choice and action.”1 He concludes: “Any great social movement leaves its mark, and the massive migration of peoples to the New World was no exception to this rule. The interaction of disparate cultures, the vehemence of the ideals that led the immigrants here, the opportunity offered by a new life, all gave America a flavor and a character that make it as unmistakable and as remarkable to people today as it was to Alexis de Tocqueville in the early part of the nineteenth century.2

These characteristics were often honored in the breach and we inevitably have fallen pitifully short, particularly when African ethnic minorities were involved as well as Asians and Latino-Hispanics. But on various occasions I have had new members of American society from a diverse range of countries observe with wonder about the openness of the system, its significant degree of tolerance compared with their countries of origin, and the fact that people actually do seem to “get along” and even change political power periodically without violence and revolution. A reasonable conclusion is that even with its tragic flaws there is something special about America’s culture and those of Western European democracies.

The Rejection of Assimilation and the Rise of “Identity Sects”

The expectation that there is a duty on the part of new entrants to seek to adapt and assimilate oneself into the host culture is under great stress. William Brannigan warned nearly two decades ago:

“[I]n the current immigration wave, something markedly different is happening here in the middle of the great American ‘melting pot.’ Not only are the demographics of the United States changing in profound and

---

1 John F. Kennedy, A Nation of Immigrants (Popular Books 1964), at 17, 18.
2 JFK, A Nation of Immigrants, id. For strongly voiced arguments pro and con, along with an excellent introductory overview of the statutory and policy discrimination that characterized American immigration for over a century, see, Nicolaus Mills, editor, Arguing Immigration: Are New Immigrants a Wealth of Diversity ... Or a Crushing Burden? (Touchstone 1994).
unprecedented ways, but so too are the very notions of assimilation and the melting pot that have been articles of faith in the American self-image for generations. E Pluribus Unum (From Many, One) remains the national motto, but there no longer seems to be a consensus about what that should mean. There is a sense that, especially as immigrant populations reach a critical mass in many communities, it is no longer the melting pot that is transforming them, but they who are transforming American society.”

The change is not limited to new immigrants where some of the entrants have no interest in assimilation. That is part of the concern but the fundamental ways in which we view ourselves in society are also changing—in many instances shifting to what has been called “cultural” as opposed to “liberal” democracy. John Fonte echoed Sidney Hook when he drew an important distinction between the long-held ideal of “liberal democracy” and the rise of a version described as “cultural democracy”. He observed: “Sidney Hook forcefully restated the liberal-democratic concept of civic assimilation, declaring that “precisely because” American liberal democracy is a “pluralistic, multiethnic, and uncoordinated society” all citizens need a “prolonged schooling in the history of our free society, its martyrlogy, and its national tradition.”

Fonte added: “Today, the traditional idea of assimilating immigrants into a national identity is … under constant attack by elites in the United States. The leading organization of American civic educators declares that national assimilation is often “neither democratic nor humane.” Suggestions that liberal-democratic regimes should limit immigration to levels consistent with steady civic assimilation are fiercely denounced as both impossible and immoral. Put bluntly, cultural democrats are saying that traditional liberal democracies do not have the moral right to reproduce themselves, either by fostering civic assimilation, by limiting immigration, or by some combination of the two.”

In explaining his position Fonte has argued: “In contrast to the philosophy of liberal democracy, which promotes equality of opportunity for individuals irrespective of race, ethnicity, and sex, the ideology of cultural democracy defines justice as achieving a particular result: proportional representation of cultural minorities and women in all sectors of society. … The U.S. Civil Rights Act of 1964 in its original form is a classic example of liberal-democratic thinking, whereas subsequent judicial and bureaucratic interpretations of the bill that established group rights represent cultural-democratic thinking.”

Note that this distinction applies not only to clusters of new immigrant “identity” groups but describes ways in which American identity and special interest clusters have organized themselves to generate maximum political leverage. The rise of

---


4 John Fonte “Upstream,” National Review, February 6, 1995. Agreement with the idea of cultural democracy can be found in, Peter Preston, “There is no such thing as community: The idea that society comprises homogenous groups is deluded,” The Guardian [online], 7/18/05.

5 John Fonte, id.

6 Fonte, id.
interests based on economics, race, gender and gender identity, religious sectarianism, anti-religion and so forth have created extreme factions and divisions that put us at each others’ throats and led to pervasive distrust that has spread throughout American society.

**Western Europe and the US Face Significant Challenges to Their Creeds and Cultures**

I confess at this early point in this analysis that I come down on John Fonte’s side of the argument, along with that of Alan Wolfe described below involving creidal congruence, as to the critical importance of insisting on the preservation of the American creed even as the culture itself undergoes changes. Western Europe faces the same dilemma. Western Europe and the US Face Significant Challenge to Their Creeds and Cultures The rising political storm over controls on immigration into Europe between more liberal political groups and ones that are seeking to defend what they consider to be vital national traditions and cultural interests holds true for the UK and nations of Western Europe as they struggle to deal with what some have described as an “invasion” of their countries from the Middle East and North Africa. Such groups attempting to resist widespread immigration, particularly from Islamic countries, have far too simplistically and smugly been labeled as bigots, racists, Islamophobes and so forth in an effort to negatively “frame” their efforts as a sort of Neanderthal resentment to a Cro-Magnon onslaught.

I just finished reviewing a news video involving an interview of supporters of something called the Sweden Democrats political party. My problem with the tone of the video, the interviewer’s obvious and smug assumptions and a number of the questions asked is that the “journalist” clearly prejudged the people and their motivations. She was unquestionably operating from the personal conclusion that it was racist and bigoted for anyone from a Western nation to be concerned about the large-scale infusion of people from cultures with extremely different values and beliefs. This kind of prejudgment is the “new normal” for all our social interactions and represents a type of pseudo-intellectual intolerance on the part of those who have arrogated to themselves a role as moral arbiters on the issues they hold most dear and “know” with total certainty that anyone who does not share those views is “stupid”, a bigot, “sadly misinformed”, racist, “on the wrong side of history”, etc. The pre-emptive strike “take out” and “framing” labels are modern propaganda devices in which many of those employing them actually

---

7 See, e.g., Mike Bird, “EU anti-immigrant parties on rise”, Nov. 19, 2015. http://www.businessinsider.in/Europes-anti-immigration-and-hard-right-parties-are-on-the-warpath/articleshow/49843744.cms. After remarking on the rise in anti-immigrant parties in Sweden and Germany, Bird adds: “Dutch polling likewise puts Geert Wilders' Party for Freedom not just in the lead for the next election (which must take place before March 2017), but 19 points clear of the next party. In the rest of Europe, it's a similar story. Austria's Freedom Party have drawn [even] or lead in every poll conducted for the last six months. Italy's regional hard-right Lega Nord's polling average is sitting at around 15%, after getting just 4.1% in the 2013 election.”

do not understand the lack of integrity in what they are doing and consider themselves as “paragons of virtue” fighting the good fight against the non-virtuous hordes.

The fairer reality in the immigration situation is that while some can be described as pathetic bigots, most people concerned about large-scale immigration, particularly those from Third World Islamic systems, are simply attempting to protect their cherished traditions, beliefs and cultures against the entry of radically different interest groups that increasingly appear unable or unwilling to try to become full participants in the host culture. If the situation were reversed and Westerners sought to take up residence in other nations with very different cultures, we have no difficulty understanding that they would have to assiduously avoid offending those hosts with their behaviors in a sort of “when in Rome” mentality or as a matter of basic “don’t offend your hosts” rules of etiquette. In my experience, many members of what can be called the Western intelligentsia consider non-Western cultures to possess a uniqueness and indigenousness that entitles them to protect the core of their beliefs and behaviors even if we might consider them less than ideal. In this extreme mindset it is the obligation, burden and duty of Western nations to take whatever is thrown at them and to tolerate behavior that is fundamentally at odds with their own core traditions.

Conversely, many of those who argue in favor of the large-scale admission of massive waves of immigrants with distinct values, behaviors and beliefs envision themselves as compassionate “one-world” leaders. In the minds of those who see themselves as compassionate globalists or multiculturalists, recognition of the uniqueness of other cultures and the legitimacy of according them the right to protect what they consider their essential nature is a one-way street. It does not extend to the longer-term residents of Western nations. As suggested above, those concerned citizens are considered xenophobes and bigots when seeking to preserve what they identify as their nation’s unique traits, values and belief systems. The multiculturalists have no difficulty with the fundamentally transformational changes inevitably imposed by multiculturalism and extreme diversity even when those systems mainly create transplanted “colonies” that occupy political and social space for their own advantage and profit while distorting the host culture. It is as if the British Raj in India or other European powers at the height of colonialism is being played out in reverse. While we might smirk and think something like “serves you right” the reality is that residents of Western nations today did not create colonies and it is unsurprising when they condemn their “enlightened” leaders when they act as if all the nation’s citizens bear post-colonial guilt to the extent they should be silent about radical and fundamental changes being engineered within their culture.

Alan Wolfe argued that the dispute is not about “culture” but about a nation’s national creed or set of fundamental principles and beliefs that transcends inevitably shifting

---

9 An example of this mindset is found in the analysis of Guardian columnists Roy Hattersley and George Monbiot. Normally I very much appreciate Monbiot’s thoughts but I obviously disagreement with the premise he asserts in this essay. George Monbiot, “The new chauvinism: I’m not ashamed of my nationality, but I have no idea why I should love this country more than any other,” Tuesday August 09 2005, The Guardian; Roy Hattersley, “End this chorus of intolerance: It is uncivilised to demand that Muslims abandon their way of life,” Friday August 12 2005, The Guardian.
cultural norms. Wolfe insists that new immigrants need to be committed to assimilation and to what Wolfe calls the *American creed*. He has argued: “it is not necessary to defend anything like a core culture to insist on the importance of assimilation; a core creed will suffice. A *national culture* is a way of life defined by one ethnic group or race, which demands that everyone else adapt to it.” 10 Wolfe then offers an important insight: “But a *national creed* is simply a set of ideas about what the United States should be – and is thus open to all, regardless of faith, ethnicity, or race. Creedal identity has been central to the greatness of the United States, allowing it to recharge its batteries by incorporating new immigrant groups at those times when Anglo-Protestant cultural elites were turning reactionary and defensive.”11 I will return to the idea of a cultural creed in a few pages because, like Wolfe, I consider it a pivotal element in setting immigration policy and expectations.

**The Radicalizing Search for Identity and Meaning**

Erich Fromm describes our search for identity in a faceless state in terms that apply to all forms of “true believing” including Islamic fundamentalism as well as Western democratic behavior. He explains that in a context that applies massive pressures to people who lack the grounding needed to cope with what might be referred to as “modernity” that: “the individual ceases to be himself; he adopts entirely the kind of personality offered to him by cultural patterns; and he therefore becomes exactly as all others are and as they expect him to be.”12 Fromm notes the consequence as being one where: “The discrepancy between “I” and the world disappears and with it the conscious fear of aloneness and powerlessness.” He continues: “The person who gives up his individual self and becomes an automaton, identical with millions of other automatons around him, need not feel alone and anxious any more. But the price he pays, however, is high; it is the loss of his self.”13

Other social philosophers have also lamented what they perceive as emptiness at the heart of humanity, arguing that it is caused in part by the enormous power, complexity, and contradictory forces of modern society.14 Walter Lippmann tells us

---

10 Alan Wolfe, while praising the integrity and clarity of Samuel Huntington’s earlier work, nonetheless is less than sanguine in reviewing Huntington’s Who Are We? Concluding it is “riddled with the same kind of moralistic passion – at times bordering on hysteria – that Huntington finds so troubling in American politics.” Alan Wolfe, “Native Son: Samuel Huntington Defends the Homeland,” *Foreign Affairs*, May/June 2004. See also, Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (1998). In a 1993 article presenting the themes of his later book, Huntington argues: “With the end of the Cold War, international politics moves out of its Western phase, and its centerpiece becomes the interaction between the West and non-Western civilizations and among non-Western civilizations. In the politics of civilizations, the peoples and governments of non-Western civilizations no longer remain the objects of history as targets of Western colonialism but join the West as movers and shapers of history.” *Foreign Affairs*, Summer 1993 (Council on Foreign Relations). Huntington also produced *Who Are We? The Challenges to America’s National Identity* (2004) where he voiced his concerns about the loss of American culture due to massive immigration.

11 Alan Wolfe, id.


that modern men “are, as Karl Jaspers says, men dissolved into “an anonymous mass” because they are “without an authentic world, without provenance or roots,” without, that is to say, belief and faith that they can live by.” 15 This sense of emptiness and its effects on Western culture has been unfolding for considerably more than a generation and we only have to look at Marxist-Leninism, Nazism and Fascism to gain a sense of how we have become vulnerable to unthinking and manipulative mass movements.

Those obvious examples are only the tip of the iceberg as our societies have all fallen victim to propaganda-skilled demagogues who “tell it like it is” and give us meaning and something to believe in without having to make the difficult existential choice of trying to figure things out ourselves. Albert Schweitzer described what we face when he argued: “no historical analogy can tell us much. The past has, no doubt, seen the struggle of the free-thinking individual against the fettered spirit of a whole society, but the problem has never presented itself on the scale on which it does to-day, because the fettering of the collective spirit ... by modern organizations, [by] modern unreflectiveness, and [by] modern popular passions, is a phenomenon without precedent in history.” 16

Other than with sports teams and music venues I must confess that chanting mobs, whether religious or otherwise, and the submergence of self into a mass of totally unified behavior leave me with an impression of the kind Fromm describes. Simply cheering for one’s favorite sports team may involve unified behavior, but organizing into an aggressive “hive” that not only controls its members’ behavior but seeks to compel everyone in a society to think and believe the same, or at least behave as if they do, is something obscenely offensive to me. Nonetheless, the “mob mentality” lies at the heart of the need to belong to something larger and supposedly more meaningful than one’s existential and individualized self. Unfortunately, it is the need for meaning and identity that makes us vulnerable to “prophets” and false prophets who remove fear and self-doubt in exchange for blind obedience.

What we are dealing with is the birth of a “gang culture”. In Extremist Groups in America Susan Lang discussed racism, the Ku Klux Klan, the “Identity Movement,” the Far Right religious groups, Neo-Nazis and Skinheads, Lewis Farrakhan and the Far Left. 17 Compare the angry Muslim youth of Britain, France, Germany and other Western European nations with Lang’s description of skinheads in the 1980s. She explains: “Like many adolescents, skins are bored kids who feel estranged from their parents and school. Feeling downtrodden, picked on, and misunderstood, they hang around waiting for something to do, somewhere to belong. Hungry for an identity to cling to and desperate for peer approval, they defiantly join a gang of tough kids, and thus teenage hatemongers are born. As they learn to be meaner and tougher, they start to feel important.

15 WALTER LIPPMANN, THE PUBLIC PHILOSOPHY 87 (Mentor 1956).
17 Susan S. Lang, Extremist Groups in America 92, 93 (Franklin Watts 1990).
According to the *Detroit Free Press* (November 19, 1987) the gang [whether it be the Crips, Hell’s Angels, al-Qaeda or ISIS]: “gives them a target for their anger: Jews, blacks and other minorities, who they believe have robbed them of their rightful, dominant place in the world. It pumps them up with a sense of power they lack. They are transformed from cast-offs into heroes, ready to defend the country from ‘intruders.’” This in itself is not surprising because the lost souls found among the young of any culture, including the followers of Islam, are vulnerable to “wise” and powerful voices that offer them an unquestionable system of structured belief at the point they are experiencing the adolescent existential despair that afflicts many of us while growing up.

A part of the problem underlying radicalization into powerfully articulated belief systems that must be defended at all costs is that we are in a historical moment in which an emptiness of spirit has made many people vulnerable to destructive ideologues skilled at describing the world in simplistic terms with great oratorical power. Rather than eagerly engaging in the existential process where we are each responsible for developing our selves to the highest possible level of insight we have become puppets manipulated by demagogic masters. They pay us with the “coin” of false promises and an ephemeral certainty that takes away our fear of the dark and meaninglessness that we suspect lies at the core of our existence. Many people will do almost anything to be free of the fear of meaninglessness and have their existence defined as being of worth. Some people will, in fact, do anything as with suicide bombers who have become only one “cell” in a “body” and lack any individual identity after being submerged into a group entity.

What we face is a relatively unique moment in history, but since demagogues have always been present it is unique only because of the tools and weaponry involved and the ability to reach out and project one’s anger and hatred far beyond the physical limits that have characterized past contexts. The technologies of weaponry, information and communication capabilities, marketing sophistication, propaganda and transportation have altered the “game”. Contrary to events that were at least as vicious but that remained “local” to the extent we were not even aware of their occurrence, ideologues, maniacs and murderers can now create havoc on a larger scale and reach almost anywhere.

While we might hope that facts, truth and a sense of proportion could be created by a “free” press that institution has become an untrustworthy set of “ratings whores” hyping whatever can be sensationalized for purposes of corporate profit and ego. The instantaneous reproduction of horror by a globalized news media addicted to the broadcasting of tragedy while hiding behind somber visages and crocodile tears and salivating at ratings coups adds a level of propaganda never before possible. This ability to project their actions into our consciousness through the immediate and relentless drumbeats of news reporters is a powerful weapon. This is because groups such as ISIS can now appear to be of a scale far beyond their actual operational ability. But our sensationalizing media are also a powerful magnet attracting fanatics because the murderers are fully aware they can now project themselves globally. This produces recruits, generates fear among people who are identified as potential targets and creates the sense that they are powerful as opposed to maniacal. Barack Obama summed the
media aspect up succinctly when asked about ISIS. Rather than praise their overblown global capability he responded: “They're a bunch of killers with good social media.”

My conclusion is that at this point we should conclude that the “dream” of the Enlightenment is dead. The belief that humans could strip away the “clouds of unknowing” through education and become almost godlike and fully developed beings able to manifest what was thought to be there inherent natural goodness of spirit has succumbed to the superficiality of being and collectivization Albert Schweitzer described. The Internet and its communications technologies, one of history’s most incredible discoveries and one we thought would empower us for good, has been converted to a tool for terrorism. On it we see malicious anonymous attacks, and the revealing of just how dark the souls of humans can be when freed of accountability and granted the ability to discover there are others just as depraved.

**The Velocity, Scale and Difference of Migrant Entry Into Dissimilar Cultures**

\[
SI = V + SV + I + CC
\]

While America faces important issues with large scale immigration, those issues pale in relation to those confronting the nations of Western Europe and the United Kingdom. Even before the massive immigrant movement triggered by civil wars in the Middle East and Africa, Europe has found itself home to a rising tide of immigrants whose creeds and religious belief systems are radically different and even contradictory to those of the countries in which it can be said they are establishing “colonies”.  That tide of immigrants has now risen to a “flood crest” that is threatening to overwhelm Western democracies in ways that they have never previously experienced. This is particularly the case with the expansion of the numbers of Muslim immigrants and refugees whose cultural experiences, beliefs and value systems are radically distinct from those of European democracies and whose religious and cultural behaviors can fairly be described as separatist and collectivist in ways that exclude others. As those numbers continue to rise it can be said that we are experiencing a process best described as “reverse colonization”.

As a general matter the potential impacts of immigration can be examined in light of a formula that accounts for its velocity, scale, intensity and creedal congruence. We can, for example, construct a formulation that might look like \(SI = V + SV + I + CC\). This represents the idea that *Systemic Impact* (SI) equals the *Velocity* (V) of migrant inflow plus the *Scale or Volume* (SV) plus the organized *Intensity* (I) of the new entrants plus the *Creedal Congruence* (CC) of the potential entrants based on the likelihood that they are closed to or will go so far as to reject the core values of the host system.

---

18 "Obama vows not to relent against Isis, 'a bunch of killers with good social media'."

I am completely uncertain about how this should play out but can figure out that if a society allows a disproportionately large number of “alien” stimuli into a controlled environment relative to its “absorptive” capacity it will alter that environment. If a nation wants to do that it is its own business, assuming that it consults its citizens and obtains their consent to take actions that alter their lives and impose significant costs and consequences of a kind that need to be openly and honestly debated in a democracy. Failing to fully engage the full range of a nation’s citizens in considering actions that are likely to create extremely significant consequences and costs capable of transforming the country itself as well as in some instances offering the potential for considerable social benefits makes the decisions of leaders such as Angela Merkel illegitimate. A nation’s citizenry has the right to be fully consulted in a situation that goes beyond a mere delegation of political authority in ordinary moments and instead goes to the fundamental core of culture and belief.

Factors that could help illuminate a nation’s sense of the pace, scale and legitimate expectations that might be part of a debate over its immigration policies include the following taking into account a variety of characteristics depending on the specific country and situation. These include:

1. The proportion of existing Islamic population relative to a country’s non-Islamic citizens.
2. The total national population.
3. The length of time over which the Islamic immigrants came to the country.
4. The extent to which the immigrants have sought to become part of the nation and culture.
5. The degree to which a significant segment of the immigrant population affirmatively rejects the values of the new culture.
6. The concentration and location of the Islamic population, i.e., have they spread out into numerous venues or concentrated in specific locations.
7. The length of time the Islamic population has lived in the traditionally non-Islamic culture.
8. The character of the rural and smaller cities in the country.
9. The degree to which the new host country was a colonial occupier of an Islamic region.
10. The newness of Islam within the traditionally non-Islamic culture.
11. The extent of assimilation between the non-Islamic and Islamic cultures.
12. The nature and purpose of Islamic imams and radical advocates and recruiters.
13. The radicalization potential within mosques and “condensed” neighborhoods into which the immigrants flow.
14. The radicalization potential within the host country’s universities.
15. The degree to which separate religious schools exist and the degree to which they advance militant fundamentalist orientations.
16. The extent of “liberal” politics in the host nation whereby fundamentalist militant ideology is permitted to be advanced as part of religious “freedom”.
17. The degree to which a host nation’s immigration laws allow liberal entry into the country.
18. Asylum and deportation laws and policies.

At the heart of this discussion is the issue of whether nations and citizens within those nations who may or may not agree with the political leaders have the right--without being excoriated as bigoted or inhumane--to take action to mitigate the effects of radically different external creeds whose rapid and large-scale entry into the host paradigm includes many who reject a nation’s creedal norms. This concern has been with the EU countries for more than a decade but it has reached increasingly intense levels with the massive and as-yet uncontrolled invasion of Western Europe by migrants and refugees from Middle Eastern countries with nearly all those migrants Islamic. For any nation the issue becomes particularly important when the proportion of new entrants reaches a significant enough level that it leads to a critical mass of new immigrants capable of generating severe internal tensions due to the clash of radically dissimilar cultural beliefs.

Consider, for example, the distinction between individual freedom and total allegiance to authoritarian “voices” that direct the actions of believers. It has been said that members of the Muslim Brotherhood take an oath to of absolute obedience to its leader Mohamed Badie. That mindset cannot fit within the conditions of a Western democracy, at least as they have been conceived prior to this moment. Americans, for example, do not take “marching orders” except now our political representatives follow the dictates of Mitch McConnell, Harry Reid, Nancy Pelosi, Paul Ryan and the Republican and Democratic national committees that are now playing according to the identity sect “tunes” of committed ideologues interested only in achieving their own agendas.

The right to protect the host culture would presumably include submerging demands by new entrants that fundamental changes be made to accommodate their incompatible creedal beliefs, cultures and values. Although the effort appears to have failed on important levels, over the past decade France has sought to create among Islamic imams living in that nation an understanding of its laws and traditions. Ten years ago this included a “call by the French government for imams to undergo university training in civil law, history, language and culture [and was seen as] an important moment for Europe's faltering attempts to try to engage with its Muslim citizens.”

Following the recent Paris murders by ISIS the leader of Muslim clergy in the region indicated support for a military campaign aimed at destroying ISIS. Christiane Amanpour reports that: “Expressing outrage at ISIS’ perversion of his religion, the chairman of the Grand Mosque of Paris called on Thursday for military action against the group's stronghold in Syria. "America doesn't want to, can't send men after Iraq, after Afghanistan — no longer wants to send men to Syria," Dalil Boubakeur said in French.

---


“And yet it is necessary, only soldiers taking back territory is the way to push them back.” “You’re saying,” Amanpour responded, “that you have to send armies to occupy the land that they hold?” [He responded] “It is necessary, it is necessary. It is absolutely necessary. Because all they will do is advance in the countries where they set up and terrorize people, force them to flee elsewhere. So those countries are empty for them to occupy and make their people stronger and stronger, more and more aggressive, and more and more armed.” 22

Boubakeur also admitted that: “Little by little,” he admitted, the group has been able to radicalize the thinking of young Muslims in Europe.” The importance of such admissions is that it reveals once again that the problem is not only one of barring new immigrants to Europe, the UK, the US, Canada or Australia but a potentially more severe threat produced by immigrants already in those countries, some even second generation.23 All Western nations now face the reality of homegrown terrorists and the problem will increase dramatically as those who have sneaked out of the UK, France, Germany, Sweden, the Netherlands, Italy and the US return with murder on their minds.24

Assimilation Is Not Easy Under the Best of Circumstances

Assimilation has always been an uneasy path for new entrants even when they actively seek full entry into the society in the utmost good faith.25 It is an even more challenging process for immigrants from fundamentally different cultures. The racism, ethnic and class discrimination and religious bias that typically act as a source of “friction” that


23 "Paris Grand Mosque chairman backs fight against ISIS", id. See also, See, e.g., Associated Press, "Terrorists Trying to Recruit U.S. Residents Is Latest Challenge, U.S. Says”, September 23, 2010. "Groups affiliated with Al Qaeda are now actively targeting the United States and looking to use Americans or Westerners who are able to remain undetected by heightened security measures," FBI Director Robert Mueller told the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee. It appears that "domestic radicalization and homegrown extremism" is becoming more pronounced, Mueller said.; William Pfaff, “A monster of our own making: These British bombers are a consequence of a misguided and catastrophic pursuit of multiculturalism,” Sunday, August 21, 2005, The Observer [online].

24 A report in London’s Telegraph indicates what Western nations face. See, "Secret cell of British Muslim women encouraging others to join Islamic State exposed”. “The group holds clandestine, invite-only meetings in back rooms where members show their support for the terror group”. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/islamic-state/12012683/Secret-cell-of-British-Muslim-women-encouraging-other-to-join-Islamposed.html.

25 See, e.g., Jason Burke, “The violence that lies in every ideology: Like most beliefs, Islam is a religion of peace that has to accept it can also breed terror,” The Observer [online], Sunday, July 17, 05; Patrick Barkham, “Journey through Britain’s Muslim divide: On the bombers’ route between London and Leeds, Patrick Barkham finds communities riven by a generation gap,” Guardian, July 16, 05; Vikram Dodd, “Crackdown on elusive extremists: Even with new measures, it will not be easy to root out those who back terrorism,” Guardian, July 15, 05; James Brandon, “A defiant Islam rises among young Britons,” Christian Science Monitor, July 28, 05; Anthony King, “One in four Muslims sympathises with motives of terrorists,” News.telegraph, July 28, 05; Ziauddin Sardar, “The struggle for Islam's soul: While most Muslims abhor violence, some terrorists are a product of a specific mindset with deep roots in Islamic history. If Muslims everywhere refuse to confront this, we will all be prey to more terror,” Toronto Star (Star.com) July 22, 05; Mundher al-Adhami, “Not hate, vengeance,” Guardian, July 16, 05; Salma Yaqoob, “Our leaders must speak up: Failure to oppose the official line creates extremists,” Guardian, July 15, 05; Dan Murphy, “Can Islam’s leaders reach its radicals?” Christian Science Monitor, July 14, 05
slows assimilation for a generation or more are factors about which we should feel shame.  

Part of the equation relates to the degree to which the host culture is a reasonably coherent system with recognizable traditions, values and a creed of appropriate behavior including understood civic duties, obligations and entitlements. An important part of this calculus involves the issue of the desire of new migrants to assimilate and whether new entrants seek to become part of their new community as it is more or less traditionally defined by its long-term residents and over time, or whether they are seeking to acquire rights and benefits without any corresponding sense of obligation and duty to contribute to the strength of the new host culture. Wanting a better life through economic opportunity is understandable but in itself does not provide an automatic right to admission into another nation as community without being willing to respect that community and work to become a contributing part. A central issue in the process is acceptance of what can be called the duty of assimilation versus rejection of the obligation to work to become part of the host community.

Nonetheless, in America at least, there has been a substantial degree of acceptance of “the other” and assimilation over time, although it would be dishonest to claim that acceptance has spread equally to include blacks, Latinos and Asians or that Irish, Italians, Catholics, Jews and other non-WASPish groups were treated with the same degree of tolerance as were the White Anglo Saxon Protestants who dominated the political and social structures of America. But there has still been a degree of seeking to realize the ideal that has provided the system’s foundation and relative openness even with its hypocritical flaws and inadequacies. The reversal of the ideal of assimilation that is now occurring alters the social equation dramatically and the separatism that the rejection of assimilation engenders has created rifts that have undermined the core ethos of Western societies.

Until now it has been the case that, although new entrants are transplanted into a radically different world with dramatically different rules and expectations, they have accepted that a condition of their entry, at least in relation to America, is the clear expectation that the newcomers embrace their adopted country. This has happened in many instances and in prior waves of immigration with Europeans, Asians and Hispanics. Obviously, how blacks have been treated occupies a different context in which we struggle to cope with a shameful and tragic history of oppression. There has been significant progress even during the period of my life but the challenge has not been fully met, nor have the
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26 On this issue of assimilation and multiculturalism, see, Kenan Malik, “Terrorism has come about in assimilationist France and also in multicultural Britain. Why is that?” http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/nov/15/multiculturalism-assimilation-britain-france.

27 Jonathan Freedland, “The identity vacuum: Britain should follow the US approach to citizenship, which emphasizes not only diversity but the ties that bind,” Guardian, 8/3/05.

28 Judson Berger, “Free Speech Concerns Ahead of Meeting With Muslim Nations on Religious Tolerance,” November 11, 2011, FoxNews.com. Berger writes: “A looming meeting with Islamic leaders hosted by the State Department has religious scholars and advocacy groups warning that the United States may “play into” the push by some Islamic nations to create new laws to stifle religious criticism and debate.”
methods by which we try to overcome the consequences of racism been necessarily the most effective ways of going at our national “Gordian Knot”.

We have also seen that even when people seek assimilation in total good faith, their adaptation and their acceptance by the society in which they represent a new element only occurs over a lengthy period of time. Given the reality of our delayed absorption of the “differences” of the “Other” that two-sided delay is to be expected even if not justified in relation to how we ought to treat each other. In Europe particularly there seems to have been a “short circuit” in the assimilation of a substantial number of Muslim immigrants even when those immigrants have sought to assimilate to a significant degree. Nor should it be thought that most immigrants fail to try to fit into the new culture they are entering. Part of the “friction” obstructing both acceptance and assimilation is attributable to the extreme “difference” that new migrants represent in the sense that their beliefs and appearance are fundamentally at odds with that to which Western systems are accustomed.

But in too many instances involving some immigrants from Muslim cultures there has been an unwillingness to become a real part of the host cultures of Western nations on the host nation’s terms. This has been exacerbated by the rise of militant Islam and the military conflicts in the Middle East and significant parts of Africa between Western nations and Islamic militants and the internal struggles for power in places such as Yemen, Mali, the Sudan, Somalia and Nigeria between Muslim and non-Muslim actors. A result of the conflicts and the tribal and sectarian tensions they create not only in the primary locations where fighting occurs but in Western European nations with large-scale Muslim residents has been the creation of enclaves and some sub-cultures that are not only unwilling to incorporate non-Islamic values and behaviors, but affirmatively reject those values.

As I suggested above, part of the problem with the length of the process of full assimilation, even if that assimilation does eventually occur, is not only the attitudes or differences of new immigrants but the resentment and fear on the part of the host community. This is a natural and inevitable fact of human societies. Many of the longer-term members of the host society into which the new entrants come take time to accept and incorporate the “different” entrants. This is because to them they represent what is seen as a direct threat, or generate the fear of “The Other” that most people feel when confronting individuals and groups they see as different.

That resentment or fear is heightened when a culture is tasked with accepting significant numbers of new entrants who are radically different in appearance and beliefs. For many in Western Europe Muslims from highly conservative Islamic cultures with mosques, imams, beards, burqas, hijabs and radicalizing figures represent a “difference” a “bit too far” for many long-term residents of Western democratic cultures. One commenter on a Guardian article describing the changing attitudes toward Muslims in Europe argues that assimilation may be an impossible dream. The individual suggests:

29 Abdelkader Benali, “I migrated to Europe with hope. Now I feel nothing but dread. As the Dutch ban the burqa, one of Holland's leading writers mourns the passing of a welcoming continent,” Guardian, Comment, October 3, 2010.
“[A]ny society, whether Holland, Morocco or elsewhere, and no matter how tolerant, still today maintain their local/national characteristics and, unfortunately, their prejudices. Assimilation has always been the best course for immigrants, but do muslim immigrants really want to assimilate into European societies? If, as is possibly the case for muslims in western Europe, the religion and traditions of the immigrant are clearly at odds with the mores and outlook of the society which they enter, then assimilation is difficult and tensions are inevitable. The fact remains, though it may pain us to say, many of us in Europe cannot and will never accept much of the traditions we associate with our muslim communities... the burka and diminution of women's lives, forced marriages, sharia law and so on. Assimilation is unlikely as long as such traditions are so at odds with European traditions.”

Another commenter added concerns that may be unfortunate but neither surprising or entirely inaccurate.

“If there is one thing Al queda and militant Islam has certainly achieved, It's killing the non muslim worlds enthusiasm for muslim immigration. If you have members of an immigrant group who are waging war against the population of countries that let them in, well, eventually there is going to be a backlash against the immigrant community they are hiding amongst. Self preservation will ultimately trump political correctness. No one can be certain someone who practices Islam isnt one day going to decide that violent jihad is the way. Because of this people will eventually decide muslim immigration just isnt worth the trouble. There are plenty of non muslims willing to immigrate, so why seed your country with potentially murderous fundamentalists if you dont have to. This might be unfair, but it shouldnt be surprising.”

To some extent, the duty to seek or facilitate assimilation is a two way street involving biases on both sides. Many of those biases are contemptible, including racism and ethnic arrogance as in, you are a “Paki” or conversely—if you are not a Muslim--that you are an “infidel”. But at a minimum in the “render unto Caesar” dimension it is the right of the host culture to expect and even demand that new residents who seek to partake of the advantages of the system dedicate themselves to the creeds of the primary host community, or remain in their own national, ethnic or religious context in which their beliefs and behaviors dominate. A long-term political community has the right to expect that allegiance whether we are intending a Western democracy or Islamic theocracy.

30 The article on which the comment is offered is, Abdelkader Benali, “I migrated to Europe with hope. Now I feel nothing but dread. As the Dutch ban the burqa, one of Holland's leading writers mourns the passing of a welcoming continent,” The Guardian, Comment, October 3, 2010. Comment by aurlius, 3 October 2010 2:39AM.
31 Reply to Abdelkader Benali: yesyesnoyes, 3 October 2010 1:41AM.
If, as Hobbes warned, the overly rigid belief that God sets a pattern of divine laws to
guide our behavior and regulate political community creates a difficulty for a more or less
democratic society, the “death of God” trumpeted by the Enlightenment creates another
dilemma. A fully secular conception of society in which laws are based solely on the
power of humans to make choices of law without some strong source of external or
divine authority such as natural law or divine inspiration has resulted in a system in
which humans lack deep principles of a kind sufficient to guide their judgments. Rather
than creating the opportunity for an “Existential Blossoming” that condition has made
many humans vulnerable and weak—easy prey for the demagogues.

The problem is as Daniel Boorstin concludes: “The discovery, or even the belief that man
could make his own laws, was burdensome…. [N]early every man knew in his own heart
the vagueness of his own knowledge and the uncertainty of his own wisdom about his
society. Scrupulous men were troubled to think that their society was governed by a
wisdom no greater than their own.” 32 With this as our cultural context, a large part of the
West’s intelligentsia have not only lost their spiritual core but sought to do away with the
sustaining power of religious faith even though the system’s core values and creeds were
derived from a combination of Judeo-Christian and Aristotelian beliefs and concepts. A
result is that the West has been floundering for several generations and this makes it
vulnerable to a system in which others are radicalized true believers committed to the
demise of a Western culture they ironically consider evil and a threat to their own system
of belief.

**ISIS, al-Qaeda and The Old Man of the Mountain**

*Islamo-Realism* is not the same as *Islamophobia*. The conflict between Judeo-Christian
based systems and Islamic systems is not new. There is undeniably a clash between
Judeo-Christianity and Islamic systems although as a general rule it is most obvious in
Western nations since Islamic theocracies repress, persecute or forbid the establishment
of Christian churches and often ban any public display of Christian worship. Regardless
of carefully worded politically correct attempts to deny the long-term tensions between
Christianity and Islam it still exists and has persisted in various forms and degrees of
intensity for well over 1000 years. There is an irony in that the “Crusader” epithet
popularly voiced by some Muslims against the West applies to the historical forces of
Islam. There was deep penetration into Europe by Islamic forces before and after the
Crusades and invasions of Muslim countries by Western powers initially driven by the
Catholic Church and more recently by the relative disparity in power of Western nations
in contrast to Muslim countries that have lagged behind their Western counterparts in
economic and military power.

Kenneth Clark captures the historical context of the initial surge by Islam as it sought to
conquer Europe after rapidly spreading throughout Northern Africa and the Middle East.
He explains in language that also helps to explain the fanatical power of Islam today and
reasons why the West is having such a difficult time responding. Clark observes:
“Civilisation might have drifted downstream for a long time, but in the middle of the

32 Daniel Boorstin, *The Decline of Radicalism* 74 (1963)
seventh century there appeared a new force, with faith, energy, a will to conquer and an alternative culture: Islam. The strength of Islam was its simplicity. The early Christian Church had dissipated its strength by theological controversies, carried on for three centuries with incredible violence and ingenuity. But Mahomet, the prophet of Islam, preached the simplest doctrine that has ever gained acceptance; and it gave to his followers the invincible solidarity that had once directed the Roman legions. In a miraculously short time – about fifty years – the classical world was overrun. 

It was not until the eleventh century that the Saracen invasions of Europe were thrown back. Subsequent to that Europe also experienced significant invasions by the Muslim Ottoman Empire that lasted until at least 1583 when Islamic forces retreated from the gates of Vienna. This back and forth conflict spanning centuries has been reborn and while there are many of the Muslim faith who are entirely willing to be full partners as residents and citizens of the West, there is and will remain a substantial portion of Islam for whom the West, its faith, creed and culture are seen as intrinsically evil and a threat to Islam. The fact that perhaps as little as five or ten percent of Muslims fit into the category of implacable enemy either through direct violence or through financial and strategic support does nothing to lessen the threat posed by a fanatical and murderous set of actors for whom anything is justified against infidels (non-Muslims) and heretics (any Muslim who does not accept the fanatics’ version of Islam).

The result is that we are confronted by a new invasion operating both from within and from beyond the national borders of Western Europe and America. Part of the invasion is overt warfare while a significant element involves “stealth” strategies similar to the creation of “Fifth Columns” of supporters within Western societies. ISIS and al-Qaeda, in fact, can be compared to the subversive terrorist strategies used by The Old Man of the Mountain and it is advisable that we understand that fact sooner rather than later. The world has returned to the time of the hashashin (assassins), of The Old Man of the Mountain, and of a world filled with infiltrators and murderers who are being called terrorists. Hashashin is the source of “assassin”. Just as The Old Man of the Mountain sat in his lair like a spider and puppet master and sent his assassins out to kill, modern hashashin operating in loosely coordinated cells plot attacks against their enemies.

The Old Man of the Mountain was Hassan-ibn-Sabbah, who in the Eleventh Century created an Islamic sect viewed as heretics by other Muslims. While the assassins represent only a dark and corrupted fragment of Islam it is one that has been present in Islam for much of its history. As is occurring today, Hassan’s followers honored his orders even when the obvious outcome was their own deaths. The Old Man’s assassins were sent out on missions to kill those who opposed him, including political and military leaders. The hashashin infiltrated the target community in roles such as trades people or soldiers, then lay in wait for the opportunity to carry out their assignments. The name Hashishin allegedly came from their use of hashish presumably to produce visions of the paradise to which they expected to be transported or to generate courage in the face of impending death. Faced with forcible resistance to his methods, Hassan-ibn-Sabbah
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retreated to the mountain fortress of Alamout. He is said to have lived to an old age, supposedly dying in 1124. In the 13th century Genghis Khan sent an army to capture Alamout and destroyed the Assassins.

It is said that, “the Assassins changed the original Isma’ili doctrine, so that terrorism became a religious duty.” 35 The same distortion is being done by the heresy of murderers such as al-Qaeda and ISIS and their supporters and “fellow travelers”. While the result is no more legitimate than that of the Old Man, or the auto-da-fes of the Spanish Inquisition that was a vile corruption against the true meaning of Christianity, that does nothing to stem the power of the movements. Ours has become an age of fanatics more than one of wisdom and insight.

Throughout history religious fanatics have been able to attract followers who mindlessly follow their dictates. The fact that reason, textual analysis of the Bible or Qur’an, and logic can demonstrate that the fanatics’ arguments are corruptions of the religion’s core beliefs is entirely irrelevant because the claim to faith is a path to power, not to God or Allah. Irrationality, ignorance and the thirst for power that creates identity and meaning for those who control others because it provides what they could never obtain by themselves rule the day, not wisdom, tolerance and compassion. The fact that evil done in the name of God remains evil in the eyes of God—whether Jehovah, Yahweh or Allah, for they are simply manifestations of the same—is of no consequence to zealots and fanatics whose only identity is forged through hatred and power over others.36 In fact once they have embarked on that path the intensity that underlies their behavior is increased because they can never afford to experience the true reality of their heresy and blasphemy.

In our era, the Mongols who destroyed the original Assassins’ network must be replaced by the leadership of Arab nations operating with strong support from Western nations. Even though the West is being attacked with increasing regularity this conflict cannot be seen as one primarily between the West and Muslims defined as one between Islam and Christianity. Although the Arab countries tend strongly toward corruption and abuse of power their governments are under as much threat from the jihadists as is the West. As with some within the Saudi power structure who were complicit in the 9/11 attacks and apparently hoped that they will avoid the fanaticism of the zealots through finance and looking the other way while the militants launched guerrilla attacks on Western targets, it is a deluded hope. Although that mindset is an illusion it demonstrates the viciousness and the weakness of many Arab governments and power brokers.

Nonetheless, no strategy to destroy ISIS and its like such as al-Qaeda can succeed without substantial participation by Arab-Muslim regimes who will be acting in their own interest more than that of the West. Anyone who thinks any Arab-Muslim regime is our friend rather than an ally acting entirely in its own interests is a fool. Similarly, any Arab

36 Some may see parallels with our current situation. See, Rick Davis, Philosophy Today, 2005 (online) http://www.philosophynow.org/archive/articles/00lewis.htm, 8/16/05.
regime that thinks we care about them other than as strategic partners would be equally idiotic. The relationships are ones of calculated strategic convenience, not ones of respect.

**What Are the Creedal Values For Which Western Nations Should Expect Commitment from Immigrants and Citizens?**

Recent European immigration policy has been based on a sense that diversity is highly desirable; that the nations of Europe have no right to claim any special status, and that there is nothing of a culturally unique character in Western societies worth protecting. There is also a substantial “guilt and atonement complex” operating among Europe’s liberal/left intelligentsia for its history of colonial rule and the exploitations, enslavements and cultural arrogance that characterized that colonial history.

The extent to which Europe succumbed to the massive wave of migrants with values that often rejected the beliefs, creeds and values of European civilization was demonstrated dramatically in the case of Italian journalist Orianna Fallaci. Following the 9/11 tragedy Fallaci authored several books relating to the collision between the Islamic and Western worlds. The widespread popularity of these books, reflected by sales of over a million copies, indicates a substantial degree of public interest in the issues she addressed. In *The Force of Reason* Fallaci criticized Europeans for surrendering their culture to the “sons of Allah.” Among her comments deemed most offensive were: “Europe is no longer Europe, it is ‘Eurabia,’ a colony of Islam, where the Islamic invasion does not proceed only in a physical sense, but also in a mental and cultural sense. Servility to the invaders has poisoned democracy, with obvious consequences for the freedom of thought, and for the concept itself of liberty.”

Fallaci also warned: “You cannot survive if you do not know the past. We know why all the other civilizations have collapsed--from an excess of welfare, of richness, and from lack of morality, of spirituality.” ..... “The moment you give up your principles, and your values ... the moment you laugh at those principles, and those values, you are dead, your culture is dead, your civilization is dead. Period.” Fallaci was quickly indicted under the Italian penal code for the crime of “vilifying” religion.

Serge Trifkovic writes that: “Twenty years ago, there were voices in the West – even eminently enlightened, anti-racist, post-nationalist, liberal voices – raising concerns and wondering what sense is there in respecting those [conservative Muslims] who don’t respect us, what sense is there in defending their culture when they scorn ours. The reaction back then was the same as today. When Italian writer Oriana Fallaci declared ‘I want to defend ours and I am informing you that I prefer Dante to Omar Khayam,’ the sky came crashing down. They crucified her: ‘Racist! Racist!’ And she was a color-blind, ultra-tolerant, diversity-conscious Leftist! Lesser brave souls naturally preferred to remain silent.” Oddly enough, her main accuser—a Muslim—was himself indicted
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for calling the Roman Catholic Church a “criminal organization” and also sought to have crucifixes removed from Italian hospital rooms because it was an offense to Islam.  

This brings us to the question of whether a nation or its people have the right to protect its sense of what comprises its national culture. If so, is it proper to take actions to inculcate the tenets of that cultural system and even decide to deny admission to people who reject those values? The proposal that former Prime Minister Tony Blair made following the July 2005 London bombings that immigrants be required to learn and understand the conditions of “Britishness” as part of the social compact they are submitting to when living in Great Britain reflects that belief. Blair was asserting the UK does have the right to ask citizens and permanent residents to accept British values. The same type of perspective is represented in the London Daily Telegraph’s listing of Ten Core Values that it argues makes up the British system of cultural beliefs. This approach offers an intriguing perspective on what might be done.

The London Daily Telegraph published in July 2005 a description of what it labeled “Ten Core Values of the British Identity.” These were:

I. **The rule of law.** Our society is based on the idea that we all abide by the same rules, whatever our wealth or status. No one is above the law - not even the government.

II. **The sovereignty of the Crown in Parliament.** The Lords, the Commons and the monarch constitute the supreme authority in the land. There is no appeal to any higher jurisdiction, spiritual or temporal.

III. **The pluralist state.** Equality before the law implies that no one should be treated differently on the basis of belonging to a particular group. Conversely, all parties, sects, faiths and ideologies must tolerate the existence of their rivals.

IV. **Personal freedom.** There should be a presumption, always and everywhere, against state coercion. We should tolerate eccentricity in others, almost to the point of lunacy, provided no one else is harmed.

V. **Private property.** Freedom must include the freedom to buy and sell without fear of confiscation, to transfer ownership, to sign contracts and have them enforced. Britain was quicker than most countries to recognise this and became, in consequence, one of the happiest and most prosperous nations on Earth.
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VI. **Institutions.** British freedom and British character are immanent in British institutions. These are not, mostly, statutory bodies, but spring from the way free individuals regulate each other’s conduct, and provide for their needs, without recourse to coercion.

VII. **The family.** Civic society depends on values being passed from generation to generation. Stable families are the essential ingredient of a stable society.

VIII. **History.** British children inherit a political culture, a set of specific legal rights and obligations, and a stupendous series of national achievements. They should be taught about these things.

IX. **The English-speaking world.** The atrocities of September 11, 2001, were not simply an attack on a foreign nation; they were an attack on the anglosphere - on all of us who believe in freedom, justice and the rule of law.

X. **The British character.** Shaped by and in turn shaping our national institutions is our character as a people: stubborn, stoical, indignant at injustice. “The Saxon,” wrote Kipling, “never means anything seriously till he talks about justice and right.”

Former British Prime Minister Tony Blair offered a description “of do’s and don’ts for religion and democracy”. In it he suggested the expectations we should have about how participants in our society should behave and what they must support to be a legitimate part of the system.\(^4\)

1. **DO** have democracy-friendly religion and religion-friendly democracies.

2. **DON’T** think you understand democracy if you think it’s only about elections: it’s about a culture and mindset which includes freedom of thought, freedom of expression, political and religious pluralism, and human rights.

3. **DO** maintain equality of treatment for different religions within the law as a core element of the secular state.

4. **DON’T** duck difficult conflicts involving religious and secular ideas: discuss them openly.

5. **DON’T** rush to legislation to solve religious conflict; instead seek first to resolve it by discussion and accommodations.

6. **DON’T** allow religious schools to opt out of the same national standards and core curriculum that you expect of everyone else.

7. **DO** listen to religious voices on social, political and economic issues, and allow people to justify their views on explicitly religious grounds if they want.
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8. **DO** insist on religious leaders making their case by reasoned argument not by bald assertion or authoritarian claims. Insist on that for atheists and secular leaders too.

9. **DO NOT** allow religious voices to have dominance in the public sphere if they cannot achieve majority support through democratic means.

10. **DO** ensure, whether the overwhelming democratic choice is either an atheist state or one dominant religion, that the voices of religious minorities and those who have no faith are protected.

The call for the articulation of such core values is understandable and important for nations to confront in a time where it is being claimed that no one has the right to prefer one’s culture. But, if we are honest, we must understand that it is difficult and sometimes even impossible to know how to instill such principles within people who have not actually “lived” the culture. Historically, in a nation such as the United States, that didn’t matter because everyone who came to the country as a free person by their own choice was striving to learn the values and to become a part of the system.

It does matter, however, when the values become attenuated and diffuse within a fragmented culture in which the desire and duty to assimilate is rejected. Unfortunately, this describes many within the democracies of the West. The matter is further undermined when the key institutions of cultural understanding such as schools and universities decide that they not only have no desire to teach things such as the duties of what have been called “civic virtue” to students but that it a discriminatory evil to do so. No nation survives without believing in something principled and substantive and “anything goes” or “everything is entitled to equal respect (or contempt)” is neither principled nor substantive.

It may sound strange in this cynical age but I can identify a set of stories, statements, codes of belief and action, and so forth that shaped my value system to the point I can neither escape them or want to. The list includes the Pledge of Allegiance, the Preamble to the Declaration of Independence and the Gettysburg Address. It contains the stories of Horatio at the Bridge, the Three Hundred Spartans, the Chanson de Roland and the bravery, sacrifice and betrayal of Joan of Arc. It includes the Boy Scout Oath and the stories of Abraham Lincoln walking miles as a boy to return an overpayment to a storekeeper and George Washington telling the truth about chopping down the cherry tree.

To this, I admit somewhat hesitantly in this culture, can be added a little boy’s understanding of the medieval Code of Chivalry as the proper way a woman should be treated by a gentleman (I apologize to my feminist friends for the rampant chauvinism of my youth), and the Athenian creed of “a perfect mind in a perfect body” (neither of which I have managed to achieve). Of course, there was more and the lessons involved subconscious and implicit messages. Nathan Hale’s statement when he was to be hanged that “I regret I have only one life to give to my country,” along with Vermont’s motto,
“Don’t Tread on Me” are parts of the experience. From all these sources I took almost intuitive lessons involving the values of truth, integrity, loyalty, duty, racial and gender equality, love of country and much more.

My point is that values of the kind we are considering as core to Britain or France or the United States are not something that can be delivered on a fixed template or simply through reading words. Such belief systems are constructed of an unpredictable diversity of experience within the culture itself and are not reproducible at will or fully achievable through formal educational processes. The call for the articulation of such core values is understandable and important for nations to confront in a time where it is being claimed that no one has the right to prefer one’s culture.

One seemingly inevitable problem is that the call for core cultural values can easily become an exclusionary mechanism that justifies denial of entry into our society to people from cultures lacking such traditions. While I am obviously saying that nations—even in the West—have the right to require and expect those admitted into their specific Social Contract to respect and adhere to the core values and terms of that implicit agreement, I won’t pretend that I know how to do this in a diverse world. Certainly, given that the July 7 and 21 UK bombers in 2005 were “homegrown” as well as a number of the Paris attackers in the Charlie Hebdo massacre and the November 13, 2015 mass murders, at least in theory we might expect that the murderers of innocent humans would have received an infusion of the Ten Core Values and the French equivalent but they obviously did not.41

This failure or refusal to accept and internalize the values of their new host country forces us to understand that it is a daunting task to instill the value systems of Western democracies in new immigrants from radically disparate cultures than our own. This challenge becomes even more difficult when leaders and educators in our own cultures decide it is “insensitive” to suggest that we have vital core values that we expect others to accept and respect if they are to live in our communities. Over time, abandonment of our core values leads to a drifting pseudo-community without any principled integrity.

The added lesson we now face is that the increasingly weakened and tenuous lessons about what Western political systems stand for are not being accepted by a violent and alienated portion of second generation Muslim youth who for a variety of reasons are

41 See, e.g., Jason Burke, “The violence that lies in every ideology: Like most beliefs, Islam is a religion of peace that has to accept it can also breed terror,” The Observer [online], Sunday, July 17, 05; Patrick Barkham, “Journey through Britain’s Muslim divide: On the bombers’ route between London and Leeds, Patrick Barkham finds communities riven by a generation gap,” Guardian, July 16, 05; Vikram Dodd, “Crackdown on elusive extremists: Even with new measures, it will not be easy to root out those who back terrorism,” Guardian, July 15, 05; James Brandon, “A defiant Islam rises among young Britons,” Christian Science Monitor, July 28, 05; Anthony King, “One in four Muslims sympathises with motives of terrorists,” News.telegraph, July 28, 05; Ziauddin Sardar, “The struggle for Islam’s soul: While most Muslims abhor violence, some terrorists are a product of a specific mindset with deep roots in Islamic history. If Muslims everywhere refuse to confront this, we will all be prey to more terror,” Toronto Star (Star.com) July 22, 05; Mundher al-Adhami, “Not hate, vengeance," Guardian, July 16, 05; Salma Yaqoob, "Our leaders must speak up: Failure to oppose the official line creates extremists," Guardian, July 15, 05; Dan Murphy, “Can Islam’s leaders reach its radicals?” Christian Science Monitor, July 14, 05.
being radicalized into a cult of death even after being exposed to Western culture. The radicalization is made easy because we no longer offer a strong system of values and beliefs with the result, as happens with many humans who have an inner drive for meaning and are willing to follow those who offer certainty and meaning, the radical “prophet” capture the souls of the weak, the lost and the emotionally needy and convert them into fascists and fanatics.

The seemingly odd but irrelevant fact is that regardless of their laments, those individuals have received far more opportunities than they would have had in virtually any Islamic-controlled country in the Middle East and North Africa. The “Death of God” in the West has created a system in which those who have a special need for that certainty are easily manipulated into otherwise insane behavior by leaders filled with hate to the point that they are themselves manifestations of the worst aspects of being human but are empowered by their deranged states of mind to present a messianic persona to their converts that generates an aura of holiness strong enough to attract those who need emotional fulfillment and meaning regardless of the costs to themselves and others. Such people are pathetic but they are undeniably dangerous.

Decades of overwhelmingly blind tolerance in Europe and the United Kingdom during which an unscreened core of fundamentally intolerant immigrants was admitted has created a support system for Islamic fanatics. This has harmed those nations and supplied the West’s enemies with cadres of sophisticated attackers and planners capable of operating in the world outside the Muslim-dominated countries. Strategically this failure is one of the most idiotic tragedies in history. It is one where the “wolf” was welcomed into a tent filled with raw meat and expected not to bite. Now the only realistic option is to answer violence with overwhelming violence that hunts down and kills all who profess allegiance to or offer material support to groups such as ISIS.

Olivier Roy argues that: “The Islam with which such young people [the London bombers and radicalized second-generation young Muslim residents] identify is not the cultural Islam of their parents or home countries. It is both Salafist and jihadist. Salafists seek to purge Islam of all outside influences, starting with the cultures and traditions of Muslim societies, and restore it to the letter of the Qur’an and the tradition of the Prophet. Salafism is fundamentally opposed to all cultural or national forms of Islam.”

“Warning! Do Not Approach!”

Let me put this in a context. When a Muslim woman comes to a Western nation and insists (or is compelled) on wearing a hijab, burqa or other form of “cover” as a religious (or political) statement it communicates to others that there is a clear line of unrelieved
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separateness that could just as well be a “Warning! Do Not Approach!” sign in bright pulsing neon. 44 The warning of difference is so alien that it makes it difficult or even impossible to communicate unless you are a member of the specific micro-community to which that individual belongs. The problem is that the principles of free speech and communication conflict with the principle of tolerance in such situations. To a Westerner the fact that it is a religious (or cultural) requirement means that there is an expectation that the decision and appearance should be tolerated in a “liberal” society. In limited amounts such “Keep Off the Grass” warnings are quaint. But in significant numbers they threaten the foundations of the political community because there can be no real communication or discourse between significant parts of the populace.

Such difference generates a barrier that is nearly impossible to transcend if one is not part of the other’s specific micro-community. It sends a message that the person and group engaging in such behavior are different in a radical way entirely outside the community’s traditions. This difference in the case of some elements of Islam includes the clear message that its members do not desire full interaction with the host community they have physically but not spiritually entered and from which they insist on standing apart. “Difference” at that point becomes something akin to being in the British Museum and looking at the displays of ancient cultures entirely unlike one’s own. You can observe, analyze, educate and the like but you cannot truly “connect” because the lines of communication are dead or non-existent. If the advantages of “difference” and “diversity” are ever to be internalized into a culture there must be a good faith effort to become part of that community. Otherwise the new entrants might as well be “museum pieces” to be looked at, marveled over, but never fully understood or joined with.

Intriguingly, Quebec decided to “ban the burqa”. Peter Worthington writes: “Once again, Quebec is showing leadership to the rest of Canada. Unlike “English” Canada, Quebec has never doubted its own identity…. By banning the niqab and burqa (the veil with eye slits and the full head covering with latticed mask) for any provincial employee, and anyone dealing with government services, Quebec is setting an example for the rest of the country.” [Worthington admits] “Some will call it racist, unfair and even unCanadian to ban face coverings for women and feel it should be a matter of individual choice. [But] … Put bluntly, having to do business with someone who refuses to have their face seen, is offensive and demeaning - to both parties. Ours is a society that prides itself on face-to-face dealings, where both parties can size one another up, establish a rapport or, in some cases, a disconnect.”45

Worthington adds: “A greater issue, implied in the Quebec ban, is newcomers to Canada identifying with the culture of their new home and adapting to it. *Most immigrants realize this and go out of their way to learn and adjust to our customs.* They gravitate to cheering for the local hockey team, bellyaching about high taxes and the weather and becoming Canadians like the rest of us. … It’s neither “scary” nor “threatening” to

---

44 Peter Worthington, “Quebec's burqa ban is not racist: It's neither scary nor threatening to expect people to adapt to the cultural mores of their new homeland,” QMI Agency, First posted: Tuesday, March 30, 2010.
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expect people to adapt to the cultural mores of their new homeland. *The niqab and burqa inhibit adaptation.* They are a constant reminder that these sartorial customs (which have nothing to do with religion) distinguish the wearer as one who is regarded as second-class and oppressed - whether they realize it or not.”

Traditionally and over time new immigrants begin to move out of cultural enclaves that were necessitated initially by their feelings of difference and need for support by people who “understand” them. In America, this multi-generational transition has often occurred and immigrants become part of the overall community through marriage across ethnic, social and religious backgrounds. That is what I intend by describing the necessity and importance of a desire to become part of the overall culture. It is a form of positive “mongrelization” that to someone (including me) committed to the ideal of the “melting pot” represents one of the higher virtues America has had to offer the world as a culture and community.

**Beyond Non-Assimilation to Cultural Transformation**

It is a sad development that, as noted by John Fonte and Alan Wolfe, the expectation that new entrants accept the core creed and guiding principles of the nation has been transformed into an evil and contributes to the rise of tribalism, factionalism and the loss of the ability to discuss, share perspectives and compromise. When a group considers it superior to all others and rejects the duty to assimilate and adapt into the host community, it is not surprising that suspicion and hostility are directed at that group by members of the community’s traditional core. This is inevitable because at that point we are no longer talking about “difference” as contributing to the enriching difference of mutual tolerance and positive adaptation but of divisiveness, dissonance and discord.

The error represented in the insistence on adhering to the principle of tolerance for groups with fundamentally different beliefs that themselves refuse to tolerate others within the community, results not in positive social evolution but in the creation of extreme political and religious identity sects. The danger is that some among those identity sects operate as Fifth Columns and operate as support bases for interests seeking to attack and undermine the existing community. These aggressive identity sects with loyalty to interests outside the host community fragment the traditional cultures of Western nations.
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Serge Trifkovic relates that Syrian-born Sheikh Omar bin Bakri has proclaimed: “‘We will remodel this country in an Islamic image’ [referring to the UK] …. [noting that Bakri] belongs to The International Islamic Front for Jihad against Jews and Crusaders, founded by Bin Laden]. [Bakri boasts] ‘We collect funds to be able to carry on the struggle; we recruit militiamen; and sometimes we take care of these groups’ propaganda requirements in Europe.’ …. [Trifkovic reports] “When the Afghan war started in October 2001, Bakri declared: ‘We will replace the Bible with the Koran… Christians have to learn that they cannot do this to Islam. We will not allow our brothers to be colonialised. If they try it, Britain will turn into Bosnia.’” Remarkably, this same Mr. Bakri … was expelled from Saudi Arabia in 1985 as a dangerous agitator for creating Al-Muhajirun, a branch of the Islamic Revolutionary Party. He has lived in London since 1986, drawing $500 a week in welfare, and calling on young Muslims to take up arms against the ‘opponents of Islam’ – ultimately meaning everyone who is not Muslim, or who does not subscribe to his vision of Islam. While living in Britain at its taxpayers’ expense he denounces it as ‘the spearhead of blasphemy that seeks to overthrow Muslims and the Islamic caliphate.’”

A 2004 news report indicates, for example, that Bakri “would support hostage-taking at British schools if carried out by terrorists with a just cause. Omar Bakri Mohammed, the spiritual leader of the extremist sect al-Muhajiroun, said that holding women and children hostage would be a reasonable course of action for a Muslim who has suffered under British rule.” He also stated after the July 7 bombings that there no longer would be a zone of security in Britain and that there would be more bombings.

The Right to Preserve a “Cultural Ecosystem”

There are useful concepts in the environmental paradigm that can help understand the perspective being offered here. This includes what is referred to as systemic or cultural sustainability. There is also the idea of the need to control inputs in ways that a bio-system can absorb changes without damaging its core qualities. This allows systemic adaptation rather than overwhelming ecosystems by large scale or massive introduction of “alien species” and “pollutants” at volumes and speeds beyond the ability of the system to absorb and “process” the new inputs.

Systemic sustainability relates in part to the idea of the “Tragedy of the Commons” introduced by Garrett Hardin. It is inevitable that, in a situation where many have the ability to use a social resource for their own benefit that there is a tendency by some actors to overload the system. The infusion of selfish interests at levels beyond the system’s regenerative sustainability collapses the system from overuse. A result is that it “crashes”. The “crash” may involve widespread pollutants, land becoming less productive, economic quality lessening, and population movement to other locations. The point is that of severe systemic disruption of a kind that is beyond the ability of the existing system to withstand.

49 Trifkovic, supra, n. 38.
In the same way that systems must be careful to avoid overloading the productive and sustainable capacity of an eco-system, it is not desirable to allow a too rapid and large-scale infusion of radically different systems into one’s traditional creedal and cultural paradigms. If we accept the less-than-bold statement that particular cultures have the right to protect themselves from extremely rapid change then we can appreciate both “difference” and the benefits of coherent communities that are able to adapt to new and very different stimuli at a sustainable pace to avoid collapsing from the weight and contradictions of distinct value systems that are unwisely forced into the system at too rapid and intense a rate.

My concern is about whether the infusion of significant external value systems into the traditional cultures such as are represented by Islamic beliefs and institutions distorts and undermines the core belief systems of the West, just as Islamic cultures resist the entry of Western culture to the point of severe criminalization.  Although replicating the hard-shelled rigidity and underlying fragility and apparent brittleness of national Islamic cultures is far beyond anything that I would urge for Western systems, the idea of protecting a core cultural system is not a “makeweight”. Western cultures operating under a quasi-secular Rule of Law derived from Judeo-Christian belief systems and hammered out through centuries of political and religious strife and persecution are far more resilient and tolerant than any Islamic majority society on the face of the earth. But as we have seen of late, Western democratic cultures are not invulnerable.

As a general matter, Western systems are considerably more capable of tolerating and absorbing those of disparate views because the political and social systems of the West are much more diffuse and stable without the paranoid fragility that dominates Islamic theocracies. The religious and political leaders of Islamic states are deathly afraid of contrary views and regularly apply laws of blasphemy and heresy to stifle alternative views that could end up challenging their authority and control.  But saying that Western nations are better able to handle “difference” is not the same as blindly accepting that there are no limits to the ability of Western cultures to accept those of radically different beliefs. This is obvious when it has become clear that many who possess, or are possessed by, those radically different beliefs reject those of their new host community.

This becomes even more the case when the scale and rate of entry of those who hold incompatible beliefs and allegiances increases dramatically. There is what can only be described as a “guerrilla” war that is taking place between some sects of Islam and Western nations and it will continue for several decades. The paternalistic arrogance and blind innocence of Western leaders who assumed their cultural openness could win the “hearts and minds” of any who were exposed to its opportunities and freedoms resulted in

51 For a discussion of how extreme the transition has been, see, Melanie Phillips, “‘After the Rushdie affair, Islam in Britain became fused with an agenda of murder’: Our capital is now ‘Londonistan’, the hub of Islamist extremism,” The Observer, 5/28/06.
a largely open-door policy that has proved to be a serious error in judgment and policy whether we say it let the “fox into the henhouse” or “the camels nose under the tent”.

All social communities have an order, rules of operation and a “cultural ecology” that are central to their essential nature. When external factors that are not elements of the specific “creedal or cultural ecology” enter the system in rapid and large-size volumes the ecology is transformed. This is true whether the system is natural or social. Accepting that almost anything is “fair game” for comment and criticism is one core value in the West. But that principle is under great pressure in the face of threats, riots, arson, murders of critics such as Theo Van Gogh, a fatwa death sentence against Salman Rushdie, “days of rage” at Danish cartoons and much more.

Rather than resist such criminal behavior in the name of religious faith, Western nations, with the UK in the forefront, have created laws to inhibit and punish speech. Guardian columnist Polly Toynbee captures the consequences of such restrictive laws: “Laws change cultural climates: it’s what they are for. Religion will become out of bounds in many spheres. Schools, universities, the arts, broadcasting, will feel social pressures that induce self-censorship.”

We have no difficulty understanding the phenomenon of the harmful effects of the introduction of alien species into coherent ecosystems in the ecological context. There are numerous instances in which careless introduction of animal and plant species from other countries have played havoc with domestic ecosystems. But we hesitate to think about such interactions in the interplay of human cultures that are sufficiently distinct as to be alien to each other. A decade-old Guardian analysis indicates that France had at least partially awoken to the challenge of trying to deal with the entrance into the French national community of millions of people with entirely different beliefs and cultural backgrounds. The report stated: “This week’s call by the French government for imams to undergo university training in civil law, history, language and culture is an important moment for Europe’s faltering attempts to try to engage with its Muslim citizens. The country with the continent’s largest Muslim population, whose secular state is a hallowed principle - and which imposed the controversial ban on wearing the hijab in schools - has decided it must try harder.”

The irony in this “blindness” is that such awareness is part of what is in play in many Muslim nations. The Saudis ban the building of Christian churches and do not allow any non-Islamic worship in public. A senior Islamic leader, the Saudi Grand Mufti, pronounced that all Christian churches must be torn down in the Arabian Peninsula. The Grand Mufti is the highest-ranking Saudi religious figure. It was reported that: “A delegation from Kuwait asked the Saudi grand mufti for guidance. He replied that Kuwait is part of the Arabian Peninsula — and that any churches on the Arabian Peninsula
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should indeed be destroyed, because the alternative would be to approve of them. The grand mufti explained: “The Prophet (peace be upon him) commanded us, ‘Two religions shall not coexist in the Arabian Peninsula,’ so building [churches] in the first place is not valid because this peninsula must be free from [any other religion].” In Saudi Arabia, of course, non-Islamic houses of worship were banned long ago, and non-Muslims are prohibited from setting foot in Mecca and Medina.”

In his [thankfully] short-lived stint as President in Egypt Mohamed Morsi addressed the United Nations and requested that there be wide ranging blasphemy laws. This was on the heels of a series of blasphemy prosecutions in Egypt’s “new democracy” including one where a defendant was sentenced to six years in prison for the offense.\(^{57}\) In many Muslim nations it is a serious crime to proselytize on behalf of any other religion or to import the Bible. The name of the ultra-violent Boko Haram movement in Nigeria is translated to mean “Western education is sinful” or “haram” (forbidden) and the movement seeks to drive out all Western “taint” from its realm in Northern Nigeria.

The wide gap between Western ideals of democracy and fundamentalist Islamic or “Political Islam’s” view of what must exist has rarely been stated more clearly than in a taped message attributed to Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, then head of Al Qaeda in Iraq released in January 2005 prior to the initial elections in Iraq. He declared: “‘We have declared a bitter war against democracy and all those who seek to enact it,’ said the speaker in the 35-minute message. ‘Democracy is also based on the right to choose your religion,’ he said, and that is ‘against the rule of God.’”\(^{58}\)

While Boko Haram may be an extreme version of intolerance they are no more so than ISIS, the Taliban, al-Qaeda, the Iranian Ayatollahs and the Muslim Brotherhood, not to mention the Saudi Wahhabis. The message was: “The leader of Nigeria's Islamist militant group Boko Haram has called for more attacks against schools, describing western education as a “plot against Islam”, in a video released days after his fighters killed 46 students in an assault on a dorm. In the 15-minute recording released at the weekend, Abubakar Shekau said schools would continue to be targeted “until our last breath”. “Teachers who teach western education? We will kill them! We will kill them in front of their students, and tell the students to henceforth study the Qur'an….”.”\(^{59}\)

The words of a leader of the organization WAW (Women for Afghan Women) provide important insight as to the reality of what Europe and America face in trying to deal with the fanatics of Jihadist Islam.

\(^{59}\) Monica Mark, “Abubakar Shekau describes western-style education as a 'plot against Islam', as two-pronged strategy delivers young recruits”, Sunday 14 July 2013, guardian.co.uk.
“The Taliban has opened an office in Doha, Qatar, and claims to want to negotiate a peaceful end to the long war in Afghanistan. Although we yearn for peace, Women for Afghan Women (WAW) believes that far from achieving that goal, negotiating with the Taliban is the way to brutal repression. The Taliban have not changed since their years of fundamentalist, totalitarian reign over Afghanistan in the 1990s. And WAW’s position has not changed. We are against negotiations with the Taliban. The Taliban are murderers and terrorists who will stop at nothing to achieve totalitarian rule over Afghanistan…. Regardless of what they agree to on paper, the Taliban will never agree that human rights belong to women as well as to men and that women’s human rights must be protected. They oppose this fundamental right: the education of females. They have burned down hundreds of girls’ schools and murdered their teachers. Above all, they will never respect and obey the Afghan constitution or participate in a democratic political process in Afghanistan.”

The Failure of Multiculturalism

The resistance to Western creeds, values, religion and culture is at the base of much of the ongoing conflict we are experiencing. Allowing people with values of the kind that are possessed by such intolerant groups into Western nations offends the essential spirit and quality of those communities. German Prime Minister Angela Merkel, the same political leader who recently triggered the mass migration to Europe from the Middle East by inviting millions of migrants to come to Germany, was quoted only five years ago singing a very “different tune”.

Merkel stated in 2010: "We kidded ourselves for a while that they [foreign Muslim guest workers] wouldn't stay, but that's not the reality," she said. … [Merkel continued]: "Of course the tendency had been to say, 'let's adopt the multicultural concept and live happily side by side, and be happy to be living with each other'. But this concept has failed, and failed utterly," she said. … [These comments] align her with Thilo Sarrazin, the former Bundesbank member whose book on how the failure of many of Germany's 16 million immigrants to integrate was contributing to Germany's decline led to his dismissal.”

Sometimes systemic transformation will be benign, at least in part. But if the external stimuli are truly alien in relation to the operational rules of the host ecology the effects are likely to be destructive from the perspective of maintaining the integrity of the host
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community’s cultural ecology. Sweden has allowed a significant amount of immigrants into its borders, many of them Muslim. Amy Kellogg reports that:

“Bejzat Becirov, head of the Islamic Center at Malmo’s main mosque, “thinks immigrants to Sweden should try harder to blend in. “Since religion doesn’t say anything about how you should dress, maybe it’s a good idea to try to take a look at how everybody else is behaving, and try to present themselves and adapt to that,” he says. “And that would make it easier for them. Perhaps things start there. Becirov acknowledges that it’s harder for non-Europeans to adapt to a liberal place like Sweden. “If you look at Muslims coming from the Middle East, I think it takes 15 to 20 years before they are integrated—a generation.” Becirov believes the number of Malmo Muslims who subscribe to extremist ideology is small, but that their recruiting methods are aggressive. In his words, python-like. [Member of Parliament] Ekeroth worries about how those extreme elements exercise their authority. “There’s unofficial Shariah police going around Rosengard, checking how women dress, and there are unofficial Shariah courts in Malmo, being used,” he says.”  

One rather significant problem is that, while the substantial majority of Muslims have sought to integrate to the degree that can be reasonably and realistically expected given their own cultural and religious principles, some of their children have moved toward fanaticism, belying our traditional assumptions about orderly assimilation. This movement toward fanaticism has been facilitated by extreme Western tolerance and the desire to protect free speech and the civil rights of all residents. It has also been a byproduct of the struggles in the Middle East. Ironically, these conflicts in which Western nations have been involved and the ability to communicate and proselytize through the Internet has produced a recruitment dynamic that allows the fanatics to be concerned about the plight of Muslims everywhere when in their own countries of origin those same Muslims often attack each other. It has been a wonderful recruiting device for the fanatics to be able to attack a common enemy, i.e., the West, America and the Jews.

Olivier Roy argues: “radical imams such as Abu Hamza, Abu Qatada and Omar Bakri, who specifically address second-generation Muslims and play on their sense of alienation and uprootedness, are in quite a different category. For such preachers, no existing country is truly Islamic: the ummah exists wherever there are Muslims. The uprootedness of young Muslims is seen as an advantage, since it removes them from the influence of the cultural and traditional Islam of their parents and countries of origin. These imams want to radicalise young Muslims in their countries of residence and enlist them in a worldwide jihad. And for that, anywhere will do. Let them go to Afghanistan, Kashmir or Yemen (the way that Abu Hamza’s son did), or just stay in London.”
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Being Intolerant of the Intolerant

All differences are not benign. When the new entrants possess values, traditions and beliefs that represent principles and behaviors that have long been rejected as undesirable in the host community such as ones contrary to the set of civil and human rights that have come to be widely accepted in Western societies the differences are ones that ought to have served as screening criteria. It is one thing to tolerate such things among a nation’s citizens where we hope the negative beliefs are at least buffered by experience and education and quite another to blindly allow migrants into a country who reject the core principles and creeds of the host and do so based on a set of religious beliefs that operate as a sort of Natural Law that trumps the domestic law.

The problem is further intensified when the new entrants possess such “illegal” principles and values and intend to behave according to those beliefs in contradiction of the core beliefs of the host community. When the new entrants intend to make no effort to become part of the “ecology” of the new host culture and are instead intent on establishing separatist sub-cultures that affirmatively reject the values of the host culture, an alien “virus” has been injected into the system, making it “ill”. Carried to the extreme the new host culture is seen as the “enemy”. At times this involves attempts to damage it from within.

It should be quite clear by now that this analysis is primarily aimed at the entry of some elements of Islamic cultures into Western Europe, the United Kingdom and North America. Some will condemn any criticism of a religion and the people who practice it as bigotry. That is an intimidating accusation and one that is nearly (or totally) impossible to refute. All I can say in my defense is that anyone who knows me and knows how I have spent my life in civil rights and related fields both domestically and internationally understands that I do everything possible to protect vulnerable people and not engage in discrimination other than opposition to bullies, tyrants, sycophants and those who seek to use others for their own benefit or warped ideologies. That is all I will say on the matter and otherwise will let opinions fall where they may.

At this point I want to make it clear that I am deeply committed to the ideal and principles represented by the Western version of the Rule of Law. I am irreversibly committed to the concept of community developed in that specific system where, regardless of the numerous differences in opinion and belief held by political factions, all are expected to seek to become assimilated into the overall community and to accept the creeds that underlie its continuing operation.

This in no way means every member of the community becomes part of an overriding “hive” mentality such as is sometimes associated with modern Chinese culture. “Difference” and “diversity” are wonderful and enriching elements of human
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cultures that when shared prevent a society from descending into a dull and orthodox state of existence. I am not arguing for some kind of “steady state” system. Yet in order to enrich the host cultures they enter, difference and diversity must be shared and modified within the framework of the host community. When they are instead impenetrable and alien systems “difference” fails to enrich but becomes “divisiveness” of a kind that harms the community. One result is that it creates hostility while blocking true communication and real interaction.

One poll done immediately after the July 2005 London bombings found that 25 percent of Muslims agreed with jihadists’ underlying motivations. Polls such as this are inevitably dangerous and subject to misinterpretation. If someone asked me, for example, whether there are situations in which I would consider someone blowing himself up as a legitimate act I would in a very limited context say “yes”. We have awarded Congressional Medals of Honor to soldiers who saved others by throwing themselves onto a grenade.

The issue is the context, the reasons, whether you were protecting or killing innocent people and so forth. If someone asked me if I could understand why someone felt driven to sacrifice himself for a cause that the individual considered of the deepest importance, including dying for one’s faith, I might even say I sympathize, but that does not mean I approve. Nor will I ever approve deliberately targeting innocent civilians as the means to demonstrate one’s faith. Rather than courage it demonstrates cowardice and insanity. The point, however, is that polls are tricky, often biased, misleading, crude and often manipulated instruments aimed at obtaining a desired answer for political reasons yet we tend to take them as valid measurements of attitudes when very often they are inaccurate, distorted or false.65

Conclusion and Suggestions

This has been a very difficult analytic process since so much of what I am saying is at war with the way I want to think about Western culture and its openness to others. I do believe in tolerance, compassion, creating opportunities for the disadvantaged and the importance of the introduction of diverse attitudes, experiences and beliefs into cultures, including the American culture in which I was raised. I have taught in the UK at the University of Westminster while living in London on three different occasions and had the honor of being appointed a Senior Associate Research Scholar at the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies at the University of London. I have also taught in St. Petersburg, Russia as well, and in both London and Russia a number of my students, co-workers and friends were Muslim. The same holds true for my career as a law professor where it was not uncommon to have students of the Islamic faith. Along with this comes a very substantial amount of other international experience in a wide variety of countries including Islamic nations such as Bangladesh and Malaysia. In my international environment and development work a number of my friends and compatriots were Muslim so I absolutely do not want to suggest that I am a “hater” of Muslims. That is not what I am saying in the analysis contained in this essay.

What I am saying includes the following.

- National cultures have the right to make intelligent decisions about the scale and pace at which they allow people from significantly different cultures into their own as permanent participants. The Western Rule of Law democracies (including Australia) seem to be the only countries where to even pose these matters gives rise to immediate accusations of bigotry and barbarism.

- National cultures have the right to demand a substantial degree of willing assimilation on the part of those they invite into their communities, and if those new entrants are unwilling to become true participants in the community then they either should not be admitted in the first instance or sent back to their country of origin if it is established that they have misrepresented themselves. For example, I once walked behind a young Muslim male on a London street and he started following a woman who had what I thought was a modest dress with short sleeves and bare arms. He started calling the woman a whore as he followed her and only stopped when he saw me glaring at him. As others will tell you, this kind of behavior, and far worse, is common in Muslim countries but as far as I am concerned it is a clear demonstration that a person really does not belong in a Western nation.

- I already remarked about the full cover burqa and the way it sends a message of total separateness from the host community. I also remember a discussion I had in London in one of my seminars in which a female student from the Sudan who was dressed modestly but as other female students tended to dress. She explained that she did not like going back to Africa because of the way she had to dress, adding that she fully understood the cover rules were simply what a bunch of repressed males created to impose on women and control their lives and that it was not a rule of Islam as opposed to a tool of male dominance by the men who control the interpretations of Islam.

- The vast proportion of Muslims, particularly those in the West, simply want what others in our nations want—security, opportunity, respect, freedom to participate, and a rich family life. Those who do not want those benefits, such as the insane imams and terror recruiters like Abu Hamza and his ilk, simply do not deserve to be allowed into Western societies. It struck me as incredible that the UK out of some sense of responsibility or compassion allowed such radicals to spew hate against a culture that subsidized his food and lodging and to admit that they were recruiting fighters for jihad. The radicals are not “salvageable”.

- Nor should we conclude that there is widespread support for ISIS and al-Qaeda among the overall Muslim population. The vast majority of Muslims who do not share the Islamic radicals’ diseased versions of faith are their targets even more than are the non-Muslim citizens of the West. Once when working with environmentalists in Bangladesh I, and a group of friends, barely escaped being
the targets of a bomb at the nation’s Independence Day celebration because we had just shifted our location away from where the bomb had been placed. Nine young Bangladeshi Muslims who had been singing and dancing in the area were killed in the explosion. The point is that ISIS, al-Qaeda, Boko Haram etc. are emotionally diseased murderers who are preying on other Muslims far more than anyone else. Their actions directly and indirectly have murdered hundreds of thousands of innocent Muslims but in their twisted logic it was all in the service of Allah. My knowledgeable Bangladeshi friends informed us that such actions were increasing and that they were attributable to Bangladeshis who went to Afghanistan to fight with the Taliban and were further radicalized to come back and create death and havoc in their own country. The specter of “returning Jihadis” is something with which the West will be dealing for years.

- Western nations can try to figure out their policy on admitting economic migrants, refugees and asylum seekers by considering the kinds of factors mentioned in the admittedly crude “Elasticity Index” formula set out earlier in this analysis. I am not offering it as some precise measuring device but simply to raise issues about what a national community has the right to take into consideration. Nations are not under a duty to accept people who reject those nations’ core values and beliefs. They are entitled to screen applicants to determine if they are likely to be contributors or threats with the burden of proof resting on the applicant.

- The very frequent tendency of applicants for entry to destroy identity papers or to claim they are from places where they are at risk when they are not, or to lie about their country of origin are matters that should be automatic grounds for denial of entry in cases where it is reasonable to believe they have done one or more of these things. My position is that except in situations of legitimate and demonstrable threat no one has the right to be permanently admitted to another country. Economic migration is a privilege, not a right and since many nations operate according to that rule many applicants for admission to a Western nation lie about their background, potential threats, identity, motives and origins. As demands are increasing for the “vetting” of migrants and refugees it is reasonable for Western countries to treat suspect claims as such and not allow the entry into their societies of any applicant whose background cannot be established.

- With all the talk about profiling Muslims, it seems absolutely reasonable to track younger Muslim males who travel outside the host country to areas in which civil strife is occurring such as Syria, Iraq, Yemen, the Sudan, Somalia, Nigeria, Libya, the Sinai Peninsula, Lebanon, Pakistan and Iran to name a few areas. With the reality being that some of the travelers are receiving training, fighting or establishing mutual support relationships with groups that intend to use them for attacks or support it is societally suicidal to assume that the intentions of such actors are peaceful. Of course in many instances individuals may have been visiting relatives or “seeking a bride” as some have claimed but the dangers are too great to casually risk that the people are operating in good faith.
The New York Police Department (NYPD) took a great deal of heat several years ago for a program involving infiltration and surveillance of mosques and some Muslims it suspected of potential terrorist intentions.66 The courts and civil liberties advocates understandably hated the program and it was terminated. One of our problems is that we nearly always tend to overreact to tragedies or we implement strategies that are wrong-headed or simply ineffective. I don’t want to reprise the horror and racism of the American Japanese treatment in WWII. That was sickening and horror-filled and can never again be allowed. No internments.

But on the question of the need to create an intelligent strategy there should be no doubt at this point that we are at war with ISIS and other elements of fanatical Islamic jihadists. Some of the attackers will strike at the US and its allies from external locations. Some will almost inevitably be among Muslim immigrants we allow into the US and other Western countries and I should make clear that I include Australia in that mix.

Others, as I indicated before, will be citizens or permanent residents of the nation being attacked who are cooperating elements of organized groups such as ISIS. Those Islamist fanatics are more dangerous because they are familiar with the country in which they reside as a citizen or permanent resident familiar with customs and behaviors and more readily able to infiltrate targeted locations. Still others will be radicalized “lone wolves” who decide to take action as Jihadis against the evil countries of the West.

The challenge we face is significant. We are at war with a fanatical strand of Islam and the rules have to be adjusted in such a context. I absolutely do not know what to do or how to take steps that reduce the certainty of deaths from the inevitable attacks but do not risk destroying the very values we claim make our Western Rule of Law systems unique. Failure to accept that there might be a legitimate need to examine young Muslim males in Western nations, including second-generation individuals, is not an intelligent path to winning the struggle in which we find ourselves. One step at least that could be applied to any new Muslim entrants into Western nations would be to collect fingerprints and DNA samples to allow future identification if necessary. Another is to consider any resident of a Western democracy who travels to one or more of the countries in which fighting or Jihadi training occurs as a suspect until screened.

Donald Trump claims that the database would be of people newly entering the US. That idea is not crazy in itself. He indicated without any specificity that he wanted surveillance of “some” mosques. How these would be identified is challenging. Although it is clear that certain mosques in the UK and other European locations were used as recruiting sites for Jihadis radicalized to join fighting in the Middle East. If that is established then it is not unreasonable to

66 On this see, Trevor Timm, "Paris is being used to justify agendas that had nothing to do with the attack", http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/nov/20/paris-attacks-political-agenda-immigration-encryption-surveillance.
think that a nation has a legitimate basis for keeping track of some people and some activities in those locations. But again, this is very difficult and as with how US government agencies have used and often abused the powers of the secretive FISA Court and the NSA and FBI conducted what appear to be unauthorized surveillance programs I admit that I have a strong distrust of how governments use powers granted them by often going beyond the mandates.67

- The terror “gang” networks depend on the Internet and other communications technology to recruit, plan and implement their actions. Dealing with this raises an enormous red flag in terms of the invasion of privacy. I lack the knowledge or skill that would be needed to understand how such communications can be used without governmental overreach and abuse. But it is also obvious that the struggle against the ISIS/al-Qaeda “gangs” and murderous networks cannot be won without the ability to conduct monitoring and surveillance of electronic communications and that we really are in some sort of “Twilight Zone State of War” in which ordinary rules are not fully applicable. Someone must know how to figure out what can be done without a permanent and massive loss of civil liberties and rights but I certainly do not know where to draw the line.

67 "Trump calls for surveillance of some mosques, attempts to clarify remarks on Syrian database",