Assimilation Anxiety: Islamic Migration as a Perceived Threat to Western Cultures

David Barnhizer

Available at: https://works.bepress.com/david_barnhizer/76/
Assimilation Anxiety

David Barnhizer

Abstract

In this cynical age it is common to smirk at claims about what is sometimes called American Exceptionalism, a term standing for the conclusion that America is an historically distinct (and better) system. To some degree it does represent cultural arrogance founded on assumption rather than fact. It also ignores “exceptionally” dark chapters in American history, including slavery, seizing of lands from Native Americans and imprisoning of US citizens of Japanese descent. Nonetheless it seems that given the diversity of the population and the sheer enormity of the nation that, as stated by an Asian Indian friend who is a scholar, feminist and activist, “It works”. While imperfect by far “It works” is a quality that is worth understanding and defending in an increasingly fractured world beset by schism, tribalism, religious fanaticism, corruption and abuse.

Granting that we in the West cannot live in a truly homogenous community such as was thought to exist in the demos of ancient Athens, and that modern democratic communities operating under the principles of the Rule of Law requiring participation for all members with significantly diverse characteristics are the “new norm” in Western society, how do we preserve a society that has a sufficient degree of unity without suppressing individual freedom? For me this raises the issue of the extent to which it is morally, politically and philosophically proper for a nation to protect its creeds, cultures and traditions, including the expectation that new immigrants from Islamic nations entering Western Europe, the United Kingdom and North America have a duty to seek to become a part of that traditions of those host cultures. This duty includes respecting the host culture rather than condemning it or withdrawing into separatist communities while accepting the benefits that host nation grants to its residents.

America represents one unique attempt to do this through its idea of the “melting pot” in which the rich diversity of culture found elsewhere blended together in important ways to share a common set of ideals and understandings, a vital national creed. These characteristics are still too often honored in the breach and we inevitably have fallen short. But on various occasions I have had new members of American society observe with a degree of 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”. We even change political power periodically without violent revolution. This applies just as much to Western Europe and the United Kingdom which, although more distinct from the US than we sometimes imagine, nonetheless are themselves exceptional and the source of the struggles, philosophy and hard-won
democratic institutions that combine to make the Western Rule of Law systems unique and well worth defending.

Democracy’s “Impossible Dream”? 

Aristotle warned in the context of the Athenian city-state: “There is a limit to the size of a city just as there is to everything else… For if any one of these is either too small or too large in size, it will not have the power that belongs to it but will sometimes wholly forfeit its nature and sometimes be in a base condition. ¹ Full and honest discourse theoretically might have been possible in the small city state of Athens where the “community” was conveniently constrained and the rights of participatory citizenship limited to Athenian males while, as in the American Republic’s first century, foreigners, women and slaves were excluded. ² Regardless whether this might have worked in the Athenian context, the political system of ancient Athens bears no relation to the very large, jumbled and chaotic political systems that currently masquerade behind the rhetoric of democracy.³

The idea in Athens, now obviously an “Impossible Dream” in Europe and America, was that for true democracy to exist, there was a generalized level of “homogeneity” in which members of a political community needed to be sufficiently familiar with each other and be able to assess the merits of positions being debated because they could evaluate the “source”. A sense of shared aims and values also was thought to advance the quality of decisions taken on behalf of the community. The sharing of aims and principles does not mean lockstep commonality. It stands for a widely accepted generalized framework comprised of an ethical and political creed within which decision-making and action take place.

The set of guiding principles being relied on are sometimes in opposition and in that way serve to balance and enliven public discourse and action. People will often not agree about what to do or how priorities ought to be set but they do understand others’ positions as being legitimate within the overall system. The essential consideration is that even though one faction’s desires may not be the “winners” in a particular struggle the participants nonetheless accept that the decisions were done legitimately through the Rule

¹ The Politics, Bk. 4, c. 4, 1326a35, at 123.
² The size and composition of a city-state is important because: “A city’s acts are those of its rulers and of its ruled subjects, and the work of the ruler is to command and pass judgment. But with respect to passing judgment on matters of justice and distributing offices according to merit, the citizens must know what each other is like, for where it happens that they do not, these matters of judgment and offices must be in a base condition. For it is not just to decide them in an offhand way, but that is manifestly what happens where there are many people. Further, foreigners and resident aliens could easily get a share in the regime because, given the excessive numbers, escaping detection will not be hard.” Politics, id. Bk. 4, c. 4, 1326b7, at 124.
³ John Gardner captured an important aspect of the situation in his comment that: “[o]ur tradition tells us that we should be individuals, initiators, and creators, free and responsible…. But [he adds] the trend … [instead] transforms individualists into specialist-links in larger systems, locked into their roles, increasingly incapable of autonomous functioning…. ” John W. Gardner, ⁵he Recovery of Confidence at 44-45 (1971).
of Law. While they may continue their attempts to achieve changes they do so within a process over time and without resort to violence.

Athens may have been at an extreme end of a political continuum, but the increasingly diverse admixtures of sect, ethnicity, religion and race found in Europe, the United Kingdom and America are moving to the other extreme. Ironically, in many non-Western parts of the world the opposite is too often true and unquestioning ethnic and religious homogeneity (or the attempt to impose that compelled unity) define the dominant ethos. Muslim-majority countries have no difficulty suppressing dissent and intimidating and persecuting others not of the mainstream belief. This has resulted in large-scale migration of Christians and others from countries such as Pakistan, along with violence and use of archaic blasphemy laws against Christians and Muslims who seek something approaching a legitimately democratic form of political organization.

Coptic Christians in Egypt are a frequent target of Islamic fundamentalists, a problem grown more intense following the elevation of Mohamed Morsi and the Muslim Brotherhood to positions of power. As I write, Morsi and the Brotherhood have been deposed for the moment following a year in which they sought to consolidate power and subvert the Egyptian “revolution” aimed at creating a democratic state.

---

4 See, e.g., Daniel Cooney, “Christian convert faces death penalty in Afghanistan,” *The Guardian*, 3/20/06. Mary Riddell, Where death is the penalty for going bare-headed, Observer, 10/29/06. “This brutality is not Islam. The death sentence given to Youcef Nadarkhani in Iran is an affront to universal moral values and a disservice to Muslims”. Mehdi Hasan Saturday October 1 2011, The Guardian. “In 1948, most of the world's Muslim-majority nations signed up to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, including article 18, "the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion" which includes, crucially, the "freedom to change his religion or belief". The then Pakistani foreign minister, Muhammad Zafarullah Khan, wrote: "Belief is a matter of conscience, and conscience cannot be compelled." Fast-forward to 2011: 14 Muslim-majority nations make conversion away from Islam illegal; several including Saudi Arabia, Afghanistan and Sudan impose the death penalty on those who disbelieve.” [Emphasis added].

5 See, Barry Rubin, ed., Revolutionaries and Reformers: Contemporary Islamist Movements in the Middle East (SUNY 2003); Lawrence Davidson, Islamic Fundamentalism: An Introduction (Greenwood 2003); Ali Mohammadi, ed., Islam Encountering Globalization (Routledge Curzon 2003); Stephen Schwartz, The Two Faces of Islam: The House of Sa’ud from Tradition to Terror (Doubleday 2002); Youssef M. Choueiri, Islamic Fundamentalism (Twayne1990); A. Ezzati, The Spread of Islam: The Contributing Factors (Islamic College for Advanced Studies 2002), and Asaf Hussain, Political Terrorism & the State: In the Middle East (Mansell 1988).


7 Magdi Abdelhadi, “The Muslim Brotherhood thought that democracy was a winner-takes-all game – but Egypt needs politicians who build bridges”, Friday, 12 July 2013, guardian.co.uk. http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2013/jul/12/egypt-truth-reconciliation-muslim-brotherhood. “While television cameras captured the tragic deaths of more than 50 supporters of the Muslim Brotherhood (MB) outside the Republican Guard base on Monday, none were present when Islamists went on the rampage in Alexandria or upper Egypt. Particularly frightening was the targeting of Christians in the south and the killing of a Coptic priest in Sinai in brutal retaliation for the Copts’ support of the army’s removal of Morsi. This has confirmed everyone’s worst fears. Worse still for the Muslim Brotherhood, the jihadis rhetoric and the violence have led to growing calls that the organisation be designated a terrorist outfit, outlawed and disbanded. Given this language, it’s hard to imagine how can Egypt re-integrate the MB into the political process – arguably one of the most difficult challenges facing the country right now.”
teeters on the brink of civil war as fanatical Islamists are enraged at having their control preempted. Saudi Arabia, with its severe restrictions on women, banning of Christian churches, and segregation of foreigners from contact with ordinary Saudis demonstrates the rigidity and intolerance of fundamentalist Wahhabist faith and ethnicity. It is illuminating to read the US State Department’s description of the official situation in Malaysia. It is undeniably clear from this that “assimilation” is a one-way street that goes only in one direction even in a relatively progressive Islamic “democracy” such as Malaysia. In that nation, as in other Muslim-majority nations there is great care being made to preserve and ensure a monoculture of faith. From the State Department website:

The Government maintains an official list of 56 sects of Islam it considers "deviant" and a threat to national security. Muslims who deviate from accepted Sunni principles may be detained and subjected to mandatory "rehabilitation" in centers that teach and enforce government-approved Islamic practices. Muslims generally may not convert to another religion, although members of other religions may convert to Islam. Officials at the federal and state government levels oversee Islamic religious activities, and they sometimes influence the content of sermons, use mosques to convey political messages, and prevent certain imams from speaking at mosques. The Government maintains a dual legal system, whereby Shari'a courts have jurisdiction over religious issues involving Muslims, and secular courts rule on other issues pertaining to the broader population. Religious minorities remained generally free to practice their beliefs; however, over the past several years, many have expressed concern that the civil court system has gradually ceded jurisdictional control to Shari'a courts, particularly in areas of family law involving disputes between Muslims and non-Muslims. Religious minorities continued to face limitations on religious expression and alleged violations of property rights. The Government restricts distribution of Malay-language Christian

---

8 The nature of the Neo-Salafist Movement is described as follows: “Some organizations, such as the Muslim Brotherhood movement, eschewed the Wahhabi appellation and dubbed themselves ‘Salafis’ -- a reference to the last generation of early Muslims, whom Abdul-Wahhab believed still practiced the “pure faith.” Like their predecessors, they rejected classical Islamic theology and jurisprudence. At the same time, they began constructing a new paradigm that drew heavily on modernist ideas of national liberation and Marxian notions of world revolution. Increasingly, these neo-Salafi groups defined themselves in opposition to the West. Their goals, however, remained as much religious as political. They continued the process of ‘purifying’ Islam begun by their Wahhabi predecessors. In practice, this led to the oppression of women, a growing intolerance for other faiths and, more recently, the sanctioning of terrorist violence -- all things which Islam traditionally forbade, but which the Wahhabi reinterpretation of the religion allowed.” Media Guide to Islam, “The Rise of Political Islam: Wahhabism and Neo-Salafism,” http://mediaguidetoislam.sfsu.edu/intheworld/04a_therise.htm. [visited 8/21/05].

9 Randeep Ramesh, “Exiled writer seeks new life in India,” The Guardian [online], Friday February 18, 2005. “The feminist author Taslima Nasreen, who was forced into a decade-long exile from her native Bangladesh after she appeared to call for the Qur'an to be rewritten because it was ‘unfair to women’, applied for Indian citizenship last night. The writer, who fled Bangladesh in 1994, has been living in Sweden since she angered Islamist fundamentalists with the publication of her novel Lajja (Shame) 12 years ago.” A death sentence fatwa has been pronounced on her by Islamic fundamentalists.

### The “Melting Pot”

Even if Aristotle’s simplistic model of the Athenian city-state’s political culture does not and cannot apply to the context of present-day Europe and America, his idea of the uniqueness of a particular social and political culture is an insight worth examining. Simply because one variety of political organization cannot exist does not mean it is a wise or just imperative to shift to the most extreme alternatives in which the lack of a common understanding and sense of community is seen as a virtue and those who attempt to protect some sense of unity and shared values and traditions are viewed as bigots or unsophisticated fools. Unfortunately, such perspectives have long dominated the so-called discourse over migration into Western Europe and the United Kingdom. Those perspectives are shifting.\footnote{Mathew Tempest, “Davis calls for rethink on multiculturalism,” \textit{The Guardian} [online] 8/3/05; David Davis, “Why cultural tolerance cuts both ways,” \textit{opinion.telegraph (London Daily Telegraph)} 8/3/05; George Jones, “Multicultural Britain is not working, says Tory chief,” \textit{news.telegraph (London Daily Telegraph)} 8/3/05; “Obsessive correctness betrays all of us,” \textit{opinion.telegraph (London Daily Telegraph)} 8/3/05. But see, Donald Reeves, “Europe needs a grassroots movement to tackle the threat of Islamophobia. We must expose this racist ideology drawn from nazism, in which Muslims have now become the new Jews of Europe,” \textit{The Guardian}, Saturday, August 6 2011.}

At the center of this situation is a vital question. Granting that we in the West cannot live in a truly homogenous community such as was thought to exist in ancient Athens, and that modern democratic communities operating under the principles of the Rule of Law requiring participation for all members with significantly diverse characteristics are the norm to be insisted on in Western society, how do we preserve a society that has a sufficient degree of unity without suppressing individual freedom? A central question involves the difficulty of preserving a society’s integrity as it ages and loses contact with its grounding principles, creeds and beliefs.

There should be little doubt that Western cultures have been cut loose from their traditional morality, making them increasingly subject to criticism and vulnerable to extremist promises of certainty because so many of the people understand the system’s inner emptiness and seek something to which they can moor themselves.\footnote{Walter Lippmann tells us 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.” \textit{Walter Lippmann, The Public Philosophy} 87 (Mentor 1950).} The vulnerability and openness to radicalized thoughts is intensified in such a situation. How does a society react when it has been “slip sliding away” from its core values as it ages and when that change is confronted and accelerated by aggressive external inputs that not only reject those values but assert that their own core values are superior and must be allowed to morally supplant the Western traditions?
Erich Fromm describes our search for some semblance of identity in a faceless state in terms that apply to all forms of “true believing” including Islamic fundamentalism. “[T]he 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. 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

I confess that chanting mobs and 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 or at least behave in that way is something obscenely offensive to me. 14

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 found elsewhere blended 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.” 15

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. 16

14 Albert Schweitzer argues: “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.” Quoted in Erich Fromm, *The Sane Society* 201, 202 (1955).
These characteristics are often honored in the breach and we inevitably have fallen short. But on various occasions I have had new members of American society observe with a substantial degree of 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.

In this cynical age where it is common to smirk at claims about what is sometimes called American Exceptionalism standing for the conclusion that America is an historically distinct (and better) system, it nonetheless seems that given the extraordinary diversity of the population and the sheer enormity of the nation itself that, in the words of an Asian Indian friend who is a scholar, feminist and activist, “It works”. Simply put, there is a difference. While imperfect by far it is a quality that is worth understanding and defending in an increasingly fractured world beset by schism, tribalism, religious fanaticism, corruption and abuse.

We would be worse than naïve if we considered Western culture to be a citadel of truth, fairness, justice or positive values. There are legitimate reasons why Islamic religious leaders look at Western culture as immoral and corrupt in many dimensions. There is a seductive quality to the attractions of the West that almost inevitably undermine any system resting on tenets of strong morality, faith and honor. The corrosive effects of Western culture are severe threats to even moderate Islamic cultures and anathema to strict Islam. For such systems it is the equivalent of introducing a virus into the host organism, one for which there is no curative treatment. So the only effective way of dealing with the threat is to create barriers that block the disease of Western culture from entering the system at all.

For me this raises the issue of the extent to which it is morally, politically and philosophically proper for a nation to protect its creeds, cultures and traditions, including the expectation that new immigrants have the duty to seek to become a part of that tradition. This duty includes respecting the host culture rather than condemning it or withdrawing into separatist communities even while happily accepting the benefits that new host nation grants to its residents.

**The Rejection of Assimilation**

The expectation that there is a duty to seek to adapt and assimilate oneself into the host culture is under great stress. William Brannigan warns: “[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

---

17 Malaysian religious authority says non-Muslims can’t use the word ‘Allah’, Tuesday, 15 January 201; http://www.alarabiya.net/articles/2013/01/15/260482.html.

18 In *The Leviathan* Thomas Hobbes identified several factors as capable of weakening or even accelerating the dissolution of a political community. Three factors particularly applicable to the entry of large numbers of devout believers in a different religion who come from very different cultures are: 1. The belief that every private man is Judge of Good and Evil actions. 2. The belief that whatever a man does against his conscience, is sin. 3. The belief that Faith and Sanctity, are not to be attained by Study and Reason, but by Supernatural Inspiration or Infusion.
profound and 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.”

John Fonte observes: “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 martyrology, and its national tradition.” He adds: “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.”

Alan Wolfe finds some common ground in the need for new immigrants to be committed to assimilation over time and to what Wolfe calls the American creed. He argues: “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.” Wolfe 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

---

20 John Fonte, “Upstream,” National Review, February 6, 1995. Fonte argues: “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. To be sure, liberal democrats also oppose racism and sexism, but they define these terms differently and consequently propose different solutions to the problems resulting from bigotry. Traditionally liberal democrats reject racial and sexual prejudice that prevents individuals from achieving the same goals that other individuals are entitled to achieve. 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.” 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.
21 John Fonte, id.
22 Alan Wolfe, while praising the integrity and clarity of 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.
batteries by incorporating new immigrant groups at those times when Anglo-Protestant cultural elites were turning reactionary and defensive.”

**Systemic Impact and the Velocity, Scale, Volume and Intensity of Immigration**

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 reject the core of the host system. I am completely uncertain about how this should play out but can figure out that if a society allows a large number of “alien” sources of stimuli into a controlled environment that it will alter that environment. The issue is whether there should be controls on those influences.

At the core is the issue of whether nations have the right without being excoriated as immoral, 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 carries with it many who reject the nation’s creedal norms to the extent that when the proportion of new entrants reaches a certain level it predictably leads to a critical mass that generates severe internal tension. This would presumably include submerging demands by new entrants that fundamental changes be made to accommodate their own creedal beliefs, cultures and values. Part of the equation relates to whether 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 whether new entrants seek to become part of their new community as it is more or less traditionally defined, or whether they are seeking to acquire benefits without any corresponding sense of obligation and duty. A central issue is acceptance of what can be called the duty of assimilation versus rejection of the obligation to become part of the community. Assimilation has always been an uneasy path for new entrants even when they actively seek full entry into the

---

23 Alan Wolfe, *id.*

24 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. See, Fox News, “Egypt orders arrest of Muslim Brotherhood leader as group rejects cabinet offer”, July 10, 2013, FoxNews.com. “Badie is a revered figure among the Brotherhood’s followers, who swear an oath of absolute obedience to him -- to “hear and obey.” That mindset cannot fit within the conditions of a Western democracy.


26 The legal system is not a self-contained theoretical construct of ideal justice, but reflects, diffuses, and balances competing claims for political and economic power. Roscoe Pound tells us: “Conflict and competition and overlapping of men’s desires and demands and claims, in the formulation of what they take to be their reasonable expectations, require a systematic adjustment of relations, a reasoned ordering of conduct, if a politically organized society is to endure.” Roscoe Pound. *New Paths of the Law* at 3 (University of Nebraska Press, 1950).
society in the utmost good faith. It is an extraordinarily challenging process for immigrants who are from fundamentally different cultures. The racism, ethnic and class discrimination, and religious bias that typically act as “friction” that slows assimilation for a generation or more are factors about which we should feel shame. Nonetheless, in America at least, there has been acceptance and assimilation over time. The reversal of the ideal of assimilation that has been increasingly occurring alters the social equation dramatically.

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 accept that a condition of their entry, at least in relation to America, is the clear expectation that the newcomers embrace their adopted country. We have also seen that even when people seek assimilation in total good faith adaptation only occurs over lengthy periods of time. Given the reality of absorption of “difference”, that delay is to be expected even if not justified in relation to how we ought to treat each other.

Part of the problem with the length of the process of full assimilation is not only the attitudes or differences of the new immigrants but the resentment and fear of the host community. Many of the longer term members take time to accept and incorporate the

---

27 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

28 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.

29 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.”

30 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. Several on-line replies copied below offered interesting insights into how some Europeans perceived the situation as to assimilation and Islam.

Replies: yesyesnoyes. 3 October 2010 1:41AM.

“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 shouldn’t be surprising.”

aurlius
3 October 2010 2:39AM
Dear Abdelkader

“[A]ny society, whether Holland, Morocco or elsewhere, and no matter how tolerant, still today maintain their
“different” entrants because to them they represent either a direct threat or the fear of “The Other”. 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 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 stay 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.31

I am not stating the old “America, love it or leave it” ethos from the heated rhetoric of Vietnam but am willing to go so far as “America, respect it, value it, build it—or stay home”. I would suggest that Western Rule of Law societies do the same.32 The odd thing, although consistent with an extreme and totally literal interpretation of their stated principles, is that the only cultures that are expected to incorporate the beliefs of other cultures, however alien they might be, are those of the West. I challenge anyone to identify a single other culture outside Western Rule of Law systems that would entertain “Western” values and protect and nurture them to the extent to allow tens of millions of “strangers” into their communities and be willing to support them.33

Brigitte Bardot Is NOT the Problem

Long ago and far away, in what now seems an almost impossibly distant universe, the French actress Brigitte Bardot was the fantasy of red-blooded American youths. Decades later, after authoring a book titled Un Cri de Silence (A Cry in the Silence even though I was told by a multi-lingual friend that the translation was not quite right) in which Bardot

31 If, as Hobbes warned, the 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. 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.” Daniel Boorstin, The Decline of Radicalism 74 (1963)

32 On these issues see David Barnhizer and Daniel Barnhizer, Hypocrisy and Myth: The Hidden Order of the Rule of Law (2009).

33 An interesting announcement by the UK’s Channel Four indicates how some in that system are attempting to demonstrate respect for the increase in those of the Islamic faith. See, “Channel 4 broadcasts Muslim call to prayer during Ramadan”, The Guardian, July 10, 2013. The statement, accompanied by a video, is: “Channel 4 is broadcasting the adhan, the Muslim call to prayer, live every morning during Ramadan. The broadcaster says it aims to reflect Britain’s diversity over the month-long period of fasting during daylight hours, which is observed by many Muslims. Channel 4 says this is a ‘deliberate provocation’ to anyone who associates Islam with extremism.” Frankly I am not certain that offering a deliberate provocation in the increasingly tense social context in which national leaders in the UK and Europe have concluded that multiculturalism has failed and there has been an increase across Europe in nationalist political movements seeking to limit further immigration of Muslims is all that grand an idea.
criticized the Islamization of Europe. Bardot found herself prosecuted by French authorities for her critical remarks, convicted, and fined.34 Bardot’s “crime” was her criticism of Muslims in France and the suggestion that they might not be the best of the country’s recent imports.35 To an American, at least at the official level, this is an incredibly offensive intrusion on free speech. To a European, my concern is that the response would be “she should have known better.” To me, that response is frightening.

Since the 9/11 tragedy now-deceased Italian writer Oriana 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 addresses. In The Force of Reason Fallaci criticized Europeans for surrendering their culture to the “sons of Allah.” Among her comments deemed 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.”36

Fallaci was 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 …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, ultratolerant, diversity-conscious Leftist! Lesser brave souls naturally preferred to remain silent.”37 Oddly enough, her main accuser–a Muslim–was himself indicted for calling the Roman Catholic Church a “criminal organization” and sought to have crucifixes removed from Italian hospital rooms because it was an offense to Islam.38

34 For a balanced analysis of the situation regarding Bardot’s “silly book” see David Orland, “Brigitte Bardot’s Cry in the Silence,” VDare.com, http://www.vdare.com/misc/orland_silence.htm (September 2, 2003, visited 7/28/05). Borland concludes: “Brigitte Bardot has written a fairly silly book. But it deserves to be remaindered, not prosecuted. Contemporary French political discourse being what it is, Bardot instead found herself on the best-seller list—and facing criminal prosecution. She was right about one thing: when it comes to the question of contemporary immigration, ‘human cowardice knows no limits.’”


36 Among her comments deemed offensive were: “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.” http://www.worldmagblog.com/blog/archives/015541.html


Any good lawyer knows that one of the most dangerous rhetorical traps we can face is to be taken to the extremes of principled arguments because there are no logical boundaries or limits. In the worlds of law and politics lines must be drawn and limits established. Principles such as “tolerance”, multiculturalism”, “diversity”, “freedom” and “religious freedom” must be bounded rather than open-ended. “Within limits” they are all positive expressions of important values. Until the point that expecting new entrants to be willing to adapt and assimilate into their new host culture became an act of bigotry, these positive but logically open-ended terms were being interpreted within a largely congruent system of shared creeds and social beliefs that worked reasonably well as signposts for interpreting behavior and expectations.

Taken outside the comfort zone for which they were created such exceedingly broad language takes on different meanings and degrees of significance that was not intended. Such principles were designed for a specific system and for people who accepted and respected that system. They were not intended for a social, legal, or political system in which the basic principles of legitimacy were rejected and groups clustered into fragmented “tribes”.

beliefs,” The Guardian [online] Wednesday July 13, 2005. A contrary view voiced shortly after the publication of one of Fallaci’s most recent tracts is offered in, Sophie Arie, “Anti-Islamic books’ success fuels fears of racism in Italy,” The Guardian [online], Saturday, August 7, 2004. “In the book Fallaci makes sweeping criticisms of authorities for failing to stop Europe becoming “Eurabia” and “a colony of Islam”, in a stealthy process she describes as the “burning of Troy”. … ‘This kind of argument does a lot of damage,’ said Luciano Scaglioni, head of the Italian branch of the European Network Against Racism. ”

39 “Blasphemy” has taken on new forms. The core question is who gets to choose what are considered established beliefs in a rapidly changing system such as characterizes Western society that within the past two decades has undergone a radical transformation. The Random House Dictionary of the English Language, Second Ed., Unabridged (New York 1987) provides that blasphemy is: “1. impious utterance or action concerning God or sacred things; 4. irreverent behavior toward anything held sacred, priceless, etc.” Heresy is: “1. opinion or doctrine at variance with the orthodox or accepted doctrine, esp. of a church or religious system. 2. the maintaining of such an opinion or doctrine. … 4. any belief or theory that is strongly at variance with established beliefs, customs, etc.” Vilify is defined as: “1. to speak ill of; defame, slander. 2. to make vile.” Vilipend: “1. to regard or treat as of little value or account.”

40 Alan Travis, “Pickles to serve up curry in government integration strategy. School to train UK nationals in line with Tory policy of deep cuts in immigration and scrapping language of multiculturalism”, guardian.co.uk, Friday, 18 November 2011. “Talk of promoting local community cohesion is out and talk of promoting integration is now in, with “tolerance” as the new watchword. It follows David Cameron’s Munich speech earlier this year when he criticised “state multiculturalism” and argued that the UK needed a stronger national identity. …. After the 2010 general election, particularly the encounter between Brown and Gillian Duffy in Rochdale, discussion of immigration within political parties, including Labour, has moved on to questions of integration, especially about requiring new migrants to learn English and participate in society. Outside the integration strategy discussions, ministers have separately been discussing a new “public interest test” to ensure that extreme or intolerant groups cannot gain public engagement or funding. The test under consideration, to be overseen by a cross-government body, would apply to all potentially extremist groups, including the far right, but also would target Islamist groups that support a caliphate, reject democracy and UK political institutions and call for the wholesale implementation of sharia law.”


42 In the midst of the insanity of fanatic religiosiity and an example of why such strategies must be resisted, see the blasphemy case set in Greece reported by Krysia Diver, “Cartoonist faces Greek jail for blasphemy,” The Guardian [online], Wednesday March 23, 2005. The report relates: “He meant it as a piece of religious satire, a playful look at the life of Jesus. But Gerhard Haderer’s depiction of Christ as a binge-drinking friend of Jimi Hendrix and naked surfer high on cannabis has caused a furor that could potentially land the cartoonist in jail. Haderer did not even know that his book, The Life of Jesus, had been published in Greece until he received a summons to appear in
Assimilation and Systemic Sustainability

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 sustainability. There is also the idea of the need to control inputs in ways that a biosystem can absorb without damaging its core qualities and allow adaptation rather than being overwhelmed by large scale or massive introduction of “pollutants” into a system at volumes and speeds beyond the ability of that system to absorb due to its limited ability to “process” the new pressures.

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.

It is not desirable to allow the rapid and large-scale infusion of alternative systems into one’s traditional creedral 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 adapt to stimuli at a sustainable pace rather than collapse from the weight and contradictions of distinct value systems 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 or undermines the core belief systems. The idea of a core cultural system is not a “makeweight”. 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
court in Athens in January charged with blasphemy. He was given a six-month suspended sentence in absentia, but if he loses his appeal next month his sentence could be increased to two years. Haderer’s book is the first to be banned in Greece for more than 20 years, and he is the first artist to fall prey of the European arrest warrant system since it was introduced in June 2002. … ‘It is unbelievable that a person can write a book in his home country and be condemned and threatened with imprisonment by another,’ said Nikki Conrad, a human rights expert.…

44 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.
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.

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.

The irony in this “blindness” is that such awareness is part of what is in play in many Muslim nations or regions within artificially constructed nations whose “parts” do not fit. 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 recently that all Christian churches must be torn down in the Arabian Peninsula. 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

45 “Bardot weeps over racism charges,” Friday, May 7, 2004, supra, n. .

46 I argue that people do not have the right in a democratic system to be free from insult, and that legal sanctions against insult kill the spirit of democracy. See, e.g., Polly Toynbee, “My right to offend a fool: Race and religion are different - which is why Islamophobia is a nonsense and religious hatred must not be outlawed,” The Guardian [online], Friday June 10, 2005. 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. A small example: if you wonder why there have been no penetrating exposes of cults like Scientology in recent years, it is because they have sued so often that the media caved in - fear of litigation outweighs the story. That is how the law cast its shadow.”

47 Leader, “Nationalising Islam,” The Guardian [online], Friday December 10, 2004. “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.” See also: Jon Henley, “Imams to be taught French way of life: Minister wants to build ‘western Islam’ through education,” The Guardian [online], Wednesday, December 08, 2004. “Muslim prayer leaders in France are to be offered university training in French law, civics, history and culture from next autumn as part of a bid to build a moderate ‘French Islam’ that respects human rights and the Republican code, the interior minister said yesterday. The courses, available initially at two university campuses in Paris will be accompanied by intensive French language lessons if necessary. Both current and future imams will be encouraged to enrol, Dominique de Villepin said in a newspaper interview. ‘Today, of the 1,200 imams who practise in our country, 75% are not French and one-third do not even speak our language,’ Mr de Villepin told the daily Le Parisien. ‘This is not acceptable. In France we should have French imams, speaking French.’” See also, Leader, “Towards a British Islam,” The Guardian [online], Thursday, April 1, 2004.

48 Clifford D. May, ‘Destroy All the Churches’, National Review Online, March 22, 2012, http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/294112/destroy-all-churches-clifford-d-may/page/0/1?splash=. The Grand Mufti is the highest ranking Saudi religious figure. “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 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 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 all Western “taint” from its realm in Northern Nigeria. While Boko Haram may be an extreme version of intolerance they are no more so than the Taliban, al-Qaeda, the Iranian Ayatollahs and the Muslim Brotherhood, not to mention the Saudi Wahhabis, 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.  

Unfortunately, several decades of overwhelmingly blind tolerance in Europe and the United Kingdom of an unscreened core of fundamentally intolerant migrants has created

---


50 See description of Malaysian law, supra, n.

51 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 released in January 2005 prior to the initial elections in Iraq attributed to Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, then head of Al Qaeda 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.’” CNN.com, Sunday, January 23, 2005. http://www.cnn.com/2005/WORLD/meast/01/23/iraq.main/ (visited 9/6/05).

52 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. See, Manizha Naderi, “Negotiating with the Taliban is the way to brutal repression”, Thomson Reuters Foundation, July 8, 2013, http://www.trust.org/item/20130708040701-u0k5t/. “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, 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.”

53 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 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,” ….”

54 For an example see, AP in The Hague, “Geert Wilders to spread his anti-Muslim movement west. Dutch far-right politician forms international alliance to attempt to ban immigration from Islamic countries”, Friday, July 16, 2010, The Guardian; Kate Connolly, “Angela Merkel declares death of German multiculturalism: Chancellor’s remarks, which claimed multiculturalism had failed utterly, interpreted as a shift rightwards from previous views”, Monday, October 18 2010, The Guardian. http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/oct/17/angela-merkel-germany-multiculturalism-failures. Merkel is quoted: “We kidded ourselves for a while that they [foreign Muslim guest workers] wouldn't stay, but that's not the reality,” she said ……….. “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. … They also 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.”
a support and organizational system for Islamic fanatics. This has not only harmed those nations but 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 shortcomings in history. It is one where the “wolf” was welcomed into a tent filled with raw meat and expected not to bite.

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 community’s cultural ecology. It is one thing if the external entrants are possessed of radically different value systems. That, in itself, is not my concern. In limited numbers, with a willingness to assimilate and the shunning of violence, this is the kind of process that enriches a community when allowed to play out over time on a relatively limited scale. It is quite another issue if the new entrants have rigid value systems that scorn and reject those of the host community they have entered. One set of dissonant values can be absorbed in a reasonably limited way and the system enriched by the difference.

---

55 Olivier Roy argues that: “The Islam with which such young people [the London bombers and radicalized second-generation 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.” See, Olivier Roy, “Britain: homegrown terror,” *Le Monde diplomatique*, August 2005, [http://mondediplo.com/2005/08/05terror](http://mondediplo.com/2005/08/05terror). See also, Olivier Roy, *Globalized Islam: The Search for a New Ummah* (2004).

56 Kim Willsher, “Charlie Hebdo front cover depicts Muslim man kissing cartoonist: French satirical magazine does not hold back in latest issue despite firebomb attack after printing Muhammad cartoon,” *The Guardian*, Wednesday, November 9, 2011. Willsher reports: “Its offices have been firebombed, its website hacked, its Facebook page suspended for 24 hours and its staff targeted with death threats, so you might have thought the French satirical magazine Charlie Hebdo would have tried “just for a while” to avoid upsetting anyone. Mais non! After provoking all the above with last week’s special edition “guest edited” by the prophet Muhammad, entitled Charia Hebdo, which took pot-shots at radical Islam, the publication is set to raise a few more hackles with this week’s edition, published on Wednesday. On the front page of the latest edition is a drawing of a male Charlie Hebdo cartoonist passionately kissing a bearded Muslim man under the headline: L’Amour plus fort que la haine (love is stronger than hate).” Its offices have been firebombed, its website hacked, its Facebook page suspended for 24 hours and its staff targeted with death threats, so you might have thought the French satirical magazine, signed Luz, are the ashes of the magazine’s offices, completely destroyed in the Molotov cocktail attack last week.” This has been followed by riots in Sweden and France, aborted attacks in the UK, and the murder and beheading of a British soldier on the streets of London.

57 Jon Henley, “France prepares to expel radical Islamist leaders,” *The Guardian* [online], 8/2/05.

58 Sweden has allowed a significant amount of immigrants into its borders, many of them Muslim. See, Amy Kellogg, “Sweden’s Immigration Debate,” FoxNews.com, October 28, 2011. She 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.”

59 Madeleine Bunting, “Throwing mud at Muslims: Branding moderates as extremists will have disastrous consequences”, *Guardian*, Monday, August 22, 2005. See also, Olivier Roy, “Britain: homegrown terror-What did those who bombed London on 7 and 21 July want? The real goals of Islamist terrorism are the provocation of a clash of cultures and the destruction of political integration”, *Le Monde diplomatique*, [http://mondediplo.com/2005/08/05terror](http://mondediplo.com/2005/08/05terror). Roy argues: “But 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..."
effect of the other set of attitudes—rejection of the community’s fundamental values and creeds on a large scale accompanied by the willingness to do harm—is profound and harmful.60

The Hattersley-Monbiot Rejection of Assimilation

Among much of the intelligentsia of Europe, and to a lesser extent America, it is considered illiberal to prefer one’s own country to another. Defending the traditional values of France or Britain marks one as a cultural bigot.61 If it is considered déclassé even for one who was raised in a national culture to value it above others, not because it is objectively “better” but because it is a sort of family or community, then how reasonable is it to expect any loyalty from people who were raised without that grounding? With this kind of ethos dominating the liberal politics and education of Western Europe, many of the new residents and citizens never bond to their new environment and feel no allegiance to their new nation. Subjected to the rabid prophets functioning as cult leaders within Britain and Europe, a not insubstantial number of Europe’s Muslims feel hatred and resentment rather than loyalty.

Roy Hattersley and George Monbiot are respected columnists for the London newspaper, The Guardian. Each authored a column following Tony Blair’s pronouncement of measures intended to provide greater security in the UK after the July 2005 bombings. Hattersley penned, “End this chorus of intolerance: It is uncivilised to demand that Muslims abandon their way of life,” while Monbiot wrote, “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.”62 I suggest these two pieces represent precisely the kind of intellectual

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.

The 7 July bombers were probably already radicalised before they went to Pakistan. It was not their brief (and uncertain) stay in a Pakistani madrasa that turned them into suicides, and it seems they did not really pursue any religious studies there. The fact that one was a convert proves that we are not dealing with the reaction of a traditional Muslim community, but with a reformulation in religious terms (Islamic) of the more general revolt of a generation adrift between its culture of origin and westernisation.”

60 See, Press Association, “Religious hatred bill unveiled today,” The Guardian [online], Thursday, June 9, 2005. It reports: “The home secretary, Charles Clarke, will today publish a controversial bill banning incitement to hatred on the basis of religious belief, which opponents believe will outlaw religious jokes and curtail free speech. The racial and religious hatred bill will extend current offences on incitement to racial hatred under the 1986 Public Order Act to cover the stirring up of hatred against people of any religious faith. The offence will carry a maximum seven-year jail sentence. The government argues the present law is unsatisfactory because it covers followers of some faiths, such as Jews and Sikhs who are also considered as racial groups, while giving no protection to Muslims, who come from many racial backgrounds.” See also, Matthew Tempest, “Artists bid to block religious hatred bill,” The Guardian [online], Monday June 20, 2005. “A coalition of some of Britain’s most prominent actors, artists and writers will today make a last-minute attempt to persuade the government to amend its plans for a new law banning “incitement to religious hatred”. Tempest reports that: “Shami Chakrabati, the director of civil liberties group Liberty, said: ‘There may be good intentions behind this bill but the road to censorship is paved that way. Most anti-Muslim hatred is thinly veiled race hatred, capable of being caught by a more narrow amendment to the present law. This offence is capable of catching attacks on ideas as well as people. [adding] ‘At best this is an empty sop to a community sorely let down by government. At worst it is a dangerous new blasphemy law out of step with our best traditions.’”


62 See, George Monbiot, “The new chauvinism: I’m not ashamed of my nationality, but I have no idea why I
system in which the writers are trapped in the logic of their assumptions to the point they can not draw lines or see limits.

For Hattersley, being civilized apparently requires the full tolerance of any belief system within one’s society. This is an extreme view that would be accepted only in the nations operating under the Western sense of the Rule of Law. One might suggest that this represents a sort of condescending arrogance in which “advanced” societies were both able and obligated to accept anything from other cultures no matter how primitive or different those cultures might appear to a citizen of the West. Perhaps even more central is the lack of awareness of the impact of speed, scale and the nature of “difference” represented by the inflow and demands for tolerance and respect.

I have been fortunate to be able to teach in the UK on three occasions and many of the Brits I have talked with in such diverse locales as London, Cornwall, Yorkshire, Wales and Scotland, feel there is a British identity as well as a special regional identity. London, or “Londonistan” as one writer described that region, is of course at this point essentially a “city-state” operating according to its own set of values and should not be thought to represent overall British culture. The fact that people outside that unique “Internationalist” city-state might sometimes have difficulty translating what to them has always been inchoate and converting their understanding to words does not at all render their system without meaning, depth or legitimacy.

Many people also fear their cultural identities and creeds are being undermined by the rapidly growing population of people who seem to have no understanding or respect for British traditions. Of course some of the feeling among some of the people is racist, while part is caused by the inevitable fear and resentment of the “other” that is found in all of us. Some of the apprehension is based on the automatic rejection of change most humans experience when their comfortable world is suddenly askew. But a not inconsiderable amount of the resentment is resistance to the radical transformation of their regional and national cultures.63 It is not that they are opposed to the new members of their society but to the sense that the “new people” are not trying to be “British” or “French” or “Swedish” or German” or “Dutch” whatever that means, and that too many even reject the culture of the nation in which they live.64

should love this country more than any other.” Tuesday August 09 2005, Guardian; Roy Hattersley, “End this chorus of intolerance: It is uncivilised to demand that Muslims abandon their way of life,” Friday August 12 2005, Guardian.

63 “David Miliband warns against complacency over rightwing extremism. Former foreign secretary praises Demos report into rise of far right in Europe”. Matthew Taylor and Peter Walker, Monday, November 7, 2011, guardian.co.uk. “David Miliband has joined those warning about the rise of a new wave of far-right nationalist parties across Europe, saying that it is important to keep track of their ascent”. In a rare foray into international politics since his defeat for the Labour party leadership 14 months ago, the former foreign secretary praised a report by the thinktank Demos which revealed a mass of mainly young, male Facebook-based supporters of such groups, who often held vehemently antagonistic views about immigrants and, in particular, Muslims.” “EDL supporters are young, male and anti-immigration, says survey.” Research into English Defence League finds pessimism about UK's future, job worries and antipathy to Islam and Muslims”. Matthew Taylor and Peter Walker Monday, October 31 2011, The Guardian.

64 November 15, 2011, Telegraph. “David Starkey in new row over 'mono-culture' comments. Historian David Starkey has become embroiled in a fresh row after saying most of Britain was a white "mono-culture". The TV historian's latest comments came in the context of Education Secretary Michael Gove's announcement that he wanted to put "our island story" at the heart of Britain's national curriculum. Dr Starkey told the conference that the national curriculum should involve “a serious focus on your own culture”. Joya Chatterji, of Trinity College Cambridge, questioned what Dr Starkey meant by Britain's "own culture", saying contemporary Britain was "rather diverse". But
This raises a fundamental question in direct conflict with the version of multiculturalism held by Hattersley. Does a nation have the right to preserve its traditional sense of culture and identity? I suggest it does, in the sense that it is entitled to expect those who are not originally of that culture but who seek to live within the society to accept certain conditions as a condition of admission and participation.65

If there are extreme and fundamental differences between cultures such as, for example, how women are treated and their acceptable roles, or whether forced or arranged marriages are allowable I have no hesitation in arguing it is not uncivilized to have contempt for this behavior and to use law to inhibit or punish it. When the conflict in values is extended to such things as the propriety of honor killings of women who have somehow offended a family’s dignity, support for violence and death aimed at innocent civilians, participation in or support for terrorist acts and so forth the conflict becomes intractable.66

George Monbiot’s analysis is equally intriguing. He could just as well have written, “I’m not ashamed of my wife, but I have no idea why I should love her any more than any other woman.” We could substitute “children,” “life partner” or any of a number of phenomena normally associated with the generally other-than-purely rational choices humans make. Monbiot’s essay leaves me with the feeling he is a pale ghost of a man

he interrupted her, saying: “No it’s not. Most of Britain is a mono-culture. You think London is Britain. It isn’t. “Where I’ve come from in Yorkshire, where I’ve come from in Westmorland, where I largely live in Kent, where I holiday much in the south west, it is absolutely and unmitigatingly white. “You have such a series of assumptions. It is a kind of Ken Livingstone-esque view of rainbow Britain. "Bits of Britain are rainbow and jolly interesting but to read out from those to everything else is profoundly misleading.”

65 Susan S. Lang, Extremist Groups in America (Franklin Watts 1990), discusses racism, the Ku Klux Klan, the “Identity Movement,” the Far Right religious groups, Neo-Nazis and Skinheads, Lewis Farrakhan and the Far Left. It is revealing to compare the enraged Muslim youth of Britain with Lang’s description of the UK’s skinheads in the 1980s. “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. According to the Detroit Free Press (November 19, 1987): “It 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.’ “ Id, at 92, 93. See also, Finn-Aage Esdebensen, Stephen G. Tibbetts, Larry Gaines, American Youth Gangs at the Millennium (Waveland 2004), and Kayleen Hazlehurst and Cameron Hazlehurst, eds., Gangs and Youth Subcultures: International Explorations (Transaction 1998).

66 This brings into play the meaning of “radical Islam” and the extent to which there are unbridgeable value conflicts between Islam and Western value systems. One critic who warns about the tendency to conflate all Muslims with radicalism because they do not approve of Western value systems and behaviors puts the dilemma as follows. Alastair Crooke, “The naïve armchair warriors are fighting a delusional war,” The Guardian, Monday, March 24, 2008. writes:

“If radical Islam, with which these experts tell us we should be at war, encompasses all those who are not enamoured of secular society, and who espouse a vision of their societies grounded in the values of Islam, then these experts are advocating a war with Islam - because Islam is the vision for their future favoured by many Muslims.

Mainstream Islamists are indeed challenging western secular and materialist values, and many do believe that western thinking is flawed - that the desires and appetites of man have been reified into representing man himself. It is time to re-establish values that go beyond "desires and wants", they argue.

Many Islamists also reject the western narrative of history and its projection of inevitable "progress" towards a secular modernity; they reject the western view of power-relationships within societies and between societies; they reject individualism as the litmus of progress in society; and, above all, they reject the west’s assumption that its empirical approach lends unassailability and objective rationality to its thinking - and universality to its social models.”
sliding through the interstices of life within a cage of ethereal logic located outside the physical reality of the world.67

As an American reared on stories such as “The Man without a Country,” I admit to a strong commitment to my nation that doesn’t reject others but prefers the special relationship between person and nation we usually call patriotism, civic virtue or some similar idea of duty and faith. In the story the court-martialed Philip Nolan angrily rejected his country after he was convicted of aiding Aaron Burr in a separatist military conspiracy. As a result, Nolan was sentenced to spend the rest of his life on a ship offshore. Part of the sentence is that he was never allowed to return to America and never to hear the name of his country uttered from another’s lips.

The point is that there are obligations and privileges that flow from being a citizen of a country. These should not be trivialized with careless use of the term chauvinism as Monbiot declaims, or Hattersley’s accusation of being uncivilized. There are consequences flowing from the statements made by respected “public intellectuals”. 68 Nations that have spent centuries struggling to develop a culture premised on the Rule of Law have the right to insist that those living within their territorial ambit respect that culture or leave.69

---

67 See, Edward Everett Hale, “The Man Without a Country,” in which Philip Nolan, an officer in the American Army who was caught up in Aaron Burr’s conspiracy and subsequently tried and found guilty of treason responded when asked by the court if he had any words to say about the United States, “‘Damn the United States! I wish I may never hear of the United States again!’ The court then granted his wish as part of his sentence and as the story goes, “He never did hear her name but once again. From that moment, September 23, 1807, till the day he died, May 11, 1863, he never heard her name again. For that half century and more he was a man without a country.” Hale’s story relates how one evening Nolan was reading out loud to officers on the ship that served as his prison and that he read the following passage before fleeing to his room and remaining for two months.

Breathes there the man, with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said -
This is my own, my native land!
Whose heart hath ne'er within him burned
As home his footsteps he hath turned
From wandering on a foreign strand? -
If such there breathe go, mark him well.
For him no minstrel raptures swell;
High though his titles, proud his name,
Boundless his wealth as wish can claim,
Despite these titles, power and pelf,
The wretch, concentrated all in self -

68 An intriguing analysis of how this works is offered by Eric Hoffer, in The Ordeal of Change (New York, Harper & Row, 1963). He argues: “The intellectual goes to the masses in search of weightiness and a role of leadership. Unlike the man of action, the man of words needs the sanctions of ideals and the incantation of words in order to act forcefully. He wants to lead, command, and conquer, but he must feel that in satisfying those hungers he does not cater to a petty self. He needs justification, and he seeks it in the realization of a grandiose design, and in the solemn ritual of making the word become flesh. Thus he does battle for the downtrodden and disinflicted, and for liberty, equality, justice, and truth, though, as Thoreau pointed out, the grievance which animates him is not mainly “his sympathy with his fellows in distress, but, though he be the holiest son of God, is his private ail.” Once his “private ail” is righted, the intellectual’s ardor for the underprivileged cools considerably. His cast of mind is essentially aristocratic.” Id, at 47, 48.

69 Hypocrisy & Myth, supra, n. .
This position has nothing to do with fear, bigotry or resentment of seemingly alien garb such as all-encompassing burqas or jilbabs, crucifixes, hijabs, yarmulkes or other external indicia of one’s religious or political belief. It has much to do with insisting that we all have real respect for each others’ dignity and the right to be free from violence. It relates to the willingness of all citizens and permanent residents who benefit from the social goods of a society to accept the Social Contract of the country in which they live rather than feeling entitled to establish what in effect constitutes an independent colony within a nation.

**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 not only possess such “illegal” principles and values but intend to continue 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 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 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

---

70 Vikram Dodd, “Crackdown on elusive extremists: Even with new measures, it will not be easy to root out those who back terrorism,” Guardian, 7/15/05; James Brandon, “A defiant Islam rises among young Britons,” Christian Science Monitor, 7/28/05; Rory Carroll, “Militants target barbers of Baghdad,” The Guardian, 7/7/05.
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 cultures that when shared prevent a society from descending into a dull and orthodox state of existence. 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.\footnote{Anthony King, “One in four Muslims sympathises with motives of terrorists,” News.telegraph, 7/28/05.}

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 separateness that could just as well be a “Warning! Do Not Approach!” sign in pulsing neon. \footnote{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 12:30 AM EDT. Worthington writes: “Once again, Quebec is showing leadership to the rest of Canada. Unlike “English” Canada, Quebec has never doubted its own identity, and has led the rest of the country in culture, music, the arts, even politics (where it can be a real nuisance). 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. A majority of Canadians likely endorse Quebec’s decision (Bill 94). 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. While worthy of debate and discussion, what the new Quebec law is not, is racist. Rather, it is an effort to promote or enhance racial and gender equality. That so few Muslim women in Quebec wear the niqab or burqa - we are told only a couple of dozen go along with the custom - makes the new law even more appropriate. It will cause no widespread disarray or discomfort. 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.}

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. Haroon Siddiqui, editor emeritus at the Toronto Star, disagrees. He finds it “scarier when majorities in democracies feel threatened by a (tiny) minority.” It’s neither “scary” nor “threatening” to 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.”
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. In significant numbers they threaten the foundations of the political community because there can be no real communication or discourse.

Such difference represents 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 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 dissimilar to 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 an adapting 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.

One might suspect that over time new immigrants would begin to move out of cultural enclaves that were necessitated initially by their feelings of difference and need for mutual support by people who “understand” them. In America, this multi-generational transition has often occurred and over time 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” is one of the higher virtues America has to offer the world as a culture and community. It is a sad development that, as noted by John Fonte and Alan Wolfe at the beginning of this analysis, the expectation that new entrants accept the core creed and guiding principles of the nation has increasingly been transformed into an evil and its critics contribute to the rise of tribalism, intense factionalism and the loss of the ability to discuss, share perspectives and compromise.

When a group considers it is superior to all others and rejects the duty to assimilate and adapt into the host community and seeks to carve out colonized niches, it should not be surprising if suspicion and hostility is 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 being 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 enriching tolerance for groups with fundamentally different beliefs that themselves refuse to tolerate others within the community results not in positive social evolution but the emergence of extreme political and religious identity sects. The danger is that some among those identity sects operate as Fifth Columns and function as support bases for interests seeking
to undermine the existing community. These aggressive identity sects with some members whose loyalty is given to interests outside the host community fragment the traditional cultures of Western nations to the extent their core character is eroding.

The Power of Certainty in an Uncertain World

The erosion in traditional creeds becomes even more profound as society becomes increasingly secular and even the deepest principles become little more than empty words. The increasingly “weak” values Western cultures assert become transformed into a thin gruel. As this occurs the society is sublimated to the aggressive religiosity of the new entrants who, while they may not fully understand what they assert, nonetheless believe deeply in what they are saying. There is great power in fanatical beliefs, particularly when the communities of Europe, the United Kingdom and America are increasingly adrift and uncertain as to the worth and validity of any value system other than an amorphous Liberalism that backs preferences and desires but has no internal “governor” to indicate where lines need to be drawn. Such “tasteless pabulum” is, for many people who need more guidance and sense of value and direction, something that

73 See the statements of Omar Bakri in admitting that the Jihadist movement was funding and supporting groups within Europe, Serge Trifkovic, “Islamic Immigrants,” supra, n. , relates that Syrian-born Sheikh Omar bin Bakri has proclaimed: “We will remodel this country in an Islamic image,” …. [noting that Bakri belongs to The International Islamic Front for Jihad against Jews and Crusaders, founded by Bin Laden, and 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.’ …. 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 colonized. 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.’” Perhaps one of the best descriptions is by in Sweden in which he admits that the extremists may be relatively small in number but operate their recruitment systems like a “squeezing python”’. Supra, n. ,

74 See, Mark Oliver and agencies, “Radical cleric banned from Britain,” Friday, August 12 2005, The Guardian [online]; Alan Travis, Duncan Campbell, and Audrey Gillan, “Clarke uses ‘personal power’ to ban Bakri from UK,” Saturday August 13, 2005, The Guardian [online]. What might Bakri have said that violated the Blair policies? 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. See, Rajeev Syal, “Cleric supports targeting children,” News.telegraph (London Daily Telegraph) Sept. 5, 2004. The Timesonline (London Times) collected several public statements made by Bakri. They include: “The 9/11 hijackers: ‘The magnificent 19’; Osama bin Laden: ‘Why I condemn Osama bin Laden for? I condemn Tony Blair, I condemn George Bush. I would never condemn Osama bin Laden or any Muslims’; Law and Order: ‘The way to earn the heart of the British youth is by the divine text, to say God say it and Mohammed say it, ‘Do not attack the people you live among.’ Not to tell them, ‘Tony Blair say it, the law say it, don't do so’”; The London bombings: “I blame the British Government and I blame the British people. They are the ones who should be blamed”; Suicide bombings: “We call it self sacrifice, You must fight for the way of Allah - to kill first and be killed. If somebody decided to land an aeroplane over 10 Downing Street, for example - this is a form of self sacrifice”’ http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,22989-1702695,00.html [8/21/05].

easily falls victim to the power of fundamentalist religion that offers certainty even if not truth.

The intensity of religious faith is a central factor in what is occurring even if the conflict is not precisely about colliding sets of religious belief. There is even a parallel with the mindsets of a Western world drifting toward secularism and the re-emergence of a dedicated religious-political movement in which simplistic and fanatical faith in a singular divinity is at the core. The dilemma of societal drift and evangelical fanaticism has been seen before. Kenneth Clark captures the context of the initial 1000 years of the struggle between Islam and Western civilization. He explains: “in the middle of the 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 … invincible solidarity …. In a miraculously short time – about fifty years – the classical world was overrun.”

---

77 Clark, *Civilisation*, *id.*