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Seeing that the Islamic State, an aggressive power, occupying two nations, seeking, through conquest, not only adjacent lands, but also, through loyal affiliates, a vast area of land; it should be recognized as a fledgling empire.

Intending to conquer not only the historical lands of the medieval Muslim empire—known as the Caliphate—but also, like the Soviet Union in recent times, the lands of the whole world.

It must be recognized as a serious threat to the national security of the United States, and to the security of the whole world. However small it is thought to be, it is already an empire.

For what it’s worth, pigeonholing this new national entity ‘the Islamic State,’ by no means legitimates it. The branding, as it were, recognizes a certain de facto material reality while, at the same time, protecting the name of a famous woman, Io, who fled Greece for Egypt in ancient times and came to be known by the alias “Isis.”

In other words, acronym ISIS feeds Islamic State propaganda, since to say one is against “ISIS” is to say one is against this famous woman and not against the Islamic State itself.

Appeasement

As an imperialistic entity aimed at conquering the whole world, the Islamic State can be neither placated nor appeased, because it seeks either the enslavement or death of all peoples contrary to its aims.

As the American people, our collective aim, or, if you will, our national interest is diametrically opposed, and utterly incompatible with the collective aim, or national interest, of the Islamic State.

The Islamic State seeks to establish an empire ruled by a religious emperor called a Caliph, or more correctly a Khalifah, who, by means of an Ulama, rules the Muslim Ummah, and the non-Muslim Dhimmi in accordance to Islamic law—Shariah. To us, it should make no difference how the Dhimmi were treated historically, or theoretically, under the Muslim Ummah. It suffices to know how we will be treated under this Islamic State.

Under such a regime, there could not be any political or intellectual freedom, for everything worth knowing would be summed up in the teachings of this Shariah law, and interpreted by a priest class handpicked by, and subordinate to, the Kaliphah—the Imams of the Ulama.

The United States, in contradistinction, is guided by humanistic principles derived from Greco-Roman thought, the Ancients owing nothing to Christianity but their own
destruction at Christian hands.* Greco-Roman thought recognizes, and indeed even encourages, freedom of thought, individual initiative, and democratic principles.

In the immortal words of Dwight D. Eisenhower:

“Political freedom for the individual, which automatically includes spiritual and intellectual freedom, is the greatest single characteristic of Western civilization.”†

In his First Inaugural Address Eisenhower furthermore said:

“We are called as a people to give testimony in the sight of the world to our faith that the future shall belong to the free...

“We summon all our knowledge of the past and we scan all the signs of the future. We bring all our wit and all our will to meet the question:

“How far have we come in man’s long pilgrimage from darkness toward the light? Are we nearing the light—a day of freedom and of peace for all mankind? Or are the shadows of another night closing in upon us? ...

“We who are free must proclaim anew our faith. This faith is the abiding creed of our fathers. It is our faith in the deathless dignity of man, governed by eternal moral and natural laws...

“This faith rules our whole way of life. It decrees that we, the people, elect leaders not to rule but to serve. It asserts that we have the right to choice of our own work and to the reward of our own toil. It inspires the initiative that makes our productivity the wonder of the world. And it warns that any man who seeks to deny equality among all his brothers betrays the spirit of the free and invites the mockery of the tyrant...

“The enemies of this faith know no god but force, no devotion but its use. They tutor men in treason. They feed upon the hunger of others. Whatever defies them, they torture, especially the truth.

“Here, then, is joined no argument between slightly different philosophies. This conflict strikes directly at the faith of our fathers and the lives of our sons. No principle or treasure that we hold...nothing lies safely beyond the reach of this struggle.

“Freedom is pitted against slavery; lightness against the dark...

“Realizing that common sense and common decency alike dictate the futility of appeasement, we shall never try to placate an aggressor by the false and wicked bargain of trading honor for security. American’s, indeed, all free men, remember that in the

---

* Freedom of thought and democracy are not Christian ideas. Freedom of thought is a Greek idea, democracy Roman. If anyone should be credited for bequeathing democracy to America, it would be the Freemasons—George Washington in particular.

final choice a soldier’s pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner’s chains…

“We must be ready to dare all for our country. For history does not long entrust the care of freedom to the weak or timid. We must acquire proficiency in defense and display stamina in purpose…

“No person, no home, no community can be beyond the reach of this call…For this truth must be clear before us: whatever America hopes to bring to pass in the world must first come to pass in the heart of America…

“This signifies more than the stilling of guns, easing the sorrow of war. More than escape from death, it is a way of life. More than a haven for the weary, it is a hope for the brave.”

Whereas the Ulama would neither recognize, nor respect, anything of this American faith, no American could ever be free under it.

Making their faith in Jihad diametrically opposed to American faith and American survival, and, therefore, diametrically opposed to our national interest—where national interest pertains to the very survival of any nation. Therefore the Islamic State must not survive.

Seeing that appeasement would serve to postpone, not prevent, a war. And whereas the Islamic State threatens the very survival of the United States, it would be most unwise to attempt to appease or placate it. That means war. But what kind of war?

Isolationism

Franklin Delano Roosevelt pursued this disastrous ‘peace at any price’ diplomacy and erected an historical monument to ‘what is shameful in conception and shameful in result,’ i.e. World War II and the atomic bomb.†

FDR was so committed to this foolish diplomacy that when, on March 16, 1935, Adolph Hitler announced, in violation of the Treaty of Versailles, a general rearmament of Germany, Roosevelt did nothing.

When Benito Mussolini invaded Ethiopia (Second Italo-Ethiopian War), October 3, 1935, Roosevelt did nothing.

Then, on March 7, 1936, when Germany occupied the Rhineland, another violation of the Treaty, Roosevelt did nothing under the pretext of avoiding a war with American involvement.

When Hitler annexed Austria (Anschluss), March 12, 1938, Roosevelt’s policy, for the same reasons, remained unchanged.

When FDR wrote to Hitler seeking peace, September 27, 1938, he saying, among other things: “The Government of the United States has no political involvements in Europe, and will assume no obligations in the conduct of the present negotiations,” he was, for obvious reasons, ignored.

† Livy, Ab Urbe Condita, 1.10.
Roosevelt preferred to sit on his hands and let Europe take the punishment of the Axis powers. When the United Kingdom was itself on the brink of collapse, FDR in his speech Fireside Chat, December 29, 1940, remarked:

“The Nazi masters of Germany have made it clear that they intend not only to dominate all life and thought in their own country, but also to enslave the whole of Europe, and then to use the resources of Europe to dominate the rest of the world…

“If Great Britain goes down, the Axis powers will control the continents of Europe, Asia, Africa, Australasia, and the high seas—and they will be in a position to bring enormous military and naval resources against this hemisphere. It is no exaggeration to say that all of us, in all the Americas, would be living at the point of a gun…

“There are those who say that the Axis powers would never have any desire to attack the Western Hemisphere. That is the same dangerous form of wishful thinking which has destroyed the powers of resistance of so many conquered peoples. The plain facts are that the Nazis have proclaimed, time and again, that all other races are their inferiors and therefore subject to their orders. And most important of all, the vast resources and wealth of this American Hemisphere constitute the most tempting loot in all the round world.”

While this reply stated that it seemed useless to continue the existing diplomatic negotiations, it contained no threat or hint of war or armed attack.

FDR remained unmoved, he was shaken, but not stirred to action. In the same speech he went on to say:

“There is no demand for sending an American Expeditionary Force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your Government to send such a force. You can, therefore, nail any talk about sending armies to Europe as deliberate untruth.

“Our national policy is not directed toward war. Its sole purpose is to keep war away from our country and our people.”

After the Axis attack on Pearl Harbor, FDR, on December 8, 1941, asked Congress for a declaration of war on Japan, and delivered his Day of Infamy speech. In it he said:

“The United States was at peace with that nation and, at the solicitation of Japan, was still in conversation with its Government and its Emperor looking toward the maintenance of peace in the Pacific. Indeed, one hour after Japanese air squadrons had commenced bombing in Oahu, the Japanese Ambassador to the United States and his colleague delivered to the Secretary of State a formal reply to a recent American message. While this reply stated that it seemed useless to continue the existing diplomatic negotiations, it contained no threat or hint of war or armed attack.”

Reality had finally found him, and had found him unprepared. Appeasement never found a foothold in American foreign policy ever again, but it can still be seen in Europe. Some people just never learn, do they?
**Containment**

The Islamic State cannot be contained for many of the same reasons it cannot be deterred. The Islamic State cannot be contained because its structure defies all forms of encirclement. If the Islamic State were to lose in Iraq and Syria, it could immediately be remade to hatch its plots in a large number of parts of the world, such as Egypt, or Libya, or in the former Soviet republics, or in the Philippines, et al.

By the same token, if they couldn’t be stopped in New York, or Boston, could they be stopped in Chicago, or Los Angeles, or any number of other places of its own choosing?

**Deterrence**

The Islamic State cannot be defeated by traditional forms of deterrence, because it is not motivated by traditional forms of national identity or national sovereignty.

The Islamic state is instead inspired by an ideology which will trade sovereignty and national identity for ideology itself, unto death. The Islamic State seeks the manifestation of itself, the universalization of its thought, and the totalization of its power. The Islamic State, considering each of these as essential to its life, in want of any, seeks its own death—individually and collectively.

The Islamic State cannot be deterred by the threat of massive retaliatory power, because its followers love to die.

**Nuclear Diplomacy**

Although it may be premature to seriously consider tiny tactical nuclear strikes on a very large scale, the possibility of the United States undertaking limited nuclear warfare cannot be taken off the table, and the enemy should know it. They have, after all, threatened us with a nuclear attack first. Shall we wait to deploy an atomic weapon until after they have actually attacked us with one?

The Islamic State is creating a situation which the United States government is seeking most earnestly to avoid.§

After nuclear weapons were used against Japan, Harry S. Truman said: “I regarded the bomb as a military weapon and never had any doubt that it should be used.”**

About the same matter, Winston Churchill said: “There was unanimous, automatic, unquestioned agreement around our table; nor did I ever hear the slightest suggestion that we do otherwise.”††

“No matter what the place and setting for the demonstration, they were sure it would not


give the adequate impression of its appalling destructive power, would not register its full meaning in human lives. The desired explosive impression on the Japanese, it was concluded, could be produced only by the actual awful experience.”‡‡

In considering the possibility of employing tactical nuclear weapons against the Islamic State the White House should consider more than world public opinion. The simple fact remains, if the United States is unwilling to use these weapons, then we should not have them at all. Deterrence only works when the threat is perceived to be real.

- Actions prove intentions.
- The source of restraint lies in fear of the consequences.
- It is a virtue to abstain even from that which is lawful.

**Propaganda Warfare**

Though it may be helpful, moral psychological force will not win the war with the Islamic State.

John Foster Dulles, in his pre-confirmation hearings for his future position as Secretary of State under Eisenhower, pointed out that the Soviet Union went from controlling 200 million people to controlling 800 million people with the space of seven years simply through “political warfare, psychological warfare, and propaganda” without using the Red Army as an aggressive force.§§

Current propaganda efforts such as the U. S. Department of State’s **“Think Again Turn Away”** program is gentle, womanish and motherly, but it will not significantly influence anyone committed to jihad.

The Islamic State cannot be killed with kindness. All sympathetic, pacifist, passive aggressive, and politically correct approaches to the propaganda war against the Islamic state are doomed to failure against a group that values strength, manliness, and unmitigated brutality.

The Anonymous hacker group (@OpIceISIS) though it claims to be “Aiming to destroy ISIS propaganda and influence on the internet,” in reality has fallen far short of its stated goals.

Along with Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter, the #Anonymous groups intended attack on the Islamic State in effect produces more censorship on the internet with the sum total effect of reinforcing ignorance about the Islamic State, it crimes, and its aims, hindering independent scholarship—the backbone of free thought. The very idea that the American public should be shielded from enemy propaganda in order to avoid

‡‡ Paterson, 248.

public panic is woefully misguided and profoundly undemocratic.

When J. Robert Oppenheimer insisted that president Eisenhower inform the American public about the “grim situation” arising from the arms race, Eisenhower launched Operation Candor which included, among other things, a radio and television series called the Age of Peril on the grounds that a free government could only work if there was an informed citizenry.

There were 60 counter-terrorism arrests in the United States in 2015, a record, and 315 counter-terrorism arrests in the United Kingdom, another record.

An estimated 1 million refugees have flooded Germany, a NATO ally, and an untold number of refugees from Syria, Iraq, and a number of North African countries such as Algeria and Libya, have poured into France, Belgium, the United Kingdom, and other NATO allies. Many of them with children who will be reared on first person shooter games and jihad videos. The Islamic State has already trained children as young as eight or ten years old to commit executions [video] [video].

Those children will soon be traveling, for instance, with German or French passports, from the United Kingdom, and from other of our closest NATO allies. Angela Merkel’s blunder will produce grave and lasting security concerns about travelers from our closest allies to the United States.

#Daeshbags is juvenile and insulting, but ultimately in effective and serves to prove that Islamic State child killers are more mature than western hackers. It should be borne in mind that there are sheep and goat herders, including yours truly, everywhere. Insulting everyone everywhere is disingenuous, to say the least, but also ineffective, and counterproductive.

It has been suggested that the United States create a magazine to counter the Islamic State magazine Dabiq.

Whatever the case may be, American propaganda against the Islamic State should stress democratic procedure, American military might—including tactical nuclear weapons—and the grinding wheels of American justice—including images of death row.

Propaganda against the Islamic State should show Congress issuing the President the “ultimatum” to destroy the Islamic State as quickly and efficiently as possible, to bring the war to a swift conclusion, and giving him a “mandate for victory” to use all means “necessary, prudent, and wise” to bring the war to a conclusion in accordance with our democratic principles.

Such propaganda should stress the grave seriousness of the democratic process, America’s unbending will, and the grinding wheels of the criminal justice system.

Comparisons between their leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi and Adolph Hitler should be
made as well as comparisons between the International Criminal Court and the Nuremberg Trials. While such propaganda should feature our greatest military leaders—for example, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Douglas MacArthur, et al—and their victories, such as D-Day and the unconditional surrender of Japan, it should also highlight American volunteerism—ordinary folks, independent researchers, and American veterans—recognizing the need, heeding the call, and contributing to victory. Much of this kind of propaganda will be as good for the American people as it will be harmful to the enemy. It should, however, understood that the Islamic State will never be allowed to surrender, since it is to be categorically destroyed. This fact must be impressed upon the enemy.

Obviously, no insults to their religion should be made. References to Arab or Muslim leaders, whether living or dead, should be omitted on the grounds that each of them are hated by someone in that part of the world.

But the insinuation of limited nuclear war should not be an idle threat. And will never be as good as use in combat for breaking the enemy’s will to fight. This war will not be won by propaganda, but by the real life annihilation of their military forces.

Post War Settlement:
Universalism or Spheres-of-Influence?

Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. said: “One theme indispensable to an understanding of the Cold War is the contrast between two clashing views of world order: the “universalist” view, by which nations all nations shared a common interest in all the affairs of the world, and the “sphere-of-influence” view, by which each great power would be assured by the other great powers of an acknowledged predominance in its own area of special interest. The universalist view assumed that national security would be guaranteed by an internationalist organization. The sphere-of-interest view assumed that national interest would be guaranteed by the balance of power.”

Under this rubric, the Islamic State could not possibly be universalist for not only do they consider all Muslim lands to be within their sphere-of-interest, but it also seeks to extend that sphere to include all of Africa, South East Asia, Europe, and even the United States. They, like the former Soviet Union, want the world.

***

---

To oppose this, the United States should adhere to the international bodies of the United Nations and the International Criminal Court, and NATO. But it should be stressed that America will never recognize an Islamic State sphere-of-interest, because the Islamic State is not to survive at all.

**Conclusion**

Islamic State *esse delendam*, as quickly as possible, without hesitation, delay, or remorse. We can plan for either of two things: immediate victory by categorically annihilating the enemy through a limited nuclear war which blanks enemy power centers, or plan for an entire historic era of jihad and limited countermeasures against an enemy that cannot by ordinary methods be defeated, if defeated at all. After the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Harry S. Truman said: “When you have to deal with a beast you have to treat him as a beast. It is most regrettable but nevertheless true.”†††

The Administration will need to decide if America can return to normalcy, or if this is the new normalcy. Whether we live in an instant of peril, or an age of peril.‡‡‡

Winston Churchill, in his *Sinews of Peace* speech, in Fulton, Missouri, March 5, 1946 made a most memorable observation:

“Our difficulties and dangers will not be removed by closing our eyes to them; they will not be removed by mere waiting to see what happens; nor will they be relieved by the policy of appeasement. What is needed is a settlement, and the longer this is delayed, the more difficult it will be and the greater our dangers will become.”

The Islamic State admires nothing more than blind obedience to religious faith, particularly their own, savagery in war, and perpetual conquest, and most hates military weakness, freedom of thought, pacifism, and anything womanly.

In war, as in journalism, time is of the essence. Appeasement can postpone, but not prevent the war that now over us looms. We have only the choice between a cheap immediate limited war of short duration, or a very expensive near future major war of great destruction, of indeterminate length, possibly engulfing the whole world.

Just as America procrastinates, so too does the enemy grow stronger, and more widespread, the threat more acute, the cost in blood and treasure greater. The clock ticks, the enemy advances, national interest is a must.

The idea of Balance of Power, Mutual Assured Destruction, or Détente, are useless because they cannot be applied here, because the Islamic State cannot be contained, deterred, appeased, isolated, or thought out of existence.

---

††† Paterson, 268.  
‡‡‡ Cf., Branyan, 189.