

The Muslim Avenger

By [James Kirkpatrick](#)

Peter King's hearings on the radicalization of the American Muslim community were probably **doomed to failure** from the beginning. An investigation into what we used to call "subversion" doesn't really work when there's nothing left to subvert. As the borders remain open, Presidents **send military technology** to hostile states, the primary mission of NASA and the **military** is Diversity, and homeland security seems to have been **outsourced to the Southern Poverty Law Center**, concern for left-wing subversion of the government seems archaic and rather quaint. Such an effort would presuppose a government that actually cares about the continued existence of the nation, rather than doing everything it can to destroy it. As the media establishment ceaselessly attacked him, I felt sorry for Representative King, who has been a **heroic figure on critical issues**, but seems to have missed that the real investigation should target Congress itself.

It was therefore unnecessary and disappointing to see the Southern Avenger, Jack Hunter, **piling on**, along with **Mark Potok**. Hunter called King's hearings "grandstanding buffoonery," because he did not address the question of our foreign policy being responsible for most homegrown American terrorism. He brought up the question of whether the so called War on Terrorism has actually become a War for Terrorism, creating more problems than it is ostensibly designed to solve.

Saying such things was ballsy in 2004, scandalous in 2006, boring in 2009, and beside the point now. We all know the neoconservatives are stupid for blaming Islamic terrorism on "evildoers" and refusing to address the arguments by the likes of Chalmers Johnson in *Blowback*. However, events from the last few years, not just in America but around the world, should tell us that violence inspired by Islam is not caused by American foreign policy, but the presence of Muslims in Western societies.

Thanks to the glorious ability of Muslims to enrich the American cultural fabric, Americans enjoy a constant stream of religiously motivated crimes that would have been considered barbaric in the Middle Ages. In Binghamton, New York, a progressive professor named Richard Antoun, who wrote books with titles like *Understanding Fundamentalism: Christian, Jewish, and Muslim Movements*, **was butchered** by a Saudi graduate student, Abdusalam al-Zahrani (or, to use media language, a "New York man.") His roommates note that al-Zahrani constantly **screamed slogans** in Arabic and would insult the country for no reason. In Buffalo, the leader of a Muslim television network designed to show ignorant and racist Americans that Islam is a religion of peace **beheaded his wife** for seeking a divorce. In Arizona, a Muslim man **ran down his daughter** with his car for being too Westernized. Similar honor killings have taken place in **Georgia** and **Texas**. It's unclear how any of this would be changed if America withdrew from Iraq or Afghanistan.

There are also the constant stream of crimes by Muslims who feel that alleged oppression within America justifies their attacks. The DC Beltway snipers, for instance, murdered, celebrated the 9/11 attacks, and

called for *jihād* against Americans. While homosexuals are generally progressives, this hasn't stopped them from being attacked randomly by Muslims in **Washington** and **San Francisco**.

Even more damaging than individual acts is what amounts to the colonization of entire areas of the United States by hostile Muslim immigrants. Minnesota's reputation for its atmosphere of "Minnesota nice" is being transformed by roving Somalia gangs, responsible for seven shootings in 10 months in 2007 and 2008. In **Lewiston, Maine**, Somali Muslims randomly **attack Americans on the street with sticks and rocks**.

Though this may shock the CATO Institute, it's no surprise to the alt Right that these "hardworking immigrants" who shame us all with their devotion to free markets and the American Dream also **deliberately choose Maine** so they can get on welfare.

Mosques are also being constructed all over the country from Ground Zero to Murfreesboro, Tennessee, with many communities expressing outrage. Many of the mosques in this country receive **funding and materials** from the Saudi government, which promotes the extremist Wahabbi sect of Islam. Of course, there is also a larger point than alleged connections to terrorism and extremism. While Jack Hunter, to his credit, proudly champions the League of the South and stands up for Southern culture, what does that matter if a Southern town like Murfreesboro just becomes another Dearborn? What difference does "constitutional conservatism" make in the face of well-funded groups that are not afraid to openly organize on the basis of religion, ethnicity, and identity? If a philosophy of liberty does not allow the South to organize so it can remain "the South" in any meaningful sense, then what is it worth?

Does this excuse the foreign policy of the United States or mean that the neoconservatives are right? Of course not. The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have nothing to do with protecting Americans, and pointless crusades aren't somehow "conservative" because they involve the military. Point granted. And there are some terrorist attacks that seem to be explained by our foreign policy. The **murder** of an American soldier in Little Rock, Arkansas, recruitment center was supposedly inspired by Washington's Middle East campaigns. Army Sergeant Hasan Akbar also stated the reason he murdered two fellow soldiers and wounded 14 others was that he was **concerned** they would be fighting against Muslims in Iraq. Nonetheless, we would not be having these problems if we did not have Muslim populations in the first place. If our country makes a mistake, it is our mistake to make. We should not have to deal with a sullen population who must be permanently begged, bribed, and appeased in order for us not to be killed.

Hunter's argument really falls apart when one looks at Europe, where Muslim immigration is far greater than here. No country waged a more forthright opposition to the war in Iraq than France. However, this has done nothing to win over French Muslims to the French population, which suffers more or less constant **riots among** the Muslim population. **Muslim hostility** towards their supposed *Patrie* is a fact of life in France that the government is seemingly helpless to prevent. There are vast "no go" areas for the French police. Nor can we blame identity politics or government policies, because, like any good little classical liberals, the *Republique* **believes race doesn't exist**. Religion also doesn't matter because even the French President Jacques Chirac is there to **tell us**, "[Europe's] ... roots are as much Muslim as Christian." To the surprise of everyone except the real Right, pretending this is all just about law enforcement or economics is not working.

Nor is France alone. In the Netherlands, Theo van Gogh was butchered in broad daylight for daring to

criticize Islam's treatment of women. In Sweden, rape by Muslim immigrants has reached crisis levels and in the city of Malmö, immigrants brag about crime as part of a “**war against Swedes.**” In Denmark, of course, there were **threats** of violence and riots because of a cartoon. Even a Church of England bishop has warned of “**no-go areas**” throughout Britain for non-Muslims. In every nation and major city of Europe, there is now the problem of how to properly integrate a growing and hostile Muslim immigrant population. None of this was necessary, and none of it has anything to do with the foreign policy of any European country, with the possible exception of Britain.

Jack Hunter's rise to prominence should be cheered, and ultimately he is on the side of the angels. Here, however, he offers the American Right a false choice. On the one hand, we are given phony wars that do nothing to protect us against the threat of radical Islam. On the other is the naïve belief that terrorism and Muslim hostility to the West is a result of our foreign policy and that if we simply adopt a less aggressive posture, we won't have an Islamic problem in the West. The solution is not neoconservatism or libertarianism—neither bombing them into democracy or preaching about the gold standard in Mecca.

The solution is for the West to separate as much as possible from the Muslim world.

They don't hate us for our freedom. They also don't hate us just because of our foreign policy. The attacks in the streets of Minneapolis, Paris, and Amsterdam demonstrate that they hate us for who we are. Instead of trying to save them or appease them, for once, let's look after ourselves.

17

Recommend

Article Info

Published in: [Exit Strategies](#)

Article topics: [Foreign Policy](#) [Muslims](#)



James Kirkpatrick

James Kirkpatrick works at a libertarian think-tank in Washington, DC.
