

## The Puzzling Relationship Between Liberals and Islamists

Tim Haile

I continue to be amazed by the readiness of liberals to accept and defend Islam. Many liberals are more accepting of Islam than they are of Christianity. They cringe when *Islamic* terrorists are so identified. They prefer that such terrorists be identified only as “terrorists,” and that their religion not be mentioned in any way. Why are liberals and liberal organizations, such as the ACLU, so quick to protect and defend Muslims? This question becomes even more intriguing when one factors in the typical antipathy that liberals generally have towards religion. What sense does it make for liberals to praise Islamic ideology and institutions, while denouncing those of Christianity?

I suggest three possibilities: Either most liberals are uninformed as to the true nature of Islam, including its doctrines and global intentions. Or, some liberals have sinister motivations, and they wish to work with Muslims for the purpose of collapsing the U.S. infrastructure and replacing it with some form of centralized control. Or, they, like others, are simply too afraid to speak out in opposition to Islamic ideology.

**Possibility # 1 - Uninformed / Misinformed:** Perhaps, like other people, most liberals are simply uneducated about the actual goals and intentions of Muslims and Islamic ideology. They have never read the Quran nor examined Islamic doctrines, so they are unaware of its dangers. If this is the case, then liberals do not understand just how intensely Islamic philosophy differs from theirs. I realize that there are different types of “liberals,” but the traditional “liberal” is one who believes in the maximum degree of personal *liberty*. He wishes to be free from the moral and legal restraints of government and society. How then, can a genuine liberal tolerate Islam? The philosophies of liberalism and Islamism are diametrically opposed to each other. Consider the following areas:

- **Homosexuality:** Liberals constantly defend homosexuality and gay marriage. They participate in gay-pride marches and generally support gay rights. However, the Quran *specifically forbids* homosexuality (7:80-82; 26:165-175; 27:55-58; 29:28, 29). Five Islamic states have the death penalty for homosexuality (Saudi Arabia, Iran, Mauritania, Sudan and Yemen). Prior to Saddam’s ouster, Iraq had the death penalty for homosexuality, and prior to the ouster of the Taliban, Afghanistan killed homosexuals. The ultimate goal of Islam for every country is the establishment of a caliphate and Sharia law, which places all aspects of one’s life: social, civil, and religious,

under Quranic rule. There can be no harmony between the liberal position and the Muslim position on subjects like homosexuality.

- **Crime & Punishment:** There has been a running debate in the United States for many years over the question of crime and punishment. Liberals tend to advocate for lighter sentences and against capital punishment. Conservatives tend to take a stricter approach. However, I know of no conservatives who go as far as the Quran in assigning punishment. The Quran calls for the cutting off of hands and feet on opposite sides of the body as a punishment for *thievery*, fighting in a war against Islamists, and other “crimes” (Quran 5:33, 38). If liberals are concerned that some criminal punishments are too strict, how can they possibly support the criminal punishments of Islam?
- **Alcohol & Gambling:** The same point can be made with respect to alcohol and gambling. Liberals generally believe that the use of alcohol and the practice of gambling should be legal. However, these practices are explicitly *condemned* in the Quran (5:190, 191). How many liberals want wine and the lottery to be officially *banned* by the government? Well, they are banned in Islamic countries, and they would be banned in our country if Muslims had their way and Sharia Law was to be implemented.
- **Women’s Rights:** For years in this country, the “Women’s Liberation Movement” has worked to achieve equal rights, including equal-pay-for-equal-work rights for women. In contrast, Islamic societies continue to treat women as second-class citizens. The Quran teaches that women are so naturally inferior to men that the testimony of two women is considered equal to that of one man (Quran 2:282). The Quran also teaches that a man is permitted to marry up to four women (4:3). However, a woman is not permitted to marry multiple men. Islamic cultures strictly govern women’s attire, as well as their interaction with males. I fail to understand just how the proponents of women’s rights can be united with Islamists. I realize that some women’s organizations do speak out against some Islamic practices, but too many liberals continue to defend Islamic practices.
- **Free Speech:** Liberals (like conservatives) cherish freedom of speech. Both prefer to address their differences in the arena of free and open discourse. They do not want their opinions to be censured by authoritarians. The Quran, however, explicitly prohibits any

“public speech” that is “evil” (Quran 4:148). Before concluding that such a law might be good for our culture, one should read a few more verses. The immediate context of this passage defines “evil speech” as that which criticizes the laws and practices of Islam (vs. 150, 151). Where Sharia law is implemented, people are not permitted to speak out against Islam or Mohammed. The recent story of the Swedish’ cartoonist demonstrates how seriously Muslims take this law. Militant Muslims quickly offered a \$100,000 dollar reward for killing Lars Vilks. His home was attacked in March of 2010, and a retaliatory bombing was carried out in December. This is just one of many such cases of violence by Muslims against the critics of Islam.

Though other areas could be cited, these are some of the major areas of difference between liberals and Muslims. Their ideologies and philosophies are utterly incompatible with each other. The acceptance of Islam by liberals defies reason and logic.

**Possibility #2 – Common Goals:** As I mentioned above, there are different types of liberals. Under possibility #1 I dealt primarily with the *classic* liberal. While all liberals take liberties with established laws, some liberals go farther than others. Some go so far as to reject the U.S. Constitution. This type of liberalism actually leans more towards *socialism*. Ironically, the label [“liberalism”], which suggests the advancement of personal liberties, actually ends up advancing them the least! Such liberals eventually call for the end of free-market capitalism, and they desire the establishment of some form of economic *central planning* to be set up in its place. Their ultimate goal is a transition from a democratic form of government to a *democratic socialism*, and some even want full-blown *communism*.

Islamic jihadists and ideologues also desire that the US government be replaced, albeit not with the same type of government, and not for the same purpose as desired by the socialist liberal. Both wish to collapse the present US infrastructure, but the Islamist has a different purpose. He desires the establishment of a worldwide caliphate. For this goal to be accomplished, each nation must come under Islamic and Sharia law. “Sharia” is Arabic for “the way” or “path,” and describes the civil law aspect of Islam. The Quran says, “*The true religion with Allah is Islam,*” and “*Whoever seeks a religion other than Islam, it shall not be accepted of him, and in the hereafter he shall be one of the losers*” (3:20, 86). The Muslim wishes to change the United States into an *Islamic* utopia. The socialist liberal wishes to change it into a *socialist* utopia. What they both have in common is the dissolution American-styled democracy.

Some liberals may think that they can work with Muslims in order to achieve their common goal [collapse of the US infrastructure], then, at the last moment, they would hope to seize control of power before the Muslims do. While history does show that such alliances can sometimes be successful, anyone who has studied the history of Islam can tell you that it is often the *Islamists* who capitalize on such political arrangements. Socialist liberals may presume themselves to be in control, but it is far more likely that the Islamists would have the upper hand in such a scenario. Unlike the liberal, the Muslim is motivated by more than just an *ideology*; his is a *religious* ideology. Regardless of what others may think of his religion, the Muslim is *religiously* motivated to fulfill his religious objectives. It is typically the case that no matter the type of religion, the true religionist is more dedicated to his cause. He is conscience-bound to accomplish his task. He does not surrender easily, especially the religionist who is convinced that being slain in battle is the surest path to eternal reward (Quran 3:159, 196; 4:75).

Some liberals may think that they have formed some sort of symbiotic relationship with Islamists. If so, they need to reevaluate their situation. If it is symbiotic, then the Muslims are the host, and the liberals are the easily removed parasites. Liberals, and particularly atheists, are just as much *infidels* to Muslims as are Christians and Jews. In the event of any collusion between liberals and Muslims, I suspect that the Muslims are the ones who are using the liberals, and not the other way around.

**Possibility #3 - Cowardice:** It is possible that some liberals and liberal organizations defend Islam because they wish to gain its favor. They have seen what happens to people who question or challenge Islam, and they do not wish to be subjected to the same kind of treatment. Those who challenge the tenets of Islam are often attacked verbally, and sometimes even physically. Sadly, the critics of Islam now have two enemies: *Muslims*, and the *proponents of political correctness*. Some may wish to believe Islam to be "just another religion," but this is naïve and wishful thinking. According to the very teaching of the Quran, Islam cannot perpetually coexist with other religions. At some point it will stifle or eliminate all spiritual and ideological opposition, and Islam will stand alone as the only [openly] practicable religion.

### Conclusion

Islam, with its system of Sharia law and theocratic approach to governance, is contrary to the basic philosophies of both liberals and conservatives. Liberals and conservatives may not agree with each other,

but they can at least debate their differences in an open and honorable fashion. Islamic societies do not permit such dialogue. There is no “freedom of religion” in Islamic States. This proves that Islam is more than just a religion – Technically, Islam is a religious *ideology*. Sharia law is antithetical to the U.S. Constitution. Liberals and all other Non-Muslims need to awake to the true nature and goals of Islamic ideology. It poses a serious threat to all *free societies*, and it doesn’t care whether those societies are composed of *liberals* or *conservatives*. It seeks to defeat them both.

Tim Haile

timhaile@me.com