

1-2015

Comparing Islamism, Fascism, and Communism

Martin W. Slann

University of Texas at Tyler, msslann@uttyler.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.uttyler.edu/polisci_fac



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Slann, Martin W., "Comparing Islamism, Fascism, and Communism" (2015). *Political Science Faculty Publications and Presentations*. Paper 1.

<http://hdl.handle.net/10950/249>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the History and Political Science at Scholar Works at UT Tyler. It has been accepted for inclusion in Political Science Faculty Publications and Presentations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Works at UT Tyler. For more information, please contact tbianchi@uttyler.edu.

Comparing Islamism, Fascism, and Communism

Martin Slann

The University of Texas at Tyler

“Comparing Islamism, Fascism and Communism”

Martin Slann

The University of Texas at Tyler

Prefatory Remarks

The twentieth century was the most violent and lethal period in human history. To be sure, the century was a relatively brief one: for our purposes it began in 1914 with the onset of World War I and ended in 1991 with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the communist empire it had established in most of eastern Europe. In some interpretations the Cold War was really World War III. It endured for the better part of half a century. Its outcome was generally viewed as another (perhaps inevitable) victory for democratic societies. As we entered the 1990s, the global victory of democracy seemed inevitable and that non-democratic societies would come to their senses and adopt and institutionalize democratic norms and practices. After all, Germany and Japan had done exactly this after 1945 and quickly became viable political democracies with relatively free market and prosperous economies.

We can recall that there was a lot of optimism during the early and middle 1990s that western-style democracy was finally safe and could expand since its most opponents, Fascism and Communism, were now gone or at least safely rendered helpless. Fascism as an ideology died rather violently in 1945 and communism, while lingering on in North Korea, Cuba, and some college campuses, seemed to be gradually withering away. And even if China remained politically communist, the general belief was that China would gradually relax its totalitarian outlook as the economy expanded and the middle class grew. Of course, China remains very totalitarian, but at least the Chinese form of communism includes a substantial element of pragmatism in foreign policy and economic development that blunt some of the harshness of the ideology.

Francis Fukuyama highlighted the optimism in his essay that was later expanded into a very worthy book, *The End of History and the Last Man*, in which he argued, rather persuasively, that the democratization process would become increasingly globalized. With the passage of time and in other writings, Fukuyama moderated his optimism. He recognized and identified the threat of Islamism as did many of his fans and admirers. The most enduring critique of optimism for democracy came from Samuel Huntington. His intriguing work, *The Clash of Civilizations*, was published several years after *The End of History*, when the reality of the international scene was settling in. Huntington believed that ideology mattered a good deal less than civilization and that the world was returning to the sort of cultural and civilizational conflict that had simply been dormant for a couple of hundred years.

Both communism and fascism were totalitarian systems that, by their ideological nature, were expansionist and brutal. Each saw itself as the future. Both came to ignominious ends, though some of their primary features such as upholding the collective over the individual have endured. A few of these features have even been injected into the western democracies. For example, we currently are afflicted

by the “soft totalitarianism” that is the outcome of policies that are guided by “political correctness” and “multi-culturalism.” Regrettably, we have numerous illustrations of where such policies lead us. Several European countries have provided disconcerting social experiments that are having bad endings.

Islamism as an Alien Presence

The relatively open borders in Sweden, France, and the Netherlands and the government emphasis on catering to refugees from principally (though not exclusively) Islamic dominant societies have produced remarkable demographic and cultural changes that are ongoing and that are drastically changing the political and economic landscape. The changes are also creating very serious stresses on societies that are dedicated to a strong presence of social welfare. The growing Muslim communities are rife with marriages and offspring that are consanguine.¹

But the recent *Charlie Hebdo* massacre in Paris has reminded us that totalitarian movements are not all alike. Communism and fascism controlled entire nations, institutionalized misery on a universal scale, and established concentration camps for those who could not or would not fit in. Islamism, on the other hand, is a hit and run movement. It is content with destroying democracies in stages rather than in full scale warfare. Its various networks, whether ISIS, or al-Qaeda, or Hamas, or the Muslim Brotherhood fully understands that it cannot win on the conventional battlefield. Western militaries, for the most part, remain strong enough to defeat them or, at the least, to contain them.

What is happening now is “intimidation jihad.” Islamists are dedicated in western countries to implementing sharia law or, failing that (for the time being), at least implementing blasphemy laws. The latter sounds more innocuous than the former, but it is the more dangerous. They are formulated with the intention of guaranteeing that criticism of Islam will be outlawed or, at the very least, legally discouraged. This is the first phase of “intimidation jihad.” The second is characterized by *Charlie Hebdo*. If outlawing criticism or mocking Islam isn’t working satisfactorily, then violence is the next resort. The journalists at the *Charlie Hebdo* offices were murdered to send (or repeat) the message that the freedoms of speech and the press no longer obtain when it comes to Islam. The message, incidentally, was not a new one.

If you’re not free to buy a book and light it up – whether by Mohammed or Mark Steyn – then in a certain hypothetical sense you’re not free at all. If you’re free to burn every book except one, then you’re not free in a far more profound and far-reaching way.²

To be sure, communism and fascism also quickly resort to violence to eliminate opponents. During the Germany of the 1920s and early 1930s communists and Nazis would regularly beat one another up or, in numerous instances, kill each other. In this sense, Islam in democratic societies does not have an opposite extremist number. Muslims can attack and slaughter perfectly innocent and

¹ Nicolai Sennels, “Muslim Inbreeding: Impacts on intelligence, sanity, health and society,” *EuropeNews*, August 9, 2010. As many as one in three marriages in the Islamic community are between first or second cousins. The impact of this practice over numerous generations is not beneficial, according to Sennels.

² Mark Steyn, quoted in “The *Charlie Hebdo* Massacre,” <http://www.nationalreview.com/node/395910/print>, 1/8/2015.

defenseless people, but they confront no or very few reprisals. This is an important difference: in democratic societies, it was not considered a phobia to criticize communism or fascism and it was done all the time. Currently and thanks to multiculturalism, criticizing Islam or even asking for its reform is equated with racism, bigotry, and irrational hatred.

In our comparison of communism, fascism, and Islamism, it is considered impolite and even racist to criticize Islam because of the notion stubbornly held by many that it is an authentic religion and it is at least as peaceful as Christianity or Judaism. Whatever one thought of communism and fascism, there was no significant pretense that either was peaceful. Nor did its advocates attempt to posit either the desirability or the preference of peace.

There were certainly numerous opportunists who joined fascist or communist parties simply for self-advancement or to simply protect themselves and their families. Such a motivation is not commendable, but it is at least understandable. And the motivation may not really matter anyway. The crimes these people committed, advocated, or justified still resulted in evil and, usually, the mass murder of millions of victims. However, it's important to note that when Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union disappeared most of the survivors of the totalitarian systems simply returned to their private lives. Gestapo agents in most cases became or returned to the German police; communists frequently remained communists or somehow integrated into the political infrastructure of the newly formed Russian Federation because of valued skill sets that involved surveillance and torture of political prisoners.

Islamists are different in this regard. They are not content with merely surviving, let alone mellowing into a new societal role. Islam is, after all, followed by hundreds of millions. Most, of course, don't commit violent acts, but large numbers believe partially or wholly in what the Islamists are seeking to achieve and support the imposition of Sharia law to one extent or another. Doctrinaire communists and fascists are often willing to die for their belief system, but they would rather not, probably because they are both atheistic and don't look forward to an afterlife. Islamists, however, are determined to die and seek martyrdom to achieve paradise. This is a huge and critical difference. As one Hizbollah leader has proclaimed, "Israelis love Pepsi-Cola, we love death; that's why we'll win."

But perhaps the most important distinction between totalitarian ideologies and Islamism is that Islamists consider war to be perpetual. It has to be to achieve the ultimate goal of global supremacy. While it is true that communism and fascism also fantasized about the same objective, they understood the impracticality of it. This distinction has become increasingly obvious during the career of the Islamic State. While many in the mainstream media and government circles are insisting that the Islamic State has nothing to do with Islam, the Islamic State fanatics are very occupied practicing the very Islam that was formulated by Mohamad and his immediate successors. Sam Harris, for example, has written that Islam and the Islamic State are thoroughly linked:

A belief in martyrdom, a hatred of infidels, and a commitment to violent jihad are not fringe phenomena in the Muslim world. These preoccupations are supported by the Koran and numerous hadith. That is why the popular Saudi cleric Mohammed Al-Areefi sounds like the ISIS army chaplain. The man has 9.5 million followers on

Twitter (twice as many as Pope Francis has). If you can find an important distinction between the faith he preaches and that which motivates the savagery of ISIS, you probably should consult a neurologist.³

That ISIS is Islamic is easy to verify.

The Commonality of Supremacism

Communism as a movement was to be guided by a self-proclaimed intellectual elite that was itself far from the suffering working classes it was determined to “liberate” from oppression. And fascism itself actually was coordinated by a less sophisticated elite, but one that still insisted that it was working on behalf of the masses. Both movements were dominated by a single party that in actuality was dominated by an aristocracy of leaders who either founded the party or were early adherents of it. In communist and fascist societies it was rare for the party to compose more than a tenth of the adult citizenry. And it was the purpose of the party to lead the remainder of society into a golden age of plenty and equality for those who deserved to enter it.

For the Nazis, inferior races were not going to continue to exist for long. The world was to be populated only by the Master Race. The Nazis decreed a policy of population increase for the Nordic races and special rewards were provided to women who produced numerous children. There would be plenty of resources for the Master Race since inferior races would be gradually eliminated.

Islamism is somewhat but not drastically different. It is a movement that also relies on a political party. In Egypt, as we have recently observed, this party was the Muslim Brotherhood.⁴ Similar to communism, the Muslim Brotherhood desired to appeal to the masses. Islam is not racist per se,⁵ but there is plenty of supremacism anyway. Non-muslim allowed to live were in constant danger and, at the very least, forced to endure exploitation and humiliation. Non-Muslims allowed to live in an Islamic society are dhimmis. Those in dhimmitude

Must live in houses smaller than those of Muslims

Vacate his or her seat for a Muslim

Move aside for a Muslim to pass on the street

Not allowed to ride horses or camels because doing so would raise them in status above

Muslims

Must adopt a humble demeanor in public⁶

Clearly, there is a critical distinction between those who are full members of an Islamic commonwealth and those who aren't and cannot be other than considered unworthy and even spiritually unclean. At

³ Quoted in Jeffrey Lord, “Obama at the Gates of Vienna,” <http://spectator.org/print/60436>, 9/19/2014.

⁴ Interestingly, the Muslim Brotherhood, established in the late 1920s in Egypt, appeared around the same time as the communist and fascist parties in Germany and Italy. All of them are totalitarian in nature and totalitarianism was technologically impossible much before the early twentieth century. The radio, mass literacy, and the development of widespread public transportation were all thought when they appeared to be good things. They are, of course, but they are also conduits of a totalitarian movement that seeks to extend its reach nationally or globally.

⁵ Though Mohamad referred to Muslims as “the best peoples evolved from mankind” Koran, 3:110.

⁶ Mark Durie, *The Third Choice: Islam, Dhimmitude and Freedom* (Deror Books, 2010), p. 145.

the least, they are second class citizens. Put another way, “Islam has no Golden Rule. Islam has one set of rules for Muslims and another set of rules for kafirs [infidels]. This is dualistic ethics.”⁷

The Commonality of Hatred⁸

Every totalitarian system requires one or more scapegoats and the ability to instill universal hatred of them. There are several obvious examples: Nazi Germany’s hatred of Jews; the Soviet Union’s hatred of counterrevolutionaries and “cosmopolitans”; and Islamism’s hatred of, effectively, anyone who isn’t a Muslim. Hatred is thoroughgoing and unending. There is always an enemy that seeks to destroy the mission of the totalitarian ideology. The Christian Bible teaches a great deal about divine love and forgiveness. The Koran doesn’t. It is a book of hatred for non-Muslims⁹ and goes into a great deal of detail when it comes to deceiving non-Muslims, intimidating them, and slaughtering them.

There is a great deal of hatred and/or contempt in *Mein Kampf*, of course, and in works authored by Marx and Lenin. In this sense, though, it becomes easier to understand how Islamists and Nazis worked in a collaborative fashion in the 1930s and during World War II. They hated the same people, particularly the Jews, and had determined the same fate for them – extermination.¹⁰ The Palestinian leader, Haj Amin al-Husseini, met and established a friendship with Heinrich Himmler. They agreed to implement the “Final Solution” in Palestine once the Germans won the war. The hatred endemic to and an important motivation for totalitarian movements almost always leads to genocide.¹¹

Hatred in totalitarian movements is also universal in the sense that age and gender make no difference to those dedicated to mass murder. The Nazis, of course, in their well-orchestrated slaughter of the European Jews did not distinguish between the young and old or men and women. The genocide of the Jews was conducted with planned thoroughness and no mercy was shown to the aged or infirmed or to children and young mothers. Hundreds of thousands of entire families were wiped out. Communists in the Soviet Union were somewhat less well organized, but the Stalinist preference to avoid taking any chances resulted in the families of real or perceived enemies also placed on trains to the gulag.

⁷ Quoted in “Statistical Islam,” p. 6.

⁸ Hatred can be natural or manufactured. In Islamism hatred is relentlessly integrated into the Koran and the Hadith. Islamic hatred permits and encourages all kinds of ill treatment of non-muslims including physical abuse, economic exploitation, and humiliation. It has become institutionalized throughout the history of Islam and has been most manifest in the concept and practice of dhimmitude and the application of Shari’a law. See Bat Ye’Or, “The Return of Dhimmitude,” pp. 223-265.

⁹ See, for example, Wafa Sultan, *A G-d Who Hates* (St. Martin’s Press, 2011).

¹⁰ For a summary of the early Islamist-Nazi connection see David G. Dalin and John F. Rothmann, *Icon of Evil: Hitler’s Mufti and the Rise of Radical Islam* (Random House, 2008).

¹¹ 2015 is the hundredth anniversary of the genocide of 2 million Armenian Christians by the Turkish army. Many were starved, some forced on death marches, and others simply beaten to death or shot. Muslim Turks slaughtered Armenians simply because they were Christian and, therefore, a threat to the Ottoman Empire that had to be eliminated. As non-Muslims they were despised, held in contempt, and worthy only of death.

Islamists are also good planners, but, thus far, lack the apparatus of the state to implement effective genocide. But they are trying. The current murderous mayhem in Nigeria by Boko Haram¹² and in areas controlled by the Islamic State is simply a preview of what these terror gangs expect to do once they have seized control of full state power. After all, the Nazi sympathizer, Haj Amin al-Husseini, we should recall, was hoping to implement the Holocaust in Palestine in order to add 600,000 Jews to the list of six million victims in Europe.

The Commonality of Global Dominance

The ultimate outcome is not the “end of history” imagined by Fukuyama where all countries finally and voluntarily see the benefits of subscribing to democratic norms and values and the free market and all the natural predators that threaten democracy have been vanquished. Communism, fascism, and Islamism insist that it is the ideology that in the end must achieve global dominance. None of these three believe this goal can be accomplished by patient persuasion. All of them are prepared to engage in relentless warfare until global conquest is achieved. Then what? Peace and justice will reign. In communism, class warfare will end; in fascism, undesirable and decidedly inferior individuals and entire ethnic communities will cease to exist; and in Islamism sharia law will prevail, assuring the peace of Allah and at the same time instructing the destruction of those who do not comply with divinely sanctioned edicts.

Of course, the ultimate golden age is never ushered in because all three ideologies require a perennial enemy who somehow is never completely vanquished. The scapegoat remains, at least one that is constantly renewed. The Nazis, for example, knew that, while they may eliminate European Jewry, remaining Jewish communities in the United States and elsewhere would remain to threaten the Master Race. Hassan Nasrallah, the leader of Hizbollah, has stated publicly that he hopes all of the world’s Jews would emigrate to and live in Israel because, when that threshold is reached, it will then be possible to slaughter all of the Jews in one battle and in one location. He stated in 2013 that Israel “is a cancer that must be eradicated.” Like the Nazis, Nasrallah compared Jews to a disease that imperils the health of its host unless it’s completely exterminated. Nor is Jew hatred in Islam simply the monopoly of a gang of radical Muslims. The Koran actually contains more Jew hatred than Mein Kampf.¹³

Of course, not all of the population will convert to Islam. Those who irrationally cling to other faiths, especially but not exclusively Christians and Jews, will have the opportunity to pay the *jizya* tax, a form of extortion that comes close to giving Islam the (richly deserved) image of a protections racket.¹⁴ For those who don’t come under the heading of “people of the book,” such as Hindus and Buddhists, the

¹² Including the recent murder of a young non-Muslim woman who was in the process of giving birth to her child.

¹³ The parts of the Koran that were formulated in Medina after Mohamad fled there with his 150 or so followers in 622 (the *Hajira* or flight) are 17 percent anti-semitic compared to Mein Kampf which is *only* 7 percent filled with Jew hatred.

¹⁴ See *Sharia Law for Non-Muslims* (Center for the Study of Political Islam, 2010) and P. David Gaubatz and Paul Sperry, *Muslim Mafia: Inside the Secret Underworld that’s Conspiring to Islamize America*, WND Books, 2009). See also Raymond Ibrahim, “Ten Ways the Mafia and Islam are Similar,” <http://humanevents.com/2014/12/08ten-ways-the-mafia-and-islam-are-similar/>, 12/10/2014. Those unfortunates who are given the typical Islamic choice of conversion to Islam or death are experiencing “An Offer You Can’t Refuse.”

choices will be limited to conversion or death. This sort of institutionalized misery is reminiscent of the Nazi plan for the domination of Europe. The Nazis assigned genocide for some – communists and Jews, in particular, and slavery for others – Slavs and other lesser “races.” For their part, communists, obsessed with counterrevolutionaries possibly appearing at any moment, are fond of shipping millions off to the gulag, or, slightly less inhumane, to “re-education” camps. Or, most brutal of all, simply insuring death for millions through planned mass starvation, as occurred during the Stalinist regime in the Soviet Union during the 1930s or in Maoist China during the Great Leap Forward in the 1960s and early 1970s.

None of these three ideologies anticipated or even hoped that their goals could be achieved without force or violence. In fact, only through force and violence could they ever be achieved. This is not to say that when the goals are achieved, force and violence naturally end because there is no need of them. Totalitarians must always be vigilant: In Islam “The punishment of those who wage war against Allah and his apostle and strive to make mischief in the land is only this, that they should be crucified or their hands and their feet should be cut off on opposite sides or they should be imprisoned; this shall be as a disgrace for them in this world, and in the hereafter they shall have a grievous chastisement.”¹⁵ This and other similar violent verses from the Koran¹⁶ sanctify the need to sustain by force what has been acquired by force. Again, there are similarities: the Nazis maintained that the Aryan Race required living space in eastern Europe and Russia and that it would be taken by force and its inhabitants driven out or exterminated. Islamists are currently claiming the requirement incumbent on them to reconquer former lands that were Islamic. These naturally include Spain and Portugal, southeastern Europe, and, of course, Israel. These territories were under Islamic rule for centuries and must be returned to Islamic governance.

No totalitarian system would be complete without interfering in the most intimate aspects of human behavior. Communist, fascist, and Islamist systems all enjoin their populations to pursue high fertility rates. “Have a baby for the Fuhrer” was a popular slogan during the 1930s in Germany. Communist regimes usually, but not exclusively (China being the primary exception), encouraged large families.¹⁷ Islamists are no different, though they are hopeful that more babies will provide more martyrs. However, it is interesting to note that in both communist and Islamic countries, the fertility rates (children per woman) have dramatically declined. Even before the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, the regime was worried about the declining fertility rate, especially among the Russian population. Even today it is below the essential replacement level of 2.11 children per couple.

¹⁵ Koran, Chapter 5, Verse 33.

¹⁶47:5 “when you meet in regular battle those (idolators) who disbelieve, smite their necks”; 8:12 – “I am with you, so strengthen those who have believed. I will cast terror into the hearts of those who disbelieved, so strike upon the necks and strike them from every fingertip”; 9:5 – “kill the idolaters wherever you find them.”

¹⁷ Islamists also get excited about wearing uniforms . . . of a sort. “Instead of the black shirts of Mussolini’s men, or the brown shirts of the Nazi paramilitaries, here is the Islamic State’s Black uniform, which the Brothers Kouachi went to some trouble to don in order to slaughter the *Charlie* cartoonists.” Paul Berman, “Why Is the Islamist Death Cult So Appealing?” <http://tabletmag.com/jewish-news-and-politics/188549/islamist-death-cult/>, 1/28/2015.

Interestingly, the population surge in Muslim societies may be short-lived. In some Muslim countries, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, and Turkey (where nearly a third of all the world's 1.6 billion Muslims live) the fertility rate is actually falling faster than it is in most of the rest of the world.¹⁸ It will not be a surprise to learn that educated Muslims, particularly women, and those who visit mosques rarely or not at all have the lowest total fertility rates. An Iranian woman with a university degree, for example, in the early 2000s, had a fertility rate of 1.3 children,¹⁹ far below the rate required for a society to sustain itself. Ironically, Israel, a modern society in almost every conceivable way, has a fertility rate among both secular and orthodox Jewish women that is nearing 3.0²⁰, about the same as the Israeli Arabs whose rate has consistently decreased for decades.

"Demographic Jihad" may not be a viable strategy for Islamic dominance in the long run or in all societies, though the short run may be a different story. One observer has made the disturbing but prescient point that "as the Muslim population in the country [United States] has expanded, so has the incidence of radicalism"²¹ suggesting once again that while most Muslims aren't terrorists, most terrorists are Muslims.

West Versus East

Despite their antagonism to what is commonly referred to as the Judeo-Christian tradition, the cornerstone of western liberal thought, emphasis on human rights, and protection of the individual against the state, both communism and fascism are the result of western political trends. They represent, for lack of a better term, the terror mirror of western civilization. They are, in effect, perversions or corruptions of western values. Islam is very different in this regard. It is not a product of the Judeo-Christian tradition, though many Muslims argue that it is the spiritual conclusion of this tradition since Muhamad was the "seal of the prophets," a line of divinely inspired holy men that includes Abraham, Moses, and Jesus. Anyone claiming to be a prophet after Mohamad was to be eliminated as false prophet.

But Muhamad and the Koran clearly are removed from this tradition that formed the bedrock of western civilization. Islam, instead of complementing or adhering to western norms and values, opposes them and, one could easily argue, is threatened by them. The United Nations Charter and the Declaration on Human Rights, which in the aftermath of Soviet Union's collapse in 1991, was promulgated with the (optimistically naïve) understanding that the individual rights enjoyed in western democracies should and inevitably would become globalized simply because doing so is both right and reasonable. However, the Declaration on Human Rights in Islam, authored and promulgated by the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) during 1989-1990 quickly put this illusion to rest. Human

¹⁸ David P. Goldman, *How Civilizations Die (and Why Islam is Dying Too)* (Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2011), p. 4.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

²⁰ See Caroline Glick, *The One-State Solution*.

²¹ Ian Tuttle, "The Troubling Math of Muslim Migration," <http://www.nationalreview.com/node/396262/print>, 1/13/2015. Pew gives an estimate of 2.75 million Muslims residing in the United States, or somewhat less than 1 percent of the total population. The Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), essentially an appendage of the Muslim Brotherhood has provided a number of 7 million, but CAIR has a long record of lies.

rights are viewed in most of the Islamic world as a western contrivance. In the Declaration on Human Rights in Islam there is a disquieting lack of human rights as understood throughout the western democracies. Religious minorities, women, and equality before the law are, after all, western concepts; they have no or little application to Islamic societies. In fact, the Islamic Declaration condemns the western version of human rights as offensive to Muslims,²² hence the strong and increasingly successful effort to blunt or eliminate any criticism or mocking of Islam and Muhamad.

To an appreciable extent, Islamic sensitivity is being placated by many western governments.²³ Nearly all of them insist that violent acts committed by ISIS or other Islamic terrorists have nothing to do with Islam even though the perpetrators insist that it does. The slaughter of the *Charlie Hebdo* journalists in Paris by Islamists, for example, was explained by one of the attackers as “We have avenged the Prophet Muhammad.” But, thus far, only one major western leader, the French prime minister, has indicated that the west and radical Islam are at war, fact frequently denied or even resented by much of the electronic and print media.

While many Muslims have condemned Islamist murders of defenseless civilians, it’s important to note that they may not represent the Islamic mainstream which continues to adhere to the Islamic ideology that advocates and sanctions jihad until victory over infidels is assured. Imams in mosques are not expressing outrage and indignation over the taking of hostages or the murder of journalists in Paris. Instead they publically warn against the evils of “islamophobia” even though such a phenomenon has been remarkably absent even after this outrage. Inside the mosques they are urging continuous struggle until Islam is supreme over all other religions. The refusal to unequivocally denounce Islamic terror is not restricted to predominantly Islamic countries. It is currently to be found rather easily and with growing and disconcerting frequency in North America.²⁴

Islamists understand that it is not possible to conquer the West and the remainder of the planet through traditional forms of warfare. ISIS is occupying much of Iraq and Syria through military means. However, western countries are simply not susceptible to his sort of offensive because their security systems, while occasionally compromised because of a culture of political correctness, are still very much viable. Instead, Islamization essentially contents itself to acquiring mini-states, often in the heart of a country’s major urban areas. Sharia law does dominate in hundreds of public schools in Muslim

²² See Ann Elizabeth Mayer, “From Islamic Particularism to Pseudo-Universalism: The Organization of the Islamic Conference and Its Resolutions on Combating ‘Defamation of Religions,’” (unpublished paper, University of Pennsylvania, 2010).

²³ Even leaders who understand the genuine menace of Islam may be reluctant to call mass murder perpetrated by radical Islamists because they are intimidated by the impressive popular support a lot of the murderers have. Many if not most of them are widely regarded as heroes. Many Muslims were no doubt appalled by what happened at *Charlie Hedbo*, but the massacre isn’t likely to dissuade them from adhering to their belief system. The Pew Research Center has found that “74 percent of Egyptians support making Sharia the law of the land, and of those, 70 percent favor corporal punishment for crimes such as theft, 81 percent favor stoning for adultery and 86 percent support the death penalty for converts from Islam.” Statistics from Rich Lowry, “Of Course It Is Islam,” <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2015/01/chaarlie-hedbo-of-course-it-is-islam-1142> . . . 1/15/2015. It should be pointed out that these numbers are found in a society that massively disowned the Morsi government.

²⁴ Tarek Fatah, “Muslims Shouldn’t Pray to Defeat Non-Muslims,” <http://www.meforum.org/4974/muslims-shouldn-t-pray-to-defeat-non-muslims>, January 13, 2015, *The Toronto Sun*.

neighborhoods in France and, increasingly, in the United Kingdom, Germany, Belgium, and the Netherlands, and requires Muslim students to pray five times daily.²⁵

Summary and Conclusion

The character of totalitarian systems is at all times an emphasis on control, primarily the control and manipulation of the individual. Communism, fascism, and Islamism are all willing (and, at times, even eager) to delay or ignore economic advancement and scientific progress if either would compromise control or diminish power. In fact, it is often the mission of totalitarians to vanquish economic and scientific progress if at possible since they both interfere with or systematically undermine control. Power and control matter much more than the freedom of the individual. And power is enhanced through physical force. Concentration camps, the gulag, and wholesale massacre that does not discriminate by gender or age are the main and most memorable features of the totalitarian systems briefly reviewed in this essay.

Totalitarian movements rarely prosper or gain much headway in democratic societies, mainly because they are correctly regarded as composed of or at least led by savages and sociopaths who have no regard for human life, let alone human rights. Islamic societies almost always have a long and ingrained autocratic tradition. The western concept of separation of the secular and spiritual spheres is lacking and generally considered an abomination that has no place in a polity that is to be governed by Sharia. One scholar on this subject has suggested that

Americans were brutally honest about the evils of Nazism, but failed to equally condemn Communism. Germany hasn't had another Fuhrer, but Russia is back to acting a lot like the Soviet Union. And while Nazism is confined to trailer parks, sympathy for the red devil is prevalent among Western elites. ISIS is exposing its own evil to the West in a way that neither the brownshirts nor the flyers of the red flag did. If we destroy ISIS without exposing the ideology behind it, then we will have won a pyrrhic victory because we will still be fighting the nice Jihadist next door for the next thousand years.²⁶

This is not a pleasant prospect, but it is an unfortunately very plausible one.

²⁵ Soeren Kern, "European 'No-Go' Zones: Fact or Fiction? Part I: France," <http://www.gatestoneinstitute.org/5128/france-no-go-zones>, 1/20/2015. Muslim children are not being brought up to integrate into overall French (secular) culture. Quite the contrary, "In Marseille, a high school principal testified that some of her students pray with such fervor that they have 'blue foreheads.'" Ibid. Islamic neighborhoods generally have high crime rates and drug trafficking gangs. They are becoming increasingly violent even for Muslims: it's about as easy to purchase a Kalashnikov as it is an iPhone and for about the same amount of money. Ibid. See also Eric Zemmur and Albin Michele, *The French Suicide*, 2014.

²⁶ Daniel Greenfield, "The Nice Jihadist Next Door", http://www.horowitzfreedomcenter.org/Daniel_greenfield_the_nice_isis_jihadist_next_door, 9/17/2014.

