The Islamic Tipping Point

Does recognizing an extreme predicament make one an 'extremist'?

Tim Murray

Why is it that only 'extremists' seem to be worried about Islam? Why is it that a website that monitors critics of Islam calls itself *Loonwatch*? Why is expressing apprehension about the growing strength of Islam called *loony, xenophobic, racist or far right?*

Madeline Weld nails it:

> The refusal of individuals and organizations to address the issue of Islam shows the effectiveness of fear – the real and justified fear of physical assault and the fear of having one's reputation smeared by Islamists and their enabling fools. As a result, it is often only the more extreme elements (such as nationalist parties in Europe) who will address the problems caused by Islam, which is then used to bolster assertions that it's mainly extremists who are concerned about the impact of Islam on our societies.

I don't know if I am an 'extremist', but I certainly have an extreme fear about the course that recent events have taken. When the leader of the so-called 'free world' can stand before the dictators of the United Nations and say, "The future does not belong to those who insult the Prophet of Islam" you know that we are in deep trouble. That was a defining moment of history. As was Obama's refusal to meet with the Israeli Prime Minister just so he could appear on a TV talk show. And the celebratory response of the left-wing consensus media and the Opposition to the announcement that jihadist murderer Omar Khadar had been allowed back to Canada

The tide has turned. Islam is winning the intellectual jihad. It has now smelled blood. Western civilization and its governing principles are on the run – thanks in large part to the Left, which spent decades preparing the groundwork for thought control by persuading lawmakers that there exists a fundamental right 'not to be offended' and that the test of 'offensive' language resides in the subjective judgment of the identity group that chooses to take offence. Contemporary discourse is now about how people *feel* rather than what they *think*. The content of speech is now less important than the imputed motive or emotion embedded in it. If it is deemed *hateful* or *insulting* then it should be proscribed. End of story. How convenient for orthodoxy.

But maybe you prefer to look the other way, or look for *hopeful* signs that moderate Muslims will prevail and promote a *liberal* interpretation of Islamic texts. Maybe you follow conventional wisdom, which sees Islam in the same light as other religions, where fundamentalists and literalists contend with modernists. Trouble is, while there may be *moderate* Muslims, there is no moderate Islam. Islamic text is radical because the more radical passages found in later material abrogate and overwhelm the kinder portions found in earlier material when this *religion of peace* did not have

the numbers to flex its muscle. As Madeline Weld put it,

It is true that there is plenty of gore in the history of other religions. Christians may have killed off the Cathars ("Kill them all, God will recognize his own") but the zealots who killed them would be hard pressed to find anything in the words of Jesus justifying what they did. Not so for Islamists slaughtering kafirs! Also, as far as Christians (like Muslims, a convert-seeking group) are concerned, and in contrast to the situation in Islam where the more peaceful Mecca Koran is abrogated by the bellicose Medina Koran, the Old Testament (OT) is trumped by the New Testament, which has a lot less slaughter and in which Jesus tells his followers to shake the dust off their feet and leave if people in a given area don't want to accept their preaching. The gory stuff in the OT really pertains to the history of the Jews, and Judaism is not a religion that seeks converts. In fact, it's a club that is really hard to join, unlike Islam, which is a club you'd damn well better join if you know what's good for you.

There is another thing that Islamo-dupes don't understand either. The successful pursuit of the Islamic agenda is dependent on ethical and tactical pragmatism. How a Muslim population behaves is conditioned largely by its demographic strength within the community it operates. As one anonymous commentator observed, "Islamization begins when there are sufficient Muslims in a country to agitate for their religious privileges".

Just as Karl Marx enjoined the fledgling and weak communist movement to adopt what later became known as Popular Front tactics, that is, to soft-pedal its ultimate objectives, compromise and look to form alliances with other less militant political formations, Islamicists who find themselves to be relatively small minorities among

> *Muslims are obliged to accept that the ultimate goal is the establishment of a universal Caliphate.*

infidels are counselled to do likewise. They are told to do what Tariq Ramadan has told Canadian Muslims to do. In so many words: "Don't be pushy. Use the existing laws of the land to advance your interests and quietly build strength, all the while pretending that you seek only reasonable accommodation and are fully reconciled to pluralism and the separation of mosque and state."

These deceitful tactics, the concealment of malevolent intentions – "taqiyya" – are scripturally mandated. There is an obligation to lie if your goal is obligatory. And Muslims are obliged to accept that the ultimate goal is the establishment of a universal Caliphate. As Donald Hudson observed, "Taqiyya has been used by Muslims since the 7th century to confuse and split 'the enemy'. A favored tactic was 'deceptive triangulation': to persuade the enemy that jihad was not aimed at them but at another enemy. Another tactic was to deny that there was a jihad at all. The fate for such faulty assessments by the target was death." [http://www.danielpipes.org/comments/25320]

At what point, then, do Muslims feel confident to push for sharia? When does a discreet minority become a boldly aggressive lobby group? What is the "tipping point" for the Islamic diaspora in liberal democracies? In his book, *Slavery, Terrorism and Islam: The Historical Roots and Contemporary Threat*, Dr. Peter Hammond established a statistical correlation between Muslim and non-Muslim populations on the one hand, and the transition from "conciliatory" to "fascist" Islam on the other. Hammond described the transition as consisting of five stages, the first of which was to "establish a beachhead" by achieving a population level of 2% of the host nation. Until then, Muslims are conciliatory, deferential and harmless. But once having reached that threshold, they begin to proselytize disaffected groups until they reach 5% of the population, when they demand such things as halal food in

supermarkets, the blocking of streets for prayers, and self-rule within the ghettos they control. As their numbers approach 10% of the general population, their demands turn to violence and vandalism. In short, collectively Muslims behave as chameleons, as their Holy Text instructs them, shifting gears according to the circumstances they find themselves in. So where exactly is the tipping point? The consensus seems to be that it occurs when the Muslim population hits 7-8% of the national population. That means that, according to somewhat dated and conservative estimates [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4385768.stm], the Netherlands at 5.8% and France at 8-9.6% are fast approaching or have already reached the Islamic tipping point, and that Germany at 3.6%, Austria at 4.1%, and Norway at 3.4%, are already halfway there. Norway's fate is illustrative of the spectacular Muslim growth rates that afflict many other countries over relatively short periods of time (eg. 450% since 1990 and about 10% in just one year, 2006-7), with heavy concentrations in a few strategic counties like Oslo (7.5%). The Pew Research Centre pegs the European Muslim population at 6% and forecasts a rise of "only" 2% over the next 18 years.

Meanwhile, Canada's Muslim population has skyrocketed from 150,000 in 1990 to 600,000 in 2011 – while its Jewish population has remained stable at around 170,000 throughout those two decades. So while it was once politically possible for former New Democratic Party (NDP) Ontario Premier Bob Rae to leave the NDP because, as he stated, it had become captive of pro-Palestinian elements, as interim leader of the federal Liberal Party Rae felt obliged to welcome the return of an unrepentant jihadist and admitted killer Omar Khadr to Canada. For every Jewish voter who would respond positively to a principled defense of

> *So where exactly is the tipping point? The consensus seems to be that it occurs when the Muslim population hits 7-8% of the national population.*

Israel and the democratic values it represents, there are now four Muslim voters who would respond negatively. That is now the electoral reality of today's Canada.

Is it any wonder then that the Opposition NDP and Liberals affect glee at the arrival of Omar Khadr, or that the NDP fielded 19 Muslim candidates in the last federal election, or that Liberal Party leadership candidate Justin Trudeau objected to Muslim honour killings being called barbaric? Or that the NDP and the liberal media would crucify Alberta's "Wild Rose" Party for fielding a candidate who made "homophobic" remarks in his church while not holding Muslim candidates to the same standard? Or that pro-Palestinian students are permitted to shout down or force the cancellation of speeches on campus that they disapprove of? The list goes on and on. The point is, a cohesive minority can effect an enormous shift in the balance of political power. Just ask the French. Ask them who pushed Francois Holland over the top. The French Socialist Party, like social democrats, Labourites and Greens nearly everywhere, have become the party of Islam. The party of the "outsider", the "underdog", the "marginalized", the "oppressed". What a god-damn lie.

How can a demographic tail like that wag a national dog? It is simple. Their population is not evenly dispersed. It is concentrated in urban centres where it can acquire the political leverage it needs to have mainstream political parties compete for its support and impose changes on local governance and school boards, and even on the customs of the neighbourhoods it dominates. Hence the proliferation of "no go" zones in France, the Netherlands, Denmark, Germany, the UK and even Norway and Sweden. Even Montreal has one now: Ville St. Laurent, where Muslims make up 40% of the neighbourhood

population. These are de facto states within a state. Pilot projects for sharia. It would not be advisable for non-Muslim women to walk through them without complying with the local dress code.

We have created a Frankenstein in our midst. Like the demolition of a building, we conducted the demolition of Canada in several stages that in retrospect seem conflated in an historical eye-blink of time:

1. The first step was to change immigration selection criteria in 1965 – now 90% of migrants come from what used to be called the Third World, and a great many from Muslim countries. It remains moot as to whether they ever will be assimilated. Even some high profile Leftists are beginning to think not.

2. The next step was the establishment of Official Multiculturalism in 1971. French and Anglo-Celtic Canada were henceforth to be regarded as mere fragments in the 'mosaic'.

3. Then we made the promotion of multiculturalism a mandate of our state-owned national broadcasting corporation, the CBC, which is an empire unto itself. Instead of seeing its mission as ensuring that all strands of Canadian opinion are reflected in its programming, the CBC sees it as giving a voice to newcomers and identity groups.

4. The consequences of our blind promotion of multiculturalism were amplified by the institution of hyper-immigration quotas in 1991 that now enjoy the support of all Canada's national parties. The pace and scale of mass immigration – between a quarter to a half-million newcomers per year – has been such that Canada is suffering from "ethnic indigestion", a chronic inability to integrate, never mind assimilate, swelling ethnic enclaves that have exploded in number from 7 in 1986 to 258 in 2011. Instead of seeing this advancing cultural fragmentation as inherently anarchic and divisive, Canadians are entreated to see it through the filter of the consensus media and the puppet intelligentsia as a convoluted form of nation-building and enrichment, an expression of "unity in diversity" and other oxymoronic cant of similar absurdity.

5. Official multiculturalism and hyper-immigration were followed up with the imposition of so-called "employment equity" targets to help New Canadians fresh from the airport leapfrog over native-born applicants, including First Nations youth who suffer historic unemployment rates. Notwithstanding this "affirmative discrimination", recent immigrants on average don't earn nearly enough income to pay the taxes necessary to offset the claims they make on our social safety net. This is not surprising, inasmuch as more than 80% were not selected on the basis of their skills but qualified by virtue of having relatives already in the country. The "net fiscal burden" of our great multicultural experiment has been estimated to be between $17-23 billion per year.

6. Finally and most importantly, we have allowed the systematic indoctrination of two generations of Canadian college and university students who have been taught that all cultures have equal merit, that our two founding European cultures have no legitimacy, and that their own displacement is to be regarded as a triumph of 'diversity'. These 'students' now occupy strategic positions in the media, in government, in the upper regions of our corporations and in the environmental organizations that these corporations fund. That's right, the leading mouthpieces of Canada's environmental movement have nothing to say about the ecological impact of adding five million migrants (plus two million of their children) to our nation since 1991, converting them into hyper-consumers of energy, or about the paving over of prime farmland with subdivisions to accommodate this immigration-driven population growth.

Canadians have been the lab rats in a massive experiment in social engineering, and the fact that those of us who understand this are labelled as "extremists" is a testimony to its success.

We are nearing the demographic tipping point, if we have not already passed it. As if Peak Everything, climate change and financial collapse were not enough.

Tim Murray is a writer and researcher who focuses on environmental, population and resource issues. He resides on Quadra Island in coastal British Columbia.