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The common complaint that "free speech" should be protected, even when it's ugly, implicitly accepts the Left's argument that we are trying to protect the First Amendment rights of Nazis, White Supremacists, and others with a bad smell. But it really isn't about protecting free speech. The Left and their Muslim allies can and do say anything they want, no matter how malodorous, obscene, dishonest, misleading or defamatory, and get away with it every day. It is about truth vs a totalitarian agenda, and the despots want to shut us up.

By James Simpson

The attack that claimed fifty lives at the Al Noor mosque in Christchurch, New Zealand brought immediate, predictable responses from Democrat politicians, the media, the organized Left and Muslim groups. Commenters from CNN to New York Mayor Bill De Blasio blamed "intolerance, "an epidemic of hatred and fear," and other shibboleths.1 Presidential hopeful Cory Booker blamed "The rising tide of white supremacy and Islamophobia..."2 Virtually all placed some blame on Trump. Nihad Awad, director of The Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), blamed President Trump directly, "We hold you responsible for this growing anti-Muslim sentiment in the country and in Europe..."3

The timing of the attack couldn’t have been better. A real cynic might even suspect it was part of the plan.4 As Rush Limbaugh said on his radio show Friday, "You can’t immediately discount this. The left is this insane, they are this crazy."5

Democrats and their allies in the radical Left have been calling Trump and conservatives, "racists," "bigots" and "neo-Nazis" in a chorus to the heavens for the past two years. Their efforts to condemn "hate speech" ran into a brick wall, however, when newly-elected

---

Minnesota Rep. Ilhan Omar began spewing a litany of hateful, antisemitic remarks, which she has persisted in, despite condemnation from both sides of the aisle. Her statements have put an embarrassing spotlight on the growing, naked antisemitism among the Left.

Calls for a resolution against Omar were proposed by a few Democrats, and a strongly-worded resolution was drafted against antisemitism specifically.\(^6\) But when their leftist base protested, any effort to take a principled stand went out the window. House Speaker Pelosi's eventual answer, House Resolution 183, condemned "intolerance, discrimination, and bigotry," and was voted favorably by the House on March 7.\(^7\)

H.R. 183 is a masterpiece of sophistry. It has been described as a "watered down, do nothing resolution," but it is much more than that. The resolution does not mention Omar at all. It is no longer exclusively, or even primarily, about antisemitism, but now condemns "anti-Muslim bias" on an equal basis, as if the world's Muslims have suffered "oppression" throughout the millennia as Jews have. The notion is laughable, but it's not funny.

Resolution 183 also went out of its way to change the subject on antisemitism by throwing every ethnic group they could think of into the mix. By making it about everything, they made it about nothing... almost.

By calling out "discrimination" and "bigotry," Pelosi and Co. flipped the narrative from condemnation of Omar's antisemitism to make "White supremacists," "White nationalists", and "neo-Nazis" the focal point of its criticism right up front. Paragraph four states:

Whereas White supremacists in the United States have exploited and continue to exploit bigotry and weaponize hate for political gain, targeting traditionally persecuted peoples, including African Americans, Native Americans, and other people of color, Jews, Muslims, Hindus, Sikhs, immigrants, and others with verbal attacks, incitement, and violence;\(^8\)

How have "White supremacists" gained politically anywhere in recent decades?\(^9\)

\(^6\) "Resolution: Rejecting anti-Semitism as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contradictory to the values that define the people of the United States," U.S. House of Representatives, accessed April 9, 2019, https://www.politico.com/f/?id=00000169-4b08-dc75-affd-dfb9d250000.

\(^7\) "H. Res 183: Condemning anti-Semitism as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contradictory to the values and aspirations that define the people of the United States and condemning anti-Muslim discrimination and bigotry against minorities as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contrary to the values and aspirations of the United States," U.S. House of Representatives, March 7, 2019, accessed April 9, 2019, https://www.congress.gov/116/bills/hres183/BILLS-116hres183ih.xml.

\(^8\) Ibid.

\(^9\) Ibid.
H. Res. 183 did raise the issue of the Pittsburgh attack on the Tree of Life Synagogue in Pittsburgh last fall. And the shooter was indeed an antisemite filled with pathological hatred for Jews.

But the question needs to be asked: who has been peddling the antisemitic tropes that animated this man’s hatred? Donald Trump? His conservative supporters? President Trump is the best thing that has happened to Jews in recent memory.

So, who has been transacting in that antisemitic currency? Ilhan Omar’s most outrageous statements parroted the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" narrative that Jews are evil and control the world with money. And she did this mere months following that horrific event. The Left and its Muslim allies increasingly have been attacking Jews, and the Boycott, Divest, Sanction (BDS) movement to financially destroy Israel relies on those false antisemitic narratives.

Of course, the resolution could not resist mentioning Charlottesville, a name that has become a rallying cry for the hard Left.

Whereas on August 11 and 12, 2017, self-identified neo-Confederates, White nationalists, neo-Nazis, and Ku Klux Klansmen held White supremacist events in Charlottesville, Virginia, where they marched on a synagogue under the Nazi swastika, engaged in racist and anti-Semitic demonstrations and committed brutal and deadly violence against peaceful Americans;⁹

Notice how "White nationalists" are now included in the mix? Anyone who is white and believes in our nation -- in other words all loyal, patriotic Americans who happen to be white -- is a "white nationalist". Suddenly, the largest racial group in the U.S. is equated with neo-Nazis and the KKK. That is critical. And as we shall see further on, people of color who believe in our nation and its founding principles and traditions get lumped in too. You don’t even have to be White to be "white."

Furthermore, Charlottesville was one protest by 500 people. Very few Americans support neo-Nazis or the KKK, but at Charlottesville they were outnumbered two-to-one by counter-protesters who were allowed to confront them, despite not having a parade permit. And the counter-protesters were not "peaceful Americans." They were followers of the Marxist Antifa, the modern-day descendants of Black Shirt communists who fought against the Brown Shirt fascists in the streets of Germany, Italy, and Spain in the 1920s and 1930s.

⁹ Ibid.
Both sides were violent, as President Trump correctly noted, and videos of the event show that the Antifa types initiated much of the violence, as they usually do. This isn’t a defense of Nazis, it is simply the truth. And the mayor of Charlottesville, and the other officials that facilitated that confrontation share the blame.

White supremacists, neo-Nazis, and other similar groups are the most marginalized of any in the U.S. I can tell you from direct experience overseeing federal law enforcement agencies for the government in the 1990s that these groups have been thoroughly penetrated by law enforcement agencies for decades.

Resolution 183 makes no mention of the thousands of unprovoked attacks by Antifa types throughout the U.S. over the past two years. Nor does it mention the many instances of Islamic terrorism since 9-11, claiming 159 lives and 503 injured in the U.S. alone.¹⁰

Unfortunately, it has become politically incorrect to surveil Antifa and other communist groups that vastly outnumber the neo-Nazis, or the many mosque-based breeding grounds for Islamic terrorists in the U.S. That threat is much greater, as we have already seen with the many deadly attacks carried out by Muslims, raised since infancy in the jihadist doctrines of the faith, whose passions were enflamed by jihadi imams either online or at the local mosque. Do I need to list them?

The threat from White supremacists has lived largely in the fevered minds of leftist conspiracy theorists, egged on with fundraising appeals by groups like the Southern Poverty Law Center. Liberal journalist Alexander Cockburn, even mocked the SPLC over it:

> horrible news for people who raise money and make money selling the notion there’s a right resurgence out there in the hinterland with massed legions of haters, ready to march down Main Street draped in Klan robes, a copy of “Mein Kampf” tucked under one arm and a Bible under the other. What is the arch-salesman of hate mongering, Mr. Morris Dees of the Southern Poverty Law Center, going to do now?¹¹

So how bad is the situation really? The Pittsburgh attack was indeed a horrible example of someone's hatred and bigotry carried to the extreme, but haven't all the Islamic
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terrorist attacks in the U.S. and abroad been driven by the same kind of bigotry? So, setting aside these unusual events, how bad is the Left’s claimed epidemic of "hate" really? Are we, as the SPLC would have you believe, a nation drenched in bigotry, yearning to build a fascist state? That may actually be what the Left has in mind, but for the rest of us… no.

The chart below shows selected data on hate crime offenses and the overall arrest rates for the same crimes in the U.S. for both 2001 and 2017. There have been a few noteworthy murders and rapes associated with bias, which are the ones that grab the headlines. The most frequent types of crimes by far, however, are intimidation, assault and vandalism, and this is true throughout the time series. Of the assault types, simple assaults make up the majority, while the more serious aggravated assaults represent about a third of the total. Intimidation and vandalism make up most of the rest. And while no one likes to have property defaced or destroyed, or be confronted by an intimidating individual, these are not crimes that cause bodily injury.

| Comparison Between Hate Offenses and Total Arrests (2001 & 2017) |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                 | 2001            | 2017            |                 |                 |                 |
|                 | Assault¹        | Intimidation²   | Vandalism       | Other           | Total           |
| Anti-Jewish     | 58              | 608             | 415             | 36              | 1,117           |
| Anti-Islamic    | 93              | 296             | 123             | 34              | 546             |
| Sex Bias        | 663             | 462             | 357             | 110             | 1,592           |
| Anti-Black      | 1,112           | 1,440           | 834             | 143             | 3,529           |
| Anti-White      | 457             | 263             | 142             | 172             | 1,034           |
| All Categories  | 3,385           | 4,331           | 3,015           | 719             | 11,451          |
| Total Arrests   | 1,793,618       | NA              | 270,645         | 11,634,993      | 13,699,254      |
| Hate % Total    | 0.19%           | NA              | 1.11%           | 0.01%           | 0.08%           |

1 Assault includes "Aggravated," "Simple" and "Other" assault categories.
2 Total Arrests does not have an "Intimidation" category.

But everything in this table debunks the Democrat narrative on hate crime. First, of the five categories shown, which were chosen because they had the most offenses, anti-Islamic bias is the lowest on the list. Anti-Jewish bias is three times greater, and so is anti-White bias. Sex bias is more pronounced than all three, and anti-Black bias is worst of all.

Also, anti-Islamic hate crimes, and all the other categories for that matter, have declined substantially since 2001—exactly the opposite of what they have been claiming. If anything, our nation has become less biased since 2001. It has certainly become less violent.

The most important information in this table, however, compares total arrests in the selected categories with those crimes that carried a bias motive. Assaults carried out as hate crimes represent a mere 0.18 percent of total arrests for assault. Overall, bias crimes are a miniscule proportion—less than one-tenth of one percent—of total crime. There is no category for intimidation outside of hate crimes, but we can still conclude that intimidation is a similarly tiny component of overall crimes. Finally, presumably not all offenses culminated in an arrest, so the actual percentage of offenses is probably even lower.

This table points out another gigantic flaw in the Left’s narrative about America. It reveals that the over-the-top hyperventilating about "hate" crimes by Democrats and their allies is fraudulent, and by insisting that law enforcement focus more resources on it, they are guaranteeing that fewer resources will go to those areas of crime where they are most desperately needed.

So, the Christchurch attack was a gift to Democrats, because it serves their purpose well. Unsurprisingly, they and their Muslim allies focused on the shooter's "White supremacist" ideology without mentioning what he claims are his other beliefs:

- Most closely identifies with Red China’s "political and social values;"
- Described himself as first "a communist, then an anarchist, and finally a libertarian before coming to be an eco-fascist;"

Media also focused on the first half of his statement about Trump being "a symbol of renewed white identity," but ignored the second half which said, "As a policy maker and leader? Dear God no."

Brenton Tarrant, the shooter who wrote the Manifesto, had visited Turkey numerous times for extended visits, and wrote "Turkofagos" on his gun stocks, which means "Eater
of Turks” in Greek. He also visited Pakistan five months prior to his shooting rampage and spoke glowingly of the 97 percent Muslim majority country on social media:

“Hello everyone my name is Brenton Tarrant and I am visitong [sic] pakistan for the first time. Pakistan is an incredible place filled with the most earnest, kind hearted and hospitable people in the world…”

A lot of this contradictory messaging may be meant to troll the media, stirring controversy and getting attention from the press. Taken at face value, it sheds little light on his true motives or ideology, but he spends much time explaining that his goal is to provoke cultural, political, and race divisions in the U.S., culminating in civil war, which would be triggered by gun confiscation.

One clear consequence always follows from mass shootings like these: an immediate response from the Left to demand gun control. These events constantly chip away at society’s resistance to it. The Prime Minister of New Zealand has already announced her intention to ban all semi-automatic firearms.

Whenever these things happen, questions should be asked that never are. Where did Tarrant get the resources to plan and execute this attack over a period of two years? Who will defend him and who are they connected to? Will some Tarrant relative suddenly become wealthy, or have they already? There are malevolent forces at work today, and most law enforcement and even intelligence professionals are woefully uninformed about the people working in the dark to facilitate and provoke such attacks, and the kinds of resources they can mobilize.

Trevor Loudon, a veteran researcher of the Left who also hails from Christchurch, New Zealand, has published an explosive report on Brenton Tarrant that asks the question, "Is the Christchurch Mosque Shooter a ‘National Bolshevik’?" Loudon reveals that Tarrant placed symbols in his "manifesto" that are strong suggestions of his sympathy with or membership in the National Bolshevik Party.
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The National Bolsheviks are a Russia-based organization founded by Aleksandr Dugin, an influential political strategist with ties to Putin and the Russian military. Under his vision of "Eurasianism," the organization seeks to unify fascist and communist groups around the world, "including Germany, Central and Eastern Europe, the former Soviet republics, Turkey, Iran, and Korea, into grand Eurasian Union strong enough to defeat the West."\(^{17}\) It has been described as "a death-seeking cult."\(^{18}\)

Tarrant's manifesto makes clear that he wanted to provoke civil war in the U.S. that would, "balkanize society," and, "reduce the USA's ability to project power globally..."\(^{19}\) He also mouths numerous socialist dog whistles like "anti-imperialism," "environmentalism", "anti-globalism," and "anti-industrialization." These slogans also animate much of the National Bolshevik narrative.

White supremacist Richard Spencer, who helped plan the Charlottesville protests with protest frontman Jason Kessler, is a member of this organization. Spencer’s wife, Nina Kouprianova, is a Russian national and great Dugin admirer who claims to have
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\(^{18}\) Ibid.

translated some of his works. Spencer and prominent members of the alt-right believe, like notorious White supremacist David Duke, that Vladimir Putin will be a savior of the white race.

It is a standard communist tactic to seed opposing sides with agent-provocateurs to sow dissention and confusion. Tarrant's stated goal was to "Destabilize, then take control. If we want to radically and fundamentally change society, then we need to radicalize society as much as possible." This is talk that conforms to National Bolshevik ideology. No conservative talks like this, not even the crazy ones. It is entirely possible that Brenton Tarrant was either knowingly put up for this job by the Russians through the National Bolsheviks or goaded into it with his own ideology.

The Left also seeks to balkanize our nation. It has focused exclusively on Tarrant's "White supremacy," because for years now, and with growing aggressiveness, the Left and its Muslim allies have sought to silence their political enemies by accusing them of "hate speech." And whites, with their "privilege" and "racism," "Islamophobia," and so on, are always the "haters." The Democrat Party is fully on board with this, including ridiculous statements from some candidates disavowing and apologizing for their "whiteness."

In his statement blaming Trump for the New Zealand attacks, CAIR (Council on American Islamic Relations) Executive Director Nihad Awad ominously called for political leaders to suppress "hate" speech. In addition to Trump, he singled out Robert Spencer of Jihad Watch and New York activist Pamela Geller. He said, "[W]e ask our political leaders to address the growing menace of Islamophobia and hate that has been perpetrated by political leaders, by ideologues, by people who want to run for political office, by people who won public office on the backs of Immigrants, Blacks, Jews Muslims and all minorities...."

---


22 Manifesto, op. cit.


Has Awad made similar proclamations regarding the 261 dead and many more injured in multiple Islamic terrorist attacks in France alone since 2015? The 159 in America since 9-11? How about the 4,305 Christians murdered by Muslims across the globe in 2018 alone? Or that the 300 million Christians living in mostly Muslim nations have earned the title, “the most persecuted religion in the world”? Where is the condemnation of Islamic terrorism, or even just acknowledging it exists? Where is Awad's condemnation of honor killings?

Christians in Muslim nations are 143 times more likely to be killed than a Muslim in Christian countries. In the weeks prior to the Christchurch attack, 120 Christians were killed by Boko Haram in Northern Nigeria. Was there a similar outcry? Meanwhile, One America News reports that the Al Noor mosque was under surveillance by New Zealand authorities for jihadist activities and two members of the mosque went on to fight for al-Qa'eda and were killed in a drone strike.

None of this justifies the attack, but why won't Muslim leaders even acknowledge the problem exists? The almost universal response from groups like CAIR when one of their own commits an act of terrorism is to disavow that Islamic terrorists have any association with the "peaceful religion" of Islam and call for police protection from the "Islamophobic" backlash sure to come… but never does.

Meanwhile, CAIR and its allies are all tied directly to the Muslim Brotherhood's subversive agenda against America. CAIR uses lawfare to intimidate any critic of this agenda who exposes CAIR's underbelly, claiming discrimination against an "oppressed" religion. CAIR Chicago, for example, brags of having launched 5,200 lawsuits. Jaylani Hussein, director of CAIR Minnesota, recently bragged of 360 lawsuits in 2017 alone. (He quickly removed the YouTube video of his boast).

---

28 "Mosque in Christchurch shootings tied to radical Islamic terrorists," OAN, March 20, 2019, accessed April 9, 2019, https://www.oann.com/mosque-in-christchurch-shootings-tied-to-radical-islamic-terrorists/?fbclid=IwAR0OOk5Seg-DCb6kVt-i6XuXVn1mXkAOL5uDI4sET3Uix5Upk-7ThnISBHCJs.
Often, mere threats will do. A former attorney for CAIR Minnesota shuttered two scheduled events in Sioux Falls, South Dakota in 2017 -- one of which featured this author and DHS whistleblower Philip Haney -- merely by calling the venue and warning them that the speakers were "Islamophobes".31 Four conferences in Wisconsin and Minnesota were cancelled following threats from Antifa groups after the SPLC alerted such groups that speakers included a prominent "Islamophobe".32

More and more frequently, the Left and its Islamic allies of the Red-Green Axis, have been successfully silencing critics. Awad and his allies scored another victory recently by getting Judge Jeannine Pirro suspended by Fox News for comments regarding Ilhan Omar. Her crime? Islamophobia.33 Pirro reasonably asked if Rep. Ilhan Omar would put Islamic law (shariah) above her duty to the U.S. Constitution: "Is her adherence to this Islamic doctrine [wearing a hijab] indicative of her adherence to Sharia law, which in itself is antithetical to the United States Constitution?"34

Ilhan Omar casually violated longstanding House rules against wearing religious headgear, unlike 170 Jewish representatives who have respected the 181-year-old ban, and no one called her on it.35 Instead, the newly-elected Democrat House removed the ban.36 That in itself was at once a bow to shariah supremacy and a demonstration of Democrats' antisemitic bias. And Omar's frequent statements and behavior already reveal a contempt for the Constitution.

But the Red-Green Axis keeps on pushing.

The Minnesota legislature has now proposed HF 2587, to create an "Islamophobia and Antisemitism" task force.37 Minnesota represents the frontlines of the battle against the Islamic shariah insurgency. Minnesota has the highest number of Somali Muslims of any state. The 5th Congressional District, formerly held by Rep. Keith Ellison and now Rep.

34 Ibid.
Ilhan Omar, has recruited more terrorists from its Muslim population than any other area of the nation.\(^3^8\)

Keith Ellison, Minnesota’s newly elected Attorney General, is aggressively pushing to see this bill enacted. Ellison is the least qualified to lead such a task force. He is a hard-core leftist Muslim who associates regularly with jihadist front groups of the Muslim Brotherhood and who intends to put a target on the back of any Minnesotan who speaks out against what the Left and the Muslims are doing to the state. The inclusion of "antisemitism" to make it sound balanced is nothing less than fraudulent, with Ellison and MN Rep. Ilhan Omar being the poster children for antisemitism.\(^3^9\)

If anything, the AG should be investigating the terrorism and epidemic of crime being committed by Minnesota's "New Americans". In a 2016 case that convicted nine Minnesota men of terrorism, Judge Michael Davis said loudly in a packed courtroom, "Everyone talks about Brussels or Paris having cells. We have a cell here in Minneapolis."\(^4^0\) Davis later explained his reason for speaking out, "We have to incapacitate this cell."

During that same trial, Rep. Omar sent a letter to Judge Davis, appealing for leniency against some of the men.\(^4^1\) "A long-term prison sentence for one who chose violence to combat direct marginalization," she said, "is a statement that our justice system misunderstands the guilty." In other words, it's our fault. Douglas Golden at Conservative Tribune writes: "[Omar]'s made anti-Semitic remarks. She supports BDS. She’s defended the noxious Black Hebrew Israelites against the Covington Catholic kids, saying that the notoriously racist sect were actually the victims at the March to Life brouhaha..."\(^4^2\)

Over a three-day period in 2016, a suburban Minneapolis neighborhood was terrorized by dozens of Somali Muslim men, some old, some young, racing around the neighborhood, lighting off fireworks, waving black Islamic State jihad flags, and shouting


\(^{4^1}\) Ibid.

threats of rape and other violence. Multiple 911 calls were made to the police, who took up to three hours to arrive. The police issued one traffic ticket.\footnote{Leo Hohmann, "Woman gives chilling, 1st-hand account of Muslim rape threat: Refugees terrorized Minnesota neighborhood 3 straight days," \textit{WND}, July 6, 2016, accessed April 4, 2019, \url{https://www.wnd.com/2016/07/woman-gives-chilling-1st-hand-account-of-muslim-rape-threat/}.
}

A restaurant in rural Minnesota, that has had the name whited out to protect the business and its owners, has been a family-run operation for decades. Recently it was harassed by a group of Muslims who objected to the Christmas display in front of the restaurant. They left the message below expressing their displeasure, concluding, "This is OUR Country NOW TOO…" they also refer to St. Cloud as \textit{Our St. Cloud}. Their names have been whited out as well.

![Message from the restaurant](image)

Massive fraud has been ongoing in Minnesota's Child Care Assistance Program (CCAP) for at least five years. Up to $100 million in cash is being sent back to Somalia annually in suitcases, some of which is likely falling into the hands of Al-Shabaab terrorists. Fox News describes the fraud:
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Surveillance videos from a case prosecuted by Hennepin County show parents checking their kids into a center, only to leave with them a few minutes later. Sometimes, no children would show up. Either way, the center would bill the state for a full day of childcare. Video from that same case shows a man handing out envelopes of what are believed to be kickback payments to parents who are in on the fraud.\footnote{Jeff Baillon, "Millions of dollars in suitcases fly out of MSP, but why?" \textit{Fox News}, May 13, 2018, accessed April 4, 2019, \url{http://www.fox9.com/news/investigators/millions-of-dollars-in-suitcases-fly-out-of-msp-but-why}.}

Minnesota residents have a lot to complain about and they have complained. Does Ellison have any intention to investigate these complaints? To the contrary, if Ellison's task force ever gets off the ground, it will be a full-throated effort to silence those speaking out about Minnesota's very serious issues.

Dana Nessel, Michigan's newly-elected Democrat Michigan attorney general, is doing the same thing. She just created a new "hate crimes" unit within the AG's office. In announcing it, Nessel said "Hate itself is not a crime and our civil liberties protect the right to speak about even the most terrible of things…" \textit{However, the office will review and monitor any organization listed by the Southern Poverty Law Center as a "hate" group.}\footnote{Beth LeBlanc, "Nessel, civil rights unit to increase prosecution of hate crimes," \textit{The Detroit News}, February 22, 2019, accessed April 9, 2019, \url{https://www.detroitnews.com/story/news/local/michigan/2019/02/22/ag-department-civil-rights-document-prosecute-hate-crimes/2954169002/}.} (Emphasis added.)

An example of what they consider hateful is a flyer handed out at a recent public event that said, "Keep America American," and urged people to report illegal aliens to ICE. The number for the local ICE office was included. The group responsible is one the SPLC brands "White Nationalist". As quoted in the Detroit News, Agustin Arbulu, director of the Michigan Department of Civil Rights, warned: "[K]now this, we are watching and we won't allow hate to divide us."

And the Antifa storm troopers are waiting in the wings to attack anyone identified by this new office at home, in restaurants or on the street, to punish you for your "hate."

It sets a dangerous precedent for a politically-directed law enforcement entity to establish itself as the arbiter of what constitutes "hate" and, even worse, to use SPLC definitions, because the SPLC is not a neutral arbiter, but a widely-discredited, hard Left group that uses defamation to attack its political enemies.\footnote{Mark Theissen, "The Southern Poverty Law Center has lost all credibility," \textit{The Washington Post}, June 22, 2018, accessed April 9, 2019, \url{https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-southern-poverty-law-center-has-lost-all-credibility/2018/06/21/22ab7d60-756d-11e8-9780-b1dd6a09b549_story.html}.} It is the most prominent,
institutionalized hate group in America. The American Freedom Law Center, another Michigan-based group named by the SPLC, has initiated a lawsuit against Nessel and Arbulu, hoping to shut this office down.

Nessel isn't alone. SPLC has been used by Twitter, Facebook, Google, PayPal, Amazon, Guidestar, and many others to identify and define the "haters." These outlets have effectively created a private censorship police that monitors, silences and, in many cases, financially destroys those who the SPLC targets.

SPLC continues to be used despite recent revelations regarding widespread abuse alleged by employees, who wrote a letter citing the SPLC as being “complicit in decades of racial discrimination, gender discrimination, and sexual harassment and/or assault.” The days of SPLC’s vitriol may be winding down, though as the organization has been in considerable turmoil since co-founder Morris Dees was fired and SPLC President Richard Cohen resigned in March 2019, along with legal director Rhonda Brownstein.

Colleges and universities have a longstanding bias against conservative speakers. The taxpayer-funded University of Maine’s Orono campus has erected a "Free Speech Zone." (See below.) It is a spot outside on a sidewalk near the Memorial Union student center, probably about 15 by 15 feet, with the perimeter guarded by orange saw horses (below.)

The University of Portland has its own "Bias Response Team."

But who are the haters really? With the Left, hate speech is doctrine. Obscene, vicious, dishonest, defamatory, hate-filled rhetoric is the order of the day. Practically all they do is vilify others. In a recent interview with former FBI director James Comey, CNN’s Christiane Amanpour complained about Trump supporters at a recent speech, shouting the familiar, "Lock her up!" regarding Hillary Clinton. She asked Comey if the FBI should have allowed that "hate speech." Fortunately, Comey responded

---

that censorship was "not the role for government to play..."\(^5\) Yet for a journalist to even ask such a question is precedent-setting, revealing how partisan journalists really feel about the First Amendment rights--at least for those with whom they disagree.

By making it all about "White supremacy" and "Islamophobia," H. Res. 183 has set the stage for advancing the Left's true goal: silencing critics with hate speech and anti-blasphemy legislation. As Robert Spencer has observed:

> The entire “Islamophobia” enterprise is a massive bait-and-switch, designed to shift attention away from actual jihad killers, and shift blame for their deeds onto the small group of counterterror analysts and human rights activists who are actually trying to call attention to what they are doing.\(^5\)

**Partisan Tolerance, White Privilege and White Crimes**

Mr. Tarrant gave the Red-Green Axis a lot more ammunition, but the battle has been waged for a long time. The Left has been trying to silence all opposition for decades, but that effort is fully out in the open now. The individuals and groups seeking to silence us have taken a cue from Vladimir Lenin, the first Bolshevik leader of the USSR, who overthrew the last Russian Czar in the name of communism. His statements and strategies were the guideposts for future action. Lenin had total contempt for the notion of free speech:

> Why should freedom of speech and freedom of the press be allowed? Why should a government which is doing what it believes is right allow itself to be criticized? It would not allow opposition by lethal weapons. Ideas are much more fatal things than guns.\(^5\)

The pretext here is that communists are justified because they are right - the ends justify the means. With that justification, all is permitted. Lenin explained how the Left should confront its enemies, "*We must be ready to employ trickery, deceit, law-breaking, withholding*


\(^5\) Robert Spencer, "Malaysia Prime Minister: 'If we want to make Islam less hated, we need to find out what wrong we have done'" *Jihad Watch*, March 29, 2019, accessed April 5, 2019, [https://www.jihadwatch.org/2019/03/malaysia-prime-minister-if-we-want-to-make-islam-less-hated-we-need-to-find-out-what-wrong-we-have-done](https://www.jihadwatch.org/2019/03/malaysia-prime-minister-if-we-want-to-make-islam-less-hated-we-need-to-find-out-what-wrong-we-have-done).

and concealing truth... We can and must write in a language which sows among the masses hate, revulsion, and scorn toward those who disagree with us."  

The Soviet Union communicated this idea in a memo to the communist parties of the world in 1943:

Members and front organizations must continually embarrass, discredit, and degrade our critics. When obstructionists become too irritating, label them as fascist or Nazi or anti-Semitic... constantly associate those who oppose us with those names that already have a bad smell. The association will, after enough repetition, become “fact” in the public mind.

The Frankfurt School and the Authoritarian Personality

In the meantime, Lenin's cohorts created what would become the driving force behind the West's cultural decline. The Marxist School for Social Research in Frankfurt, Germany, aka "the Frankfurt School", created "Critical Theory," a bogus philosophy that sought to dissect and discredit all aspects of Western culture, following Marx's call for "the ruthless criticism of everything existing." The Frankfurt School used academicians to spread the poison. Willi Münzenberg, the Soviet COMINTERN agent who helped organize the Frankfurt School, stated,

We must organize the intellectuals and use them to make Western civilization stink. Only then, after they have corrupted all its values and made life impossible, can we impose the dictatorship of the proletariat.

With the ascension of Hitler in 1933, the Frankfurt School communist professors fled, reconstituting the Frankfurt School at Columbia Teachers College in NY, with the assistance of John Dewey, then-president of the National Education Association.

In the 1930s, Frankfurt School academic Erich Fromm developed a pseudo-science combining Freud and Marx in the service of Critical Theory. Another Frankfurt School member, Theodor Adorno, worked with three other American professors to further develop Fromm's work. The result was a 1950 book titled The Authoritarian Personality. They posited that people who believed in capitalism, nationalism, freedom, Christianity,


the nuclear family, and traditional American values were "authoritarian," and carried subconscious, even unconscious, incurable racist, bigoted, anti-Semitic, fascist traits -- whether they were aware of it or not.57

Armed with this "research," the Frankfurt School communists could easily destroy any and all opponents, because after all, if you believed in America's founding principles, Christianity, free market capitalism, etc., you were by definition, a fascist, racist, anti-Semitic, bigoted, budding tyrant. The book's leftist slant was not lost on many critics, but few noted the irony of the communist Left accusing conservatives of those very traits amply demonstrated by Lenin, Stalin, Mao, Pol Pot, Castro, as well as Hitler, who was also a Socialist.

Now, of course, you can add all the new terms they have invented to define whom they claim you are, whether you're aware of it or not, like xenophobe, Islamophobe, homophobe, etc. And the "authoritarian personality" now enjoys a prominent place in the psychology lexicon, with Adorno recognized as its author (though without mentioning his communist ideology or agenda).58

By the 1970s, ideas embedded in The Authoritarian Personality had already taken root in academia and other leftist circles. The notions of nationalism, adherence to our founding principles, and the rule of law already were being discredited. For example, in 1973, Charles Pierce, the prominent Harvard professor of educational psychiatry, stated to 2,000 teachers at the Child International Education Seminar in Denver, Colorado:

Every child in America entering school at the age of five is insane because he comes to school with certain allegiances to the Founding Fathers, towards his parents, towards our elected officials, toward a belief in a supernatural being, and toward the sovereignty of this nation as a separate entity. It's up to you, teachers, to make all these sick children well by creating the international child of the future.59

The Authoritarian Personality provided the intellectual ammunition for radical Left academicians and is the genesis for the mass group think that today regards Donald Trump and his followers as "racists," "bigots," etc., and accuses the Trump administration of being fascist.60 So, having defined traditional America -- the America that Made

57 Ibid., p. 177-184.
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America Great -- as incurably fascist, bigoted, and dangerous, they had to find a way to silence us.

Partisan Tolerance

In the 1960s, Frankfurt School Communist Herbert Marcuse invented a strategy for overcoming America's "authoritarian" personality. He created the concept of "partisan tolerance," i.e., tolerance of ideas from the Left and complete intolerance of those of the Right. Marcuse argued that America practiced a form of "repressive tolerance," because, while the First Amendment gives the Left the opportunity to air its complaints, America is a nation of authoritarians who are incurably imperialist, capitalist, and "oppressive". Thus, the Left's ideas would never be given the audience they deserve. Marcuse advocated "liberating tolerance" to remedy this:

Liberating tolerance, then, would mean intolerance against movements from the Right and toleration of movements from the Left.... Not 'equal' but more representation of the Left would be equalization of the prevailing inequality...  

The Authoritarian Personality visualized America as the repository for post-WW II fascism. Naturally, it had to be stopped. Marcuse continues, rationalizing the complete silencing of conservatives, over four decades ago:

The whole post-fascist period is one of clear and present danger. Consequently, true pacification requires the withdrawal of tolerance before the deed at the stage of communication in word, print and picture. Such extreme suspension of the right of free speech and free assembly is indeed justified only if the whole of society is in extreme danger. I maintain that our society is in such an emergency situation...

Withdrawal of tolerance from regressive movements before they can become active; intolerance even toward thought, opinion, and word, and finally, intolerance in the opposite direction, that is, toward the self-styled conservatives, to the political Right--these anti-democratic notions respond to the actual development of the democratic society...  

Some on the Left are parroting almost these very words, calling Donald Trump a threat to democracy, and this tactic is in operation every day when left-wing professors, universities, journalists, performers, politicians, and activists ridicule, misrepresent,

---

threaten, shout down, shut down, sue, physically attack, or just fail to report anything said by political opponents.

The Southern Poverty Law Center, Media Matters for America, and even the Anti-Defamation League are assisting in this effort today. Social media does the same by "deplatforming," "shadow-banning," and other forms of censorship, while online payment processors discriminate against those with a politically incorrect mission or message, financially crippling or destroying them. All of these tactics are examples of "partisan tolerance."

White Privilege

Students for a Democratic Society member Noel Ignatiev, (aka Noel Ignatin), also a member of the Provisional Organizing Committee of the Communist Party USA,63 its most extreme wing, added further to the attacks on American society by creating the term "White Skin Privilege" in a 1967 pamphlet co-authored by fellow SDS radical and CPUSA member Ted Allen.64 Ignatiev's later journal, Race Traitor: Journal of the New Abolitionism, sought to "abolish the white race:"

The way to abolish the white race is to challenge, disrupt and eventually overturn the institutions and behavior patterns that reproduce the privileges of whiteness, including the schools, job and housing markets, and the criminal justice system. The abolitionists do not limit themselves to socially acceptable means of protest, but reject in advance no means of attaining their goal. (Emphasis added.)65

Ignatiev further made his intentions clear, by saying, "Abolitionism is also a strategy: its aim is not racial harmony but class war."66

You can see the seeds of Antifa violence justified in these statements. But it is not really whites to whom they object. It is anyone who opposes their agenda to steal power. Whites are just the fall guy because they represent the majority race in the U.S. Ignatiev's treatise refers to "all those who partake of the privileges of the white skin in this society."

"White" in radical construction means anyone of any race, creed, nationality, color, sex, or sexual preference who embraces capitalism, free markets, limited government, and

---
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American traditional culture and values. By definition, these beliefs define "White Privilege" and are therefore irredeemably evil. Anyone who aligns with them is "white" in spirit and thus equally guilty of "white crimes." So, one can be of any color and still be "white." For example, black conservative scholar Thomas Sowell offered, "...those who think white and look black."\(^{67}\)

Saul Alinsky's 1971-published *Rules for Radicals* systematized all these notions with his now-famous vilification tactics, especially Rule 13. Pick the target, freeze it, personalize it, and polarize it. The entire agenda is a complete misdirection. The true goal is to terrorize, intimidate, discredit, and divide our society, turning itself against itself.

Is that not a perfect description of today's media, the Democrat Party, and the Left generally? Does it not describe how CAIR and the other Muslim Brotherhood front groups operate? Today's effort by the Left to push all the "haters" into one camp so they can be silenced follows this strategy, initiated by Lenin and fine-tuned over a century. They have been getting a lot of help from the Islamic Movement for a long time too.

**Islamophobia, Blasphemy, and UN Resolution 16/18**

What constitutes the entirely-contrived term, "Islamophobia"? Esam Omeish is a Libyan-born American physician, and chief of Surgery at a Northern Virginia Hospital. In the wake of the New Zealand shootings, Omeish posted on Facebook a list of words that he defines as "Islamophobic," along with a warning:

---

So, if Islamophobia is defined by all these terms, then if we discuss the latest incidence of Islamic terrorism, we are the ones doing the killing? And how does one react to someone who is out there "killing?" Does a negative reaction justify still more Islamic terrorism?

Omeish is the former president of the Muslim American Society (MAS), one of the Muslim Brotherhood's foremost front groups in the U.S. He is also a board member at the Dar al Hijra mosque in Falls Church, Virginia. Anwar al-Awlaki, who inspired Ft. Hood shooter Nidal Hassan and many others before he was killed in a drone strike in Yemen, led Dar al Hijra before he fled overseas. Dar al Hijra also assisted three of the 9-11 attackers.

Is it safe to call Dar al Hijra a jihadi mosque? Good grief, no! John Rossomando of the Investigative Project on Terrorism unearthed Omeish's Facebook post. He quipped, "Memo to the Palestinian Islamic Jihad and other terrorist groups which have "jihad" in their name: Esam Omeish thinks you hate Muslims."68

---

Omeish’s statement is akin to a KGB agent telling you, "Yes, we’ve penetrated your intelligence, defense and security organizations, your churches, schools and colleges, your media and Hollywood, and are working to subvert all of them to our cause, but you can’t talk about it or we’ll accuse you of 'Red-baiting'".

**Resolution 16/18**

In 2011, then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and the Obama White House actively co-sponsored UN Resolution 16/18, *Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatization of, and discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against persons based on religion or belief.*

16/18 was a resolution originally proposed by the 57-member Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC). Founded in 1969, the OIC is the second largest inter-governmental organization in the world. Early drafts of 16/18 included specific prohibitions against criticism of Islam that would see people criminally prosecuted for "hate" speech. They weren’t concerned with hate speech against Christians and Jews, though, which they continue to practice with gusto.

The Obama administration partnered with the OIC from the beginning, with Clinton taking the lead. The administration voluntarily complied with the OIC’s edicts by minimizing or removing references to Islamic terrorism whenever it struck. The 2009 Fort Hood attack was characterized as "workplace violence". Following the Orlando nightclub attack, where Omar Mateen murdered 49 innocent people, the administration edited Mateen’s 911 call to remove references to Islamic terrorism before allowing it to be released to the public.

---
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The OIC's specific goal with 16/18 was to silence criticism of Islam and the OIC had been working to get such a resolution at the UN since at least 1997.

In December of 2007, the U.N. passed Resolution 62/154, “Combating Defamation of Religions”. The only named religion was Islam. Muslims were made out to be the victims of "xenophobia," which the Resolution blamed for much of the world's violence:

…manifestations of cultural prejudice, intolerance and xenophobia towards people belonging to different cultures, religions and beliefs generate hatred and violence among peoples and nations throughout the world.

Among the Resolution's 19 points, point 6 Claimed that 9/11 caused an unfair backlash against Muslims:

6. Notes with deep concern the intensification of the campaign of defamation of religions and the ethnic and religious profiling of Muslim minorities in the aftermath of the tragic events of 11 September 2001;

Really, what did they expect? Point 7 blamed the War on Terror for the oppression of "target groups" i.e., terrorists:

7. Recognizes that, in the context of the fight against terrorism and the reaction to counter-terrorism measures, defamation of religions and incitement to religious hatred becomes an aggravating factor that contributes to the denial of fundamental rights and freedoms of members of target groups, as well as their economic and social exclusion;

Finally, 62/154 requested a report that would investigate "possible correlation between defamation of religions and the upsurge in incitement, intolerance and hatred in many parts of the world." In other words, the negative characterizations of Islam inspired by Islamic terrorism were to blame for growing “radicalization” of Muslims.

---
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62/154 was reaffirmed and strengthened in the March 12, 2009 UN Human Rights Council Resolution Combating Defamation of Religions. 77 Two points in particular are important:

7. Expresses deep concern in this respect that Islam is frequently and wrongly associated with human rights violations and terrorism and in this regard regrets the laws or administrative measures specifically designed to control and monitor Muslim minorities, thereby stigmatizing them and legitimizing the discrimination they experience; 78

Point 11 makes clear the UN wants to enforce blasphemy laws:

11. Strongly condemns all manifestations and acts of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance against national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities and migrants and the stereotypes often applied to them, including on the basis of religion or belief, and urges all States to apply and, where required, reinforce existing laws when such xenophobic or intolerant acts, manifestations or expressions occur, in order to deny impunity for those who commit such acts; 79

(emphasis added)

The 2009 resolution did make what was considered a major change by dropping the word "blasphemy" from its language. 80 Otherwise, 16/18 incorporated the sentiments of these prior resolutions. The final version took pains to reaffirm the right to free speech, as follows:

Reaffirming the positive role that the exercise of the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the full respect for the freedom to seek, receive and impart information can play in strengthening democracy and combating religious intolerance, 81

While that statement may have mollified some Western critics, it was a throwaway line that did not change the fundamental thrust of the resolution. An OIC official implicitly affirmed this, saying that OIC "was not wedded to either a particular title or the content

---
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of a resolution… We just wanted to ensure that the actual matter of vital concern and interest to OIC member state was addressed.” And it certainly was.

16/18 included numerous references to curbing speech:

- Section 5(f) in particular called for "Adopting measures to criminalize incitement to imminent violence based on religion or belief;"
- Section 5(g) also called for, "Understanding the need to combat denigration and negative religious stereotyping of persons, as well as incitement to religious hatred"

These ideas were reinforced in other sections condemning speech that constituted:

- [C]ontinued serious instances of derogatory stereotyping, negative profiling and stigmatization of persons based on their religion or belief;
- [N]egative stereotyping of individuals on the basis of religion or belief;
- [A]dvocacy of religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence, whether it involves the use of print, audio-visual or electronic media or any other means;

Instead of using the incendiary word "blasphemy," its more subtle language of "incitement", "negative profiling", and so forth, leaves the door open to broad interpretation. Prominent Muslims like Congressional Representatives Ilhan Omar and Rashida Tlaib, and any number of prominent imams, routinely traffic in "stereotyping", "profiling", "religious hatred", and justify or at least defend terrorist acts, so these proscriptions obviously don't apply to them.

But criticism of Islam is illegal under shariah laws regarding slander, so they never gave up. And while the OIC was constantly pushing for prohibitions against criticism of Islam, as far back as 2000 the UN was already building a case for insulating "migrants" as a protected class. The Millennium Development Declaration, signed in September 2000, urged nations:

To take measures to ensure respect for and protection of the human rights of migrants, migrant workers and their families, to eliminate the increasing acts of

---
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racism and xenophobia in many societies and to promote greater harmony and tolerance in all societies.\textsuperscript{85}

This was followed by UN Resolution 59/194, \textit{Protection of Migrants}, adopted in March 2005. This document is virtually identical to the 2018 UN \textit{Global Compact on Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration}, and laid out then the UN's justification for criminalizing speech. Point 1:

\textit{Strongly condemns} the manifestations and acts of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance against migrants and the stereotypes often applied to them, and \textit{urges} States to apply the existing laws when xenophobic or intolerant acts, manifestations or expressions against migrants occur, in order to eradicate impunity for those who commit xenophobic and racist acts; (emphasis added.)\textsuperscript{86}

This was strengthened in the 2018 \textit{Global Compact}, which contains specific language criminalizing almost any speech against "migrants". Objective 17 states:

We commit to eliminate all forms of discrimination, condemn and counter expressions, acts and manifestations of racism, racial discrimination, violence, xenophobia and related intolerance against all migrants in conformity with international human rights law.\textsuperscript{87}

The Compact then makes seemingly contradictory statements reaffirming the right to free speech:

We further commit to promote an open and evidence-based public discourse on migration and migrants in partnership with all parts of society, that generates a more realistic, humane and constructive perception in this regard. We also commit to protect freedom of expression in accordance with international law, recognizing that an open and free debate contributes to a comprehensive understanding of all aspects of migration.\textsuperscript{88}


\textsuperscript{88} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 25/36-26/36.
Note that the commitment to "open and evidence-based public discourse" is qualified as that which "generates a more realistic, humane and constructive perception…" Unfortunately, the truth about mass migration and its chaotic, devastating impact on Western society to date does not often lend itself to "constructive perception".

Will it still be legal to raise the many alarming issues that mass migration has caused and is causing? We already know the answer. Despite its token nods to "freedom of expression", note that every provision in the Compact is to be followed, "in accordance with international law", not national law.

Furthermore, the Compact tosses in so many landmines open to interpretation by politicians, politicized courts, and law enforcement, that "freedom of expression" will become largely theoretical. Objective 17 includes the following provisions (emphases added):89

- Enact, implement or maintain legislation that penalizes hate crimes and aggravated hate crimes targeting migrants…
- Empower migrants and communities to denounce any acts of incitement to violence directed towards migrants…
- Promote independent, objective and quality reporting of media outlets, including internet-based information, including by sensitizing and educating media professionals on migration-related issues…
- Stopping allocation of public funding or material support to media outlets that systematically promote intolerance, xenophobia, racism and other forms of discrimination…
- Establish mechanisms to prevent, detect and respond to racial, ethnic and religious profiling of migrants by public authorities, as well as systematic instances of intolerance, xenophobia, racism and all other multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination…
- Engage migrants, political, religious and community leaders, as well as educators and service providers to detect and prevent incidences of intolerance, racism, xenophobia, and other forms of discrimination against migrants…
- Promote awareness-raising campaigns targeted at communities of origin, transit and destination in order to inform public perceptions regarding the positive contributions of safe, orderly and regular migration, based on evidence and facts, and to end racism, xenophobia and stigmatization…

So, while gang rapes, Muslim grooming gangs, and Islamic terrorist attacks have become epidemic in Belgium, France, Germany, Scandinavia, the UK, and elsewhere, we will all
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need to be re-educated regarding the benefits of mass migration and stop our *intolerance, xenophobia, racism, and other forms of discrimination.*

In November 2018, Europe of Nations and Freedom (ENF) party members of the European Parliament held a press conference to discuss the Compact on Migration. Parliament member Marcel de Graaff, a member of the Dutch Party for Freedom, warned what the Compact would mean:

> [A]lthough this joint agreement isn't binding, it's still meant to be the legal framework on which the participating countries commit themselves to build new legislation. One basic element of this new agreement is the extension of the definition of hate speech. The agreement want [sic] to criminalize migration speech. **Criticism of migration will become a criminal offense, and media outlets… that give room to criticism of migration can be shut down.** The compact for **migration is legalization of mass migration.** (Emphasis added.) It's declaring migration as a human right. So in fact, it will become impossible to criticize Ms. [German Chancellor Angela] Merkel's "welcome migrants" politics, without being at risk to be jailed for hate speech.90

Despite its claim that the Compact is "nonbinding," the UN is aggressively promoting this policy, pressuring signatory countries to censor any speech that sheds a negative light on Islam or the mass immigration that has occurred over the last few years. For example, the **UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination** has demanded Norway become more aggressive in its prosecution of "haters."91

One Norwegian author, Hege Storhaug, published a 2015 best-selling book, now translated into English, titled *Islam: Europe Invaded, America Warned.*92 Storhaug has testified before the Norwegian parliament and is a nationally-known journalist, author, and expert on Islam. Storhaug and her book have been reported to the UN, ironically by a liberal group that includes gays, despite proclamations by a prominent Norwegian imam

---

that all "normal" Muslims believe gays should be killed.93 The UN has been asked by this group to seek her prosecution.94

Storhaug became educated to the nature of Islam through Pakistani Muslim friends of hers, who warned her about allowing Islam to establish itself in Norway. She has been reporting and writing on the issue since 1992. Following publication of a 2007 book on immigration, she was physically assaulted and beaten unconscious. She has lived in an undisclosed location under police protection ever since.

For writing a book. Who are the haters?

In a recent debate in the German Bundestag, Chancellor Angela Merkel said that the Compact will, in fact, be binding. It will also require signatory nations to abide by other odious UN programs, like Agenda 2030.95

Well before 16/18 was signed, hate speech laws were already enacted and being aggressively enforced in many European nations. Courts, law enforcement and the political establishment have demonstrated overt hostility to any citizens who tell the truth about Islam, Islamic law (shariah), or migration, or make any derogatory statements.

For example, in 2011 Elisabeth Sabbaditsch-Wolff, an Austrian woman, was convicted for "denigration of religious beliefs of a legally recognized religion," when during a private seminar on Islam she told the audience, "Mohammed had a thing for little girls."96

As anyone who has studied Islam knows, Mohammed's favorite wife, Aisha, was six when they married and nine when the marriage was consummated. Mohammed was 52. That constitutes pedophilia by any definition accepted in liberal Western Civilization nations. In issuing her bizarre ruling, the judge claimed that Mohammed could not be a pedophile because he remained married to Aisha for the rest of his life. She was eighteen when he died.
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Ironically, the charge was not brought by authorities at first. Leftist journalists for the online blog, *NEWS*, had snuck into two of Wolff’s seminars in 2009 and secretly recorded them. They then reported her to authorities. She wasn’t charged for almost a year, and when she was, it was *NEWS* reporters, not the court, who informed her.97

Wolff had initially been charged with "incitement to hatred," but that charge was dropped, largely because she was just reciting factual information about Islam. Wolff could speak authoritatively on the subject, having been raised as an Austrian diplomat in Libya, Kuwait, Iraq, and Iran. She was in Iran as a youth during the 1979 revolution and was working in Kuwait when Saddam Hussein invaded in 1990.98

Prosecutors had a very weak case, so the judge pulled a new charge out of the hat during the 2011 trial. The second charge accused Wolff of "denigrating religious symbols of a recognized religious group," and she was found guilty of that charge. Later in 2011, Wolff appealed to the Provincial Appellate Court in Vienna, but the charge was upheld by the court, which accused her of “an excess of opinion”. 99

She appealed then to the Austrian Supreme Court in 2013, which also upheld the conviction, claiming Article 9 of the European Convention of Human Rights trumps Austrian law. Ironically, Article 9 says nothing about "denigration of religious beliefs", but merely affirms the right to practice religion:

> Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief, in worship, teaching, practice and observance…100

Even more telling, Article 10 clearly reaffirms the right to freedom of speech:

> Everyone has the right to freedom of expression. This right shall include freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers…101

So clearly, the Supreme Court’s decision was driven by politics, and either fear of, or collusion with, Austrian Muslim groups to silence critics. Wolff finally appealed to the
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European Court of Human Rights, which affirmed the Supreme Court decision in December 2018.

Wolff now must pay fines or spend 60 days in jail. Wolff called the decision, "a black day for Austria". The Vienna Federation of Academics called it "politically and sentimentally motivated justice," concluding that it represented "the end of freedom of expression in Austria".102

Wolff's case is not unique. Europeans who speak out about the problems with Muslims in their nations are being attacked, arrested, and silenced at the same time that terrorist attacks are becoming more frequent and deadly. Blasphemy laws exist in many European nations, including Austria, Finland, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Poland, Spain, and the UK.103 A few nations have repealed or modified theirs, but the political establishment continues to oppress and silence critics of Islam or migration.

Great Britain has been aggressively prosecuting Christians for "hate speech", while ignoring the true hate speech being expressed by Muslim groups. After one such arrest, when a Muslim man threatened a Christian street preacher, London Mayor Sadiq Khan said, "There's not an unlimited right to freedom of expression or free speech".104 The Muslim man, who was the source of the conflict, was not arrested.

**Countering Violent Extremism**

UN Resolution 16/18 further propelled an agenda initiated during the George W. Bush administration, but which accelerated under President Obama, making a wholesale shift away from law enforcement's focus on Islamic terrorism under the pretext of protecting Muslim "civil rights." 16/18 Section 6(d) specifically calls upon all states:

> To make a strong effort to counter religious profiling, which is understood to be the invidious use of religion as a criterion in conducting questionings, searches and other law enforcement investigative procedures;105

That shift to "Civil Rights and Civil Liberties (CRCL) essentially blinded U.S. security agencies. According to best-selling author and former DHS intelligence analyst Phillip

---
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Haney, attacks in Boston, Massachusetts, Orlando, Florida, and San Bernardino, California might have been prevented had surveillance programs not been scuttled to accommodate the new CRCL agenda.

At the same time, traditional counter terrorism efforts were replaced by "Countering Violent Extremism" or CVE, which focused more on "domestic terrorism" than terrorism with so-called ‘international’ connections (aka, Islamic jihad terrorism). Predictably, this placed much more focus on "rightwing terrorism" and "White Supremacists". Despite the election of President Donald Trump in November 2016, this orientation had not significantly changed as of this paper's publication date, and of course, among Democrats and their media allies, "Down With White Supremacy" has become their battle cry.

But gradual acceptance of malevolent Islamic groups in the U.S. long predated even this. At the same time Muslim terrorists were being tried for the 1993 World Trade Center bombing, terrorism-connected individuals were meeting in Philadelphia to advance developments of Muslim front organizations in the U.S. The following year, the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) emerged as a front for the U.S.-designated Palestinian terrorist group HAMAS, with Nihad Awad as its co-founder and executive director.

It goes even further back than that. The oldest Muslim Brotherhood group in America is the Muslim Students Association (MSA), founded in 1964. Today, MSA is the source of much of the growing, virulent antisemitism on college campuses. Out of MSA came the North American Islamic Trust (NAIT, incorporated in 1973), the Islamic Society of North America (ISNA, incorporated in 1981), and CAIR. All three were named by the Justice Department as unindicted co-conspirators in the 2008 Holy Land Foundation HAMAS terror financing trial. They remain unindicted only because President Obama shut down further prosecutions. MSA also founded the International Institute for

---
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Islamic Thought (IIIT, founded in 1982), which allegedly coined the term "Islamophobia" in the early 1990s.\textsuperscript{111}

In 1994, the Runnymede Trust, a British think tank, recommended creating a commission to study Islamophobia. In 1997 the resulting Commission on British Muslims and Islamophobia published its final report: \textit{Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All}. A follow-up independent commission, Insted, (Inservice Training and Educational Development), was established in 1999 and published \textit{Islamophobia: issues, challenges and action} in 2004. The foreword to that report blamed whites for the lack of progress in combating Islamophobia:

Most major British institutions are led by white, middle-class men – like me. So they have a distinctive responsibility to help make Britain a safer, more inclusive society for all who live here. Racism is not in the minds of black people, nor is Islamophobia in the minds of Muslims, nor antisemitism in the minds of Jews. Racism, Islamophobia and antisemitism are in the minds of white people, non-Muslims and non-Jews, and in the institutions, organisations and cultures that they mould and lead.\textsuperscript{112}

\textbf{Congressional Action}

In December 2015, House Democrats proposed H. Res. 569 "Condemning violence, bigotry, and hateful rhetoric towards Muslims in the United States". This bill had 145 Democrat co-sponsors. It forwarded the narrative that Muslims are victims who have suffered by being wrongly associated with Islamic terrorism: "Whereas the rise of hateful and anti-Muslim speech, violence, and cultural ignorance plays into the false narrative spread by terrorist groups of Western hatred of Islam…"\textsuperscript{113}

As noted in UN Res. 16/18, that is a familiar thread. And while it is certainly true that many Muslims do not support Islamic terrorism -- indeed many are victims of it -- Islamic terrorism \textit{is Islamic}, based on passages in the Qur’an, Sunna, and shariah.

H. Res. 569 went nowhere in the House and the Senate never offered a companion bill, but the resolution put out a marker that many Democrats would support such a measure.

\textsuperscript{111}"International Institute of Islamic Thought (IIIT)," \textit{Discover The Networks}, last updated April 9, 2019, accessed April 5, 2019, \url{https://www.discoverthenetworks.org/organizations/international-institute-of-islamic-thought-iiit/}.


In April 2017, both the U.S. Senate and the House proposed and later passed resolutions "Condemning hate crime and any other form of racism, religious or ethnic bias, discrimination, incitement to violence, or animus targeting a minority in the United States," S. Res. 118) and (H. Res. 257).114

These bills were made more palatable with the inclusion of sections condemning antisemitism and hate crimes against Sikhs and Hindus and other minorities. Like UN Res. 16/18, the bills condemned "incitement to violence", and called for the creation of an interagency task force to combat hate crime.115

The resolution introduced in the Senate by Kamala Harris, was co-written by the Muslim Public Affairs Council (MPAC) and EmgageUSA (formerly EmergeUSA), two more Muslim Brotherhood front groups.116 It was considered and agreed to without dissent on April 5, 2017, the same day it was introduced. GOP senators Marco Rubio (R-FL) and Susan Collins (R-ME) helped out, as Emgage later boasted on its Facebook page:

Thanks to the hard work of Senator Marco Rubio, Senator Dianne Feinstein, Senator Susan Collins and Senator Kamala Harris we have achieved the approval of Senate Resolution 118, an anti-hate crimes bill supported by Emgage.117

The virtually identical House version was introduced by Rep. Barbara Comstock (R-VA) one day later but then languished for over a year. On July 25, 2018, H. Res. 257 was agreed to without objection. Emgage (closely associated with CAIR, the U.S. branch of HAMAS) claimed credit for this bill as well, announcing in a press release that, "Emgage Action has lead [sic] the effort on Capitol Hill in advocating for anti-hate crime legislation".

In response to the Charlottesville protests of August 10-11, 2017, 240 members of the U.S. Conference of Mayors joined with the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) to form the "Mayors’ Compact to Combat Hate, Extremism and Bigotry." The announcement

contained dramatic language, notably excluding any mention of the Antifa groups that provoked the conflict:

    Dark forces of extremism and violent bigotry are rearing their ugly heads. We are now seeing efforts in our states and at the highest levels of our government to weaken existing civil rights policies and reduce their enforcement.\textsuperscript{118}

    We have seen an increase in hate violence, xenophobic rhetoric, and discriminatory actions that target Muslims, Jews, and other minorities. We will not permit them to succeed.

The language of the Compact is similar to both UN 16/18 and H. Res. 183:

1. EXPRESSLY REJECTING EXTREMISM, WHITE SUPREMACY AND ALL FORMS OF BIGOTRY

    Mayors will use the bully pulpit to speak out against racism, extremism, xenophobia, white supremacy and all forms of bigotry, and those who espouse such ideologies, and promote community conversations around these issues as needed.\textsuperscript{119}

Once again, the Compact includes a provision guaranteeing the protection of free speech, but then goes on to recommend a laundry list of proposals to create hotlines and online tools to report "hate incidents," and recommends boosting resources for "hate crime" investigations and indoctrination of school children with all the usual liberal mantras. This will not lower the temperature. It will raise it. We will find neighbor spying on neighbor, routine disagreements turning into "hate incidents" and so forth.

The problem with all of these proposals is that so-called "hate" incidents, xenophobia, and bigotry are in the eyes of the beholder. There was plenty on both sides in Charlottesville. The Left and their Muslim allies have already demonstrated that "hate," by their definition, is simply opinions and people that they hate, and as Ilhan Omar repeatedly shows, they are increasingly open about their rank bigotry.

Furthermore, their arguments are founded on false premises, \textit{i.e.}, that targeting of minorities is on the rise, that "White supremacy" is a nationwide threat, and that Muslims and other groups are "oppressed minorities". These are all leftist narratives that


have been dragged out of the closet again and again for decades with different groups and different issues. One tweet described the process humorously but accurately using the Trump/Russia collusion as an example:

That is the formula. It should be painfully obvious now to most rational people. The true goal of the Red-Green Axis is to dominate the dominant culture, and to do that, the dominant culture must be marginalized, discredited and silenced.

It is likely that ADL borrowed some of the Compact ideas from Emgage or perhaps worked with Emgage in formulating the Compact and utilized what has become boilerplate language at this point. ADL has since partnered with Emgage in opposing Ken Isaacs, President Trump's nominee to lead the International Office of Migration (IOM). IOM is the UN organization that wrote the Migrant Compact.120

But why would the ADL partner with Muslim groups which defend antisemites like Ilhan Omar and Rashida Tlaib, rather than protest antisemitism? Many wonder why leftwing Jews so often side with those who would seem to be their enemies. But communists are always communists first. Most leftwing, secular Jews are as antisemitic as their Muslim friends -- odd as that may seem. It was an outstanding characteristic of the Frankfurt School communists, almost all of whom were ethnically Jewish.

Like many leftwing Jewish organizations, the ADL is showing its true allegiances. In another example, a letter has been posted at a new website, www.jewswithIlhan.org,

---

headlined *We Stand With Ilhan*. The most prominent signatory is Naomi Klein, a Canadian communist who also happens to be Jewish. The others are similarly predisposed. A look at the list of signatories finds as many Muslim names as Jewish names. The purpose is obvious: another leftist maneuver to attack Donald Trump as antisemitic and a white supremacist, while supporting the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) movement to destroy Israel:

Genuine anti-Semitism and the growth of white supremacy are indeed growing concerns in Donald Trump’s America. Omar and Tlaib, the first two Muslim congresswomen in this country’s history, are not part of this ugly growth of white supremacy. Instead, they are part of movements which seek to confront it. For that, and for their courageous support of the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) campaign, they are being smeared by a racist and Islamophobic chorus, including the House Democratic leadership itself.122

Now the rest of the Swamp has jumped in. A brand-new group, bolstered by two related websites, has announced itself. The group is named *Change the Terms* and calls on technology companies to shut down anyone saying things they define as "hateful." This is an agenda that has become all too familiar at this point. Who are the "haters"? Of course, according to *Change the Terms*, they are:

For example, white supremacist and other organizations inciting hate are using online platforms to organize, fund, recruit supporters for, and normalize racism, sexism, xenophobia, religious bigotry, homophobia and transphobia, among others…

This chills the online speech of the targeted groups, curbs democratic participation, and threatens people’s safety and freedom in real life…

Change the Terms uses the term “hateful activities” to mean activities that incite or engage in violence, intimidation, harassment, threats, or defamation targeting an individual or group based on their actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, ethnicity, immigration status, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, or disability.124

The very creation of this group is a form of threat and harassment because it telegraphs their intentions to us. It is in essence a declaration of war. The Left controls most media

122 www.jewswithIlhan.org.
123 https://www.changetheterms.org/terms.
124 Ibid.
and they know it. The few less-regulated media sources still available to non-leftists are social media and a few internet news sites. So, their overt goal is to shut us out of those as well. The list of founders and supporters tells you everything you need to know:

**Center for American Progress** - Leftist think tank founded by Clinton insider John Podesta  
**Color of Change** - Activist organization co-founded by self-described communist, Van Jones  
**Free Press** - A "progressive" news outlet founded by hardcore Socialist Robert McChesney  
**Southern Poverty Law Center** – Communist-inspired institutional hate group  
**Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law** - Extreme Left legal organization  
**Council on American Islamic Relations** - Muslim Brotherhood/Hamas front  
**Church World Service** - Subsidiary of the National Council of Churches, a communist front

And the following:

- 18 Million Rising  
- Advocates for Youth  
- African American Ministers in Action  
- Arab American Association of NY  
- Arkansas United  
- Athlete Ally  
- Benton Foundation  
- CASA de Maryland  
- Center for Community Change  
- Center for Media Justice  
- Center for Victims of Torture  
- Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights (CHIRLA)  
- Consumer Action  
- Define American  
- Deplatform Hate  
- Emgage Action  
- Equality California  
- Faith in Public Life  
- Franciscan Action Network (FAN)  
- Hollaback  
- Illinois Coalition of Immigrant and Refugee Rights (ICIRR)  
- Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition (MIRA)  
- Media Mobilizing Project  
- MPower Change  
- Muslim Advocates  
- National Hispanic Media Coalition  
- National Immigrant Justice Center  
- National Immigration Law Center (NILC)  
- National Urban League  
- OneAmerica  
- Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada (PLAN)  
- The Revolutionary Love Project
- Services, Immigrant Rights, and Education Network (SIREN)
- South Asian Americans Leading Together (SAALT)
- The Arc of the United States
- United Church of Christ, Office of Communication, Inc.
- United We Dream
- Western States Center
- Yemeni Student Association
Another recently created website with the same goal is Reject White Nationalism, (https://rejectwhitenationalism.org). Many of the same actors listed above are affiliates, along with some new ones. But the objective is the same: to use Leninist tactics to discredit anyone who cares about our nation as "racists", "bigots", etc.

The site provides Facebook and Twitter links to every member of the U.S. Congress, a very handy tool that they can use to lobby members of Congress to demand the criminalization of "hate" speech. CAP receives millions from George Soros foundations and other well-heeled leftists.

**Conclusion**

To top everything off, on Tuesday, April 9, New Jersey freshman Rep. Tom Malinowski proposed a nonbinding resolution condemning "white supremacist rhetoric and violence." Eighty House Democrats supported the measure. No Republicans did. While they don’t mention his name, they didn’t deny that the goal is to saddle President Trump with that label because of his characterizations of the border crisis as an "invasion," and calling MS-13 members "animals."125

This gets to the heart of the issue. With statements like these, and others he has made about the frightful condition of our nation, President Trump is echoing sentiments shared by a large majority of Americans, that the border is in meltdown, which it absolutely is. There are very few Americans who express racist, supremacist ideas. What a growing majority express is moral outrage at what the Left and its Islamic allies are doing to our beloved nation.

Tens of thousands have been murdered by illegals; hundreds of thousands -- including children -- have been raped. American businesses are stolen under our noses by illegal alien competitors who circumvent the wage, licensing and tax requirements of legitimate businesses. Politicians at every level of government have enabled this horrifying trend with open borders and sanctuary policies. Leftist judges have jumped in, essentially declaring themselves dictators by blocking executive decisions on illegal immigration authorized by both law and Supreme Court precedent. They have created a constitutional crisis.

Illegal aliens and populations brought in through refugee resettlement, the Diversity Visa Lottery and other programs, utilize welfare at rates that are off the

charts, while enjoying taxpayer-funded benefits that in many cases put them in front of the line, even before veterans, and many benefits are unavailable to citizens at all. They have rekindled diseases long thought stamped-out, and brought in numerous new ones, like the deadly Chagas. The reintroduction of bedbugs in the U.S. is due to immigrants. It has caused the evacuation of housing complexes and even a veterans hospital in Manchester, New Hampshire. Over 400 languages are now spoken in public schools, with a commensurate plummet in academic performance.

We send our children off to die in wars that the DC elitists tell us we are not supposed to win, because winning is an outdated idea. We are outraged to see transgender activists attempting to indoctrinate elementary school children into the LGBT lifestyle, while Massachusetts just became the 16th state to outlaw so-called "conversion therapy" for kids who don’t want to identify as LGBT. They can't even choose to get out. Meanwhile, LGBT activists ram their agenda down our throats, and make a mockery of the First Amendment by suing Christian businesses, pastors and others who won't comply.

The many Muslim Brotherhood organizations in the U.S. have penetrated government at all levels, carefully dismantling our counter-terrorism strategy to exclude anything that would shine a light on their subversive efforts. Meanwhile a nationwide campaign of defamation and lawfare intimidates and silences opponents, while a subversive campaign to introduce Islamic concepts into public schools goes largely unchallenged.

We are fleeced by every level of government with taxes and overregulation. We are promised all kinds of fixes on the campaign trail and then watch the people we supported with campaign donations and volunteer hours betray us to DC lobbyists. They toast each other with champagne, while our nation’s infrastructure crumbles under our feet.

---

Americans are not white supremacists, bigots, racists or Islamophobes; many of us are not even white. We are outraged at what the Left and its Muslim allies have been doing and are doing today to destroy this country. And because they have no legitimate answer, they double down and attack all loyal Americans.

America's only nonviolent recourse is the First Amendment. So, they are seeking any means to stifle our political speech. The very first bill offered up this year in the new Democrat-controlled House, HR 1, has been called a direct threat to our First Amendment rights.130 In 2014 Senator Chuck Schumer (D-NY) proposed a constitutional amendment in the Senate that Ted Cruz described as a vote "to repeal the First Amendment."131 Fortunately, these proposals have gone nowhere... yet. Everything that has followed since has the same goal: to silence the Left's critics.

The Left, as personified by the Democrat Party, has indisputably shown itself to be hostile to the First Amendment. If a Democrat held the White House today, the UN's Compact on Migration would have been signed and every sentence in this paper would be a crime. House Resolution 183, and everything that has followed since, is another deliberate step on the road to silencing speech. With the help of hapless, stupid Republicans, the subversive, calculating Democrats have stood the notion of antisemitism on its head to deliver legislation that elevates an agenda threatening to silence us forever.