

VIETNAM VETERANS FOR ACADEMIC REFORM

Leonard Magruder - Founder/President
Former professor of psychology - Suffolk College, N.Y.,
Director of Counseling and Research - Univ. of N.D.(ret.)

PRESSURE ON FBI TO LIE ABOUT ISLAM

by Leonard Magruder

(the following is from two recent news items from "Danger Room" and "Mother Jones".)

"Danger Room has obtained material showing how wide an anti-Islam mentality has spread throughout the Bureau. The FBI library at Quantico currently stacks books from authors who claim that "Islam and democracy are totally incompatible." The Bureau's private intranet recently featured presentations that claimed to demonstrate the "inherently violent nature of Islam," according to multiple sources. Earlier this year, the Bureau's Washington Field Office welcomed a speaker who claimed Islamic law prevents Muslims from being truly loyal Americans. And as recently as last week, the online orientation material for the FBI's Joint Terrorism Task Forces included claims that Islam seeks "domination of the world."

The FBI declined to respond directly to questions from Danger Room. But what's clear is that the anti-Islam sentiment in the FBI's training and orientation isn't the marginal problem that the Bureau portrayed in its previous public statements and press releases, it's ongoing. And it will require substantial effort to root out.

Said one FBI report to its agents, "Sunni Muslims (the vast majority of Muslims) have been prolific in spawning numerous and varied fundamentalist extremist terrorist organizations. Sunni core doctrine and end state have remained the same and they continue to strive for Sunni Islamic domination of the world."

That paragraph is contained in orientation material, known as the Joint Terrorism Task Force Orientation v2 course, distributed online through a secure intranet for every member of the JTTFs. That's approximately 4,400 officials, according to FBI figures, all charged with stopping terrorism. The orientation course is mandatory for every member of the task force.. Several Bureau and law enforcement officials who spoke to Danger Room on condition of anonymity believe that the FBI continues to be less than forthright with the press and the public about the extent of its teaching that Islam is at the root of the menace of terrorism. Evidence for this continuing belief can be found in Quantico, Virginia,

at the FBI's elite training academy.

Within the sprawling campus of that academy, Quantico maintains a library befitting the FBI's status as America's most important law enforcement agency. It stacks thousands of books, from heavy tomes containing the U.S. criminal code to forensics reference material. The library is open to all FBI agents, plus intelligence officials and police from across the country.

There's a section on religion — in which Islam, perhaps understandably, predominates. A law enforcement source provided Danger Room with a photographic catalog, compiled in late August, of approximately 150 books on Islam stacked at Quantico. Many of them are innocuous or contain unquestioned scholarship. But, significantly, the library also contains books by anti-Islam authors that portray the religion as devoted to murder and world domination.

At the Bureau's training ground in Quantico, Virginia, agents are shown a chart contending that the more "devout" a Muslim, the more likely he is to be "violent." Those destructive tendencies cannot be reversed an FBI instructional presentation adds: Also, "Any war against non-believers is justified" under Muslim law; and "a moderating process cannot happen if the Koran continues to be regarded as the unalterable word of Allah."

Echoing the theological assessments of many scholars who agree that terrorism is the "correct" interpretation of Islam, one of the briefings states that "There may not be a 'radical' threat as much as it is simply a normal assertion of the orthodox ideology....The strategic themes animating these Islamic values are not fringe; they are mainstream."

In the past few years the FBI has accelerated its monitoring of mosques, community centers, businesses and other organizations run by Muslims. Several observers suspect that the persistence of training materials that casts Islam in a threatening light helps explain the increased surveillance. Needless to say all this is under increasing complaint from Muslim leaders.

"We are glad that this very serious issue has finally received the attention of FBI leadership," says Farhana Khera, executive director of the San Francisco-based civil rights group Muslim Advocates, "but an internal review is insufficient at this stage. In the last year, the FBI has either defended its use of bigoted trainers or emphatically assured the public that the various trainings were one-time, isolated incidents. Each time those assurances were later revealed to be false."

On January 11, the FBI's Washington, D.C. Field Office held another seminar on Islamic extremism. In the conference room of its Judiciary Square offices, about 60 of the Field Office's agents and intelligence analysts spent the morning hearing two presentations on how Islam is out to take over the world and that there is no such thing as a loyal American Muslim.

One of the speakers told the agents that Muslims believe Islamic law to be all-encompassing, presenting an either/or choice to U.S. Muslims: either reject the

U.S. Constitution or fall into apostasy. He also explored an obscure Islamic concept known as "abrogation," the supposition that some Koranic verses supersede others, to argue that the Koran's non-violent passages are overtaken in Muslim eyes by commands to wage war against "non-believers."

"Abrogation" is not "obscure". It is a central principle of Islamic hermeneutics, or interpretation of scripture, and this is the key to how there can be both arguments for the claim that Islam is a religion of peace, for the consumption of the non-Muslim world, and the internal knowledge known to all true Muslims that Islam is a religion that calls for violence against "unbelievers". If it is "obscure" that is because the books and experts that discuss this principle are uniformly boycotted in America by mainstream media and academia.

We brought up the issue of abrogation in a number of our earlier articles:

"Andrew C. McCarthy, the top federal prosecutor who put in prison the jihad organization responsible for the first bombing of the World Trade Center, writes about abrogation in his book, "Willful Blindness."

McCarthy, already an expert on Islam before the trial, wrote : "The more tolerant verses of the Koran trace to the early Meccan period, such as the injunction that there shall be "no compulsion in religion" (2:256) - the unparalleled favorite of self-styled "moderates" and Western elites who mulishly portray Islam as "the religion of peace" in the teeth of overwhelming counter-evidence. In Medina, things changed drastically. It was from here that Islam was principally spread not by intellectual persuasion but by the sword. The scriptures tending toward ecumenism and tolerance were negated, superseded by divine commands that the prophet "make war on the unbelievers and deal rigorously with them."(Sura 9:73) This is reflected in the Islamic doctrine of abrogation (naskh) , the concept that, as He sees fit, Allah refines or repeals his prior instructions. Abrogation is essential to a proper understanding of the Median period, and of the chasm between the Islam of Western fantasy and the one that actually exists. In Islamic thought there is no deed on earth that equals jihad in God's favor, even though today's pundits are determined to portray jihadists as heretics who have perverted the "true" faith, relieving us of any need to concern ourselves over Islam, the 800-pound gorilla that is somehow always in the middle of the room when terror strikes."

Writes William Wagner in his recent and highly praised book "How Islam Plans to Change the World," "In looking at the difference between the Meccan and the Median Koran we can see that different parts of the Koran are used in different areas of the world. In the West, the Meccan Koran , which teaches tolerance and acceptance , is used. In the Islamic world ,the Median Koran has a strong presence. Both are Koranic, but two different messages are sent out. Both are true to the Koran , but it is essential to understand the very important Islamic

doctrine of abrogation. Abrogation states that a later revelation from Allah abrogates an earlier one. In looking at the two parts of the Koran we are told that the earlier verses are inferior to the later verses. When it comes to a final interpretation, those verses advocating violence are more important because they abrogate the earlier, moderate statements. According to this Islamic doctrine, when Allah replaces a verse, the later version is a better and improved one."

From "Religion of Peace ?- Islam's War Against the World" - by Gregory Davis. "The principle of abrogation directs that verses revealed later in Muhammad's career 'abrogate' - cancel and replace - earlier ones whose instruction they contradict. Thus, passages revealed later in Muhamad's career in Medina overrule passages revealed earlier in Mecca. The Koran itself lays out the principle of abrogation.

"Sura 2:106 Whatever a verse do we (Allah) abrogate or cause to be forgotten, we bring a better one or similar to it. Know you not that Allah is able to do all things ?"

While there are different schools of thought on the precise effect of abrogation on the meaning of the Koran, there is general agreement on main points. One such point central to our exploration is that the various passages commanding tolerance towards non-Muslims occurred early in Muhammad's career and have been overruled by later passages commanding violence towards those who reject Islam. In short, all the passages recommending killing, decapitating, and maiming , the so-called "Sword Verses", are Median or later. "Tolerance" has been abrogated by "intolerance."

As examples, all of the following verses are found in the second half, or Median period of the Koran, as a result of the principle of abrogation. And these are the verses taken most seriously by Muslims, basic to jihad, their plan to dominate the world. Taking these seriously is also what is behind the so-called "home-grown terrorist" phenomenon. Collected in "Leaving Islam", by Ibn Warraq, page 405:

9.5 Slay the idolaters wherever you find them...lie in ambush everywhere for them.

47.4 When you meet the unbelievers in battle strike off their heads.

98.6 The unbelievers among the People of the Book, Christian and Jews, and the pagans shall burn forever in the fire of Hell. They are the vilest of creatures.

5.60 God has cursed the Jews, transforming them into apes and swine. and those who serve the devil.

5.33 Those who make war against Allah and his Apostle shall be put to death or have their hands and feet cut off on alternate sides.

9:5 Kill those who join other gods with God (the Trinity) wherever you may find them .

8:12 I will instill terror into the hearts of the Infidels , strike off the heads then, and strike off from them every fingertip.

.9:111 Allah has purchased of their faithful lives and worldly goods and in return has promised them the Garden. They will fight for his cause, kill and be killed.

Plans are in progress by a number of organizations to educate the non-Muslim world on the true nature of Islam, inasmuch as media and university continue to whitewash the religion:

Jihad Watch: U.S. Newswire April 1, 2011:

Leaders of anti-terrorist organizations announced today their plans for an "International Read the Koran Day." Representatives of Stop Islamization of America, the United Kingdom Independence Party, the Dutch Party for Freedom, and other groups have posted on their websites plans for "International Read the Koran Day," noting their intention to gather in groups at local schools, church basements, and civic venues, and read aloud the hateful verses in the Muslim holy book. In the U.S. , the national organization, "ACT ! for America," with multiple chapters in every state, is preparing a similar project:

"We have co-branded the day: The Doctrine of Abrogation: Open the Koran Day. Oct. 29-30. Our goal is to educate the general public about an important doctrine called "abrogation." It is central to the jurisprudential study of the Koran by Islamic scholars and is the doctrine believed and taught by Major Nidal Hasan, the infamous Fort Hood shooter. In a presentation that has now been published in its entirety, Major Hasan walked a room full of commissioned military officers through the doctrine of abrogation and how it led him to believe that the peaceful verses of the Koran no longer apply, only the violent ones."

A new mission for our organization, (V.V.A.R.) began shortly after 9/11 with the desire to understand what was the true "root cause" of terrorism. By the time we issued the first of some 40 articles posted at WMDterror.com, on July 31, 2003, four things were very clear from our research:

- 1) The root cause of terrorism is to be found in Islam, the religion, not in poverty or American foreign policy..
- 2) Academia and the media, brainwashed by multiculturalism and political correctness, were hiding this fact from the American people.
- 3) Misguided as to the root cause, the government had no policy to meet the threat of continuing terrorism.
- 4) The only solution was the president publicly naming the religion Islam as the enemy and warning of catastrophic retaliation on any or all Muslim nations for any new attack on America.

In studying Islam you learn that there are two groups of books on the subject. One group contains both the Western and Muslims apologists, who invariably ignore "abrogation" and the verses of violence or try to "contextualize" them, the latter practice unacceptable to almost all Muslim scholars, who also hold to the

literal interpretation of the Koran. The other set of books, written mostly by converts from Islam, or present or former FBI or CIA analysts, or counterterrorism experts, all discuss abrogation and the verses that incite violence and are the books you learn to rely on to be objective.

Here are most of the authors whose names appear repeatedly in the rosters of symposiums and conferences on terrorism, events always boycotted by media and on campus. These are the authors who cover abrogation and the Median verses in their books and lectures, documenting that Islam is violent by nature. Because of this they are rarely, if ever, mentioned in the mainstream media or on campus, nor do their books appear as recommended reading or in the campus bookstore. Occasionally one or more have been interviewed on the Fox network.

**Walid Phares
Andrew McCarthy
Kenneth Timmerman
Robert Spencer
Brian Jenkins
Abul Kasem
Whalid Shoebat
Pamela Geller
Dr. Andrew Bostom
Brigette Gabriel
Paul Williams
Sam Harris
Nonie Darwish
Ibn Warraq
Bat Ye'or
Ayaan Hirsi Ali
Michael Evans
Mark Gabriel
Serge Trikovic**

Recently we ran into the same observation about this suppression of material in the writings of Diana West, one of the most perceptive analysts we have on the subject of Islam. In chapters 7, 8, and 9 of her book, "The Death of the Grown-Up", she has written the best expose' of Islam as the enemy that we have seen. And she sees the same cover-up of information on this that we do:

"Both the topic of Islam ...and the topic of Islamization - are verboten. Islam as a whole, as a historical continuum, as the theology of what we know as terrorism, as a rationale for dhimmi repression, is off the charts; out of bounds, really, and way beyond acceptable discourse. The issues central to Islam's incompatibility with modernity are ignored according to an unspoken consensus, and thus, never appear on the public agenda. What is left is a black hole. But - there does exist a formidable body of contemporary scholarship that bravely

explicates the history of jihad and its modern- day applications. But such scholarship has been largely relegated to the sidelines, scholarship all but ignored by elites for purposes of public discussion and debate. Ex-Muslim intellectuals such as Ibn Warraq, Ali Sina, Wafa Sultan, Ayaan Hirsi Ali, and Brigitte Gabriel, are held at arm's length.... out in the cold, their copious knowledge of the dire perils of jihad unheeded, unexplored, undebated. These elites seek to defend the West by repelling or defeating "Islamic extremists" , but not the ideology contained within mainstream Islam that seeks to establish world dominance ruled by sharia. This is dreampolitic.

This has helped enforce a terrible silence on the urgent questions of our times.

Thus, we pretend Islam isn't a threat to Western liberty; it's those awful "extremists", Jihad isn't a historic and theological tradition in Islam; it's those awful "extremists." Shari'a isn't a threat to freedom of expression and sexual equality; it's those awful "extremists". Rather than confront the hard truths of our times, we tell ourselves soothing tales, rather than act on the logic of reality, we deny its implications.

We call our self-censorship the silence of respect; in reality it is the silence of fear. We call it the silence of tolerance, actually it is the silence of cultural submission.

Whenever any of these experts are allowed to be heard, opinions change. Here is what happened the only time one of them was allowed to speak on campus, at New York University: Here is what happens when a university finally does allow one of the boycotted experts on Islam, like Steve Emerson or Robert Spencer, in this case Ayaan Hersi Ali, to be heard.

Prior to the debate, "Religion of Peace ? " the audience of 800 at NYU was polled as to what they thought about the issue, and results showed 41 percent were for 'peaceful', 25 percent were for 'violent' 34 percent were 'undecided'. After the debate, poll results revealed a dramatic change from the results at the beginning of the night — 36 percent were now for 'peaceful', 55 percent were for 'violent' and 9 percent were undecided.

Let's look at this reversal carefully:

Before the debate: 25% violent, 34 % undecided

After the debate: 55% violent, 9% percent undecided.

The following items, which came out even before this FBI story, show even then the growing conflict over the nature of Islam in the Obama government.

Walid Shoebat, former PLO terrorist now supporting Israel, sent us a link to an interview by investigative journalist Bill Whittle of PJTV. Here, paraphrased, is what Shoebat said in material accompanying the video:

"This interview, with counter-terrorist experts in the CIA and the FBI, confirm that

our government is fully aware that Islam is not a "peaceful" religion", but deliberately suppresses reports showing this that they themselves ordered done. One analyst at the Defense Department was told to do research for the Joint Chiefs of Staff with a view to vindicating the "moderate view" of Islam But after much research he discovered that the theology of Islam supports the terrorist view. When the report was filed it was thrown back in the face of the analyst by the very people who commissioned the study, the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

"The State Department and Department of Homeland Security recently issued guidelines for U.S. government officials that said American Muslim groups had recommended not using "jihad" or "Islamic extremism" in labeling Muslim extremist violence in order not to offend Muslims.

A U.S. Central Command Red Team of experts, however, stated in another report that honest reports require labeling the terrorists as Islamic and jihadist since the roots of the violence lie in Islamic law. "The fact is, our enemies cite the source of Islam as the foundation for their global jihad."

"If the American people don't rise up quickly we are all sunk," says Shoebat. "The safety of every person in the US is at risk. Each one of us needs to act in some way to defend the freedom of the West because our leaders, under the new Obama administration, are handcuffing the people who could save and protect us but they are being misled and mismanaged in what can only be described as criminal negligence on a scale never seen before in the history of the U.S.."

Failure to correctly identify the roots of terrorism is the direct road to catastrophe. This kind of ignorance stops a president from doing what must be done, and immediately. Warn the world that there is something wrong, something sub-moral and a threat to humanity about the religion Islam. That it poses a threat to the entire non-Muslim world, and therefore he is issuing a warning to the Muslim world that an attack on America will be met with catastrophic retaliation against, at minimum, all Muslim nations known to be harboring, or supporting, terrorists in any way.

The following is from one of a number of articles we sent out before the Obama election trying to raise this issue of Islam and violence:

In our article of Aug.12, 2008 we wrote:

"Obama as president would plunge America into an existential crisis as liberal delusions about Islam take hold. On Sunday CNN aired an interview Barack Obama recently gave Fareed Zakaria, in which the candidate expressed the opinion that Islamic jihad is a result of U.S. foreign policy failure. "Around the world," said Obama, "there is not the sense that Islam is inherently opposed to the West, or inherently opposed to modern life...you can see some correlation between the economic crash during the Asian financial crisis, where about a third of Indonesia's GDP was wiped out, and the acceleration of these Islamic extremist forces. There has been a shift in Islam that I believe is connected to the

failures of governments and the failures of the West to work with many of these countries, in order to make sure that opportunities are there, that there's bottom-up economic growth."

None of this makes much sense. According to Obama, the "shift in Islam," referring to the rise of jihad, has nothing to do with imperatives within Islam itself. Economics is the reason. This is classic leftist or Marxist analysis. Typical "blame it on the West" multiculturalist cant of university and media, with no comment on the possible role of Islam itself.

Mitt Romney, who is very knowledgeable about terrorism, in an interview with Newsmax, said Obama's approach to the war on terror shows "frightening naivete". "Barack is one of the few who has still refused to speak out against radical violent Islam and jihadism. Now is the time to stop this enemy, because the consequences of ignoring them until they have massive casualty capability are almost unthinkable."

Instead of a national dialogue what we get is silence. Only Mayor Giuliani recognized the issue when he said at the end of the Republican debate: "Not once did the Democrats mention Islamic terrorism."

Nor did any of the media or university people who questioned the candidates. Here are the obvious questions that we demand be asked of the presidential candidates, Democrats and Republicans, in the next debates. (And now in the 2011 debates):

How would you respond to a nuclear attack on the U.S.?

Many people want America to meet Islamic threats with a threat of catastrophic retaliation. Would you consider this?

There are many who argue that Islam is the root cause of international terrorism. Do you agree ?

The issue of national security must be addressed as at least as important as the economy. Without a country you don't have to worry about the economy. Usually the American electorate accepts the outcome of a presidential race and moves on. But this time, if Obama wins, as Americans increasingly see the truth about Islam, and see that Obama's "naivete" (Romney) is placing their lives at risk, there will be various and growing forms of protest, as seen, for example, when Clarion Fund paid huge sums of money to distribute 25 million copies of "Obsession" through the Sunday supplements of 75 major newspapers. Tensions over this will grow rapidly, especially as demoralization grows in the armed forces, and media and academic attempts to shore up the delusion grow more hysterical. That is what the growing threat of a nuclear attack, on a nation paralyzed by the delusions of its own government, will do.

As Obama forces his administration to hide the full truth about the enemy, the

nation will move closer to that moment William Bennett once warned about, "accommodation, appeasement, and surrender." While it is true that Obama has recently taken bold action against al-Qaeda, his overall vision of the threat is limited.

In their new book, "An End to Evil", analysts David R. Frum and Richard Perle point out how limited our current idea of the enemy really is:

"The terrorists kill and will accept death for a cause with which no accommodation is possible. That cause is militant Islam. Moreover, these beliefs are not really confined to a radical fringe, but infect even ordinary Muslims. Even though it is comforting to deny it, all the available evidence indicates that militant Islam commands wide support, and even wider sympathy, among Muslims worldwide, including Muslim minorities in the West. The result is an unlimited threat to dominate the world through Jihad."

The noted Israeli strategist Shmuel Bar says the same, "Insofar as religious establishments in most of the Arabian peninsula, in Iran, and in much of Egypt and North Africa are concerned, the radical ideology does not represent a marginal and extremist perversion of Islam but rather a genuine and increasingly mainstream interpretation. Even after 9-11, the sermons broadcast from Mecca cannot be easily distinguished from those of al-Qaeda."

Said Tony Blankley, editor of "The Washington Times," "Most of the world today is not only in denial concerning the truly appalling likely consequences of the rise of radical Islam, it often refuses to even accept unambiguous evidence of its existence. The nation cannot design a rational response to the danger if the nature and extent of the danger is not identified, widely reported and comprehended. The public has the right and the vital need to have these events of our time fully and fairly described and reported."

It is no accident that Kansas University Professor of Anthropology Felix Moos said recently on the front page of our local paper, "I find at KU that people are oblivious to the fact that we are at war." The ratio of Democrats to Republicans on faculties across the nation is roughly 12 to 1 and it is largely they that are keeping communities totally in the dark about the danger from Islam.

Some proposals as to preventive measures have been made:

Wrote Joseph Farrah of "WorldNetDaily" in Jan. 2005:

"What would be the U.S. response to a nuclear attack? Now is the time to think about the unthinkable. Contingency plans need to be made. And those plans need to be known to the whole world to serve as a deterrent against such an attack. We cannot afford to put off this discussion until it happens. It will be too late.

We don't need to be specific about which major cities and installations will be

vaporized. But it needs to be clear that the response will be overwhelming. By having this national debate now and putting the world on notice, we can give the terrorists something to think about. Do they really want to see their cities vaporized? Do they really want to see their religious centers destroyed? Do they really want to see adherents to their ideology and their faith killed in massive numbers as a direct result of their actions?"

Wrote the noted Stanford scholar Victor David Hansonand Selma California native :

" We should be clear about a proper response now and inform the appropriate parties exactly of the real damage they should expect...inform hostile countries of a big list of their assets - military bases, power plants, communications, and assorted infrastructure - that will be taken out in the aftermath of another attack.. Honesty and resoluteness now might just save lives later on, as the Middle East realizes that it has a collective stake in preventing such a calamity."

Right now the enemy feels free to strike, believing we won't strike back because we can't figure out where the attack came from. Once everyone understands that there will be instantaneous catastrophic retaliation, targets unspecified, sovereignty irrelevant, even the destruction of Mecca a possibility, this will stop. We need a mechanism similar to the policy of mutually assured destruction (MAD) of the Cold War era that will cause an enemy to pause if contemplating an attack on the United States.

What has happened is that the FBI, seeking to put together a comprehensive library of books on Islam managed to include a significant number of those authors who discuss the Median verses, the true root cause of terrorism. This is the first time these authors, who Diana West agrees have been ignored, have ever been mentioned either by the mainstream media or on campus or any institution, including the church. But now that the FBI realizes that the vast majority of Muslims go by the abrogated interpretation of the Koran, and that this is the true root cause of terrorism, the FBI is morally obligated to make this increasingly known to the public and especially impressed upon those in the Obama administration, whose ignorance on this matter has long been the subject of our articles on terrorism.

If the FBI is charged with stopping terrorism, then obviously they are going to have to take the Median more violent verses more seriously than the earlier more peaceful Meccan verses. and it is clear that their thinking is moving rapidly in that direction.

The world can no longer live with a religion whose mission it is to murder those who won't convert to Islam, and now has access to the weapons of mass destruction that can make that mission possible!!

magruder44@aol.com

v-v-a-r.org

wmdterror.com

785-312-9303

article may be reproduced in any form. to unlist contact magruder44@aol.com