

Counter-jihad Conference
Brussels: October 18, 2007 (10:00-11 a.m.)
Eurabia: How far has it gone?
Bat Ye'or

The title of this lecture was not chosen by me, but I found it excellent and will try to examine how deep the damage is now. I will start by a warning: have no illusions. The Eurabia in which we live is solidly established although there are some improvements since the election of Angela Merkel and Nicholas Sarkozy, and also the realization by more and more people that things cannot go on like this. For 40 years Eurabia has built its networks, its finance, its hegemonous power, its totalitarian control over the media, the universities, the culture and the mind of people. If one wants to end this system, one will have to reverse decades of policy. In fact, I do not know how we can get rid of a culture; we still live with Nazism, the genitor of Eurabia, with fascism and communism which have structured its networks system. And this is not said by me only, but by others who know well this subject: Vladimir Bukovskij and Pavel Strojilov in their book: ***EUSSR*** (European Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics).

Eurabia grew within the growth of the European Community (EC) and then the European Union (EU). It was conceived and planed by the European Council and implemented by the European Commission as a supranational policy, linked to the European Community interests and immediate security concerns over terror and energy supplies. The EC correlated a massive Muslim immigration to a strategy of peace and stability in the Mediterranean, hoping that the Euro-Arab symbiosis through economic development, soft diplomacy and multiculturalism would guaranty peace, markets and oil. In the Euro-Arab policy, Muslim immigration is welcomed as an element of a Mediterranean geo-strategy conducted as a partnership with the Arab-Muslim world on the base of pacifism and continual funding and services provided to the Arab world, similar to the subsidies given to the economically underdeveloped EU member-states. [The European Investing Bank is the model for the Mediterranean Investing Bank. \(and here\)](#)

This strategy had also an ideological perspective: the refusal of any more war – peace at last by resorting to economic agreements and mutual concessions. However this laudable formula, which succeeded for the integration of Europe, was not adapted to deal with a Muslim world that conceived its international relations only in the framework of jihad. Worst, the Nazi evils

came back with a vengeance in the Euro-Arab alliance so similar to the [Vichy-Berlin-Arab and Palestinian Nazi and Fascist axis](#) of the thirties and forties against Jews, democracies and America. These evils had not died after World War II, and they reemerged within the Eurabian-Arab Palestinian jihad against Israel.

Let us see how the secret Arafat-EC alliance has transformed Europe. Threatened by Palestinian terrorism in the late 1960s and the 1970s, and by an oil boycott, Europe searched protection under the wings of those who threatened her. The conditions were: oil and peace for Europe in exchange for a hostile policy toward America and Israel, and most important, European support for Arafat and the PLO, a jihadist and international terrorist movement. Since that moment, Europe entered into the vicious cycle of dhimmitude and self-destruction by justifying jihadism. It developed a culture of hate against America and Israel and paid billions as a security ransom to the Palestinians. Likewise, it opened its gates to massive Muslim immigration according to agreements with the Arab League countries.

This choice of a policy based on fear, ransom and surrender, and on the justification of jihad has blinded Europe to its dangers. Allied with the PLO and the Arab League, the EC denied the threat of global jihadism. This denial, fundamental to Eurabian policy, motivated the appeasement and peaceful surrender to jihadists while pretending that Europe's enemies were American, but above all, Israel's policies of resistance to jihad. Hence, **Europe** transferred onto Israel and America the threat of a terrorist war to which it had already capitulated.

It is "Palestinianism" – the most cherished European ideology because it is the very guaranty of its security against terror – that has determined European support for jihadist tactics. And [jihad](#) is not like any war, it represents a whole theological corpus of war, with its holy strategy and ritual tactics of air piracy, terrorism, abductions, beheadings and killings of civilians.

For the Arab and Muslim world, Palestinianism embodies the ideology and aims of jihad against a rebellious dhimmi people. Based on a Muslim culture, history and theology, it denies territorial independence and sovereignty to any non-Muslim people. Such a position is self-defeating for all non-Muslim states, and particularly Europe. Palestinianism is at the root of Europe's self-destruction.

Palestinianism opposes Israel on two main points: 1) Jews being a dhimmi people cannot rule Muslims, even less liberate and govern their homeland, especially if it has been formerly conquered and colonized by jihad – as is the case also of Spain, the Balkans, Hungary and other parts of Europe. Jews must be brought under the yoke of Islam. And this, of course, applies to Christians as well; both must be reduced to submission and dhimmitude.

Anti-Zionism goes to the essence of Europe's Christian spirituality. Muslim doctrine rejects the Bible; it does not accept that it is the history of the people of Israel and the source of Christianity. Muslims believe that the biblical narrative, including the Gospels – as transcribed in the Qur'an – is the story of a Muslim people and Muslim prophets. For this reason, they deny the historical patrimony and ancestry of Jews and Christians in the Holy Land and their anteriority to Islam. For them, both Testaments have an Islamic source and describe an Islamic history since the people in the Bible, and Jesus himself (Isa), were Muslims. Judaism and Christianity are seen as a falsification of Islam. This is the inner core of the ideology – even the doctrine – of Palestinianism, and of its war against Israel.

This view empathizes with the Nazi war to deJudaize Christianity and Europe. The Islamization of the West needs, as a first step, its deJudaization, its – as a Syrian priest has argued – debiblionization, in order to impose the Qur'an which is according to Muslim dogma, the uncreated predecessor and the origin of Christianity. Hence, Christian filiation from Judaism is an irritant, a heresy and a link that must be broken in order to bring the Gospel closer to the Qur'an. Although this might seem of no importance for non-religious people, it is essential however for Europe since it implies the replacement of a civilization based on the Judeo-Christian bible values by one based on the Qur'an and shari'a.

I will quickly summarize the main domains affected by the Eurabian policy of collusion with jihadist states:

- 1) First the demographic revolution – a main element of the Euro-Arab geo-strategic alliance. Eurabian politicians and intellectuals, eager to link Europe to Islam planned the demographic transformation that one can notice in schools, universities and society at large.
- 2) This demographic policy was coupled from the 1970s with a cultural revolution aiming at imposing in the universities an Islamic interpretation of history. This includes the belief in jihad as a rightful and peaceful duty ordained by Allah to Islamize the world. It is the infidels

who oppose it that are guilty for provoking wars. Hence, jihad is a defensive war **against the infidels who oppose** Allah's law on earth. A Muslim victimology literature contrasting with the cruelty of Christian Europe sprung up in Europe from the 1970s. Likewise, it praised the magnanimity of dhimmitude, promoted the Golden Age for Jews and Christians under shari'a in Andalusia and elsewhere, and claimed the superiority of Muslim culture over Western civilization which it had inspired. This affirmation would give Islam equal rights with the indigenous Jewish and Christian European cultures: the right to develop madrassas, Islamic cultural centers, Qur'anic colleges and institutions, and to implement shari'a.

These cultural and political trends went together with the denial of the historical jihad and of the Armenian genocide. The *devshirme* – the institutionalized system of enslavement and Islamization of Armenian, Greek, and Serbian Christian children of both sexes in the Ottoman Empire during several centuries – elicited no criticism. Western censorship obfuscated the Muslim practice of religious enslavement around the Mediterranean during 13 centuries and over Europe, Africa and Asia – a system anterior, wider and ideologically different than the Western trade-slave based on race and economic interests started in the 16th century and abolished from early 19th century.

This prohibition of any criticism has encouraged the radicalization of some European Muslim groups which oppose and even murder apostates or critics of Muslim history, law and religion, as the shari'a punishes by death criticism of Islam by infidels and dhimmis. Hence, the Palestinian-EC alliance introduced into Europe the shari'a laws with its correlated facets of dhimmitude, fear, insecurity and self-censorship. The common history of Jews and Christians in Islam, aggressed by jihad and dhimmitude became taboo – denied, as is the current oppression of Christians in Muslim countries. The Eurabian Nazi trend attributed these persecutions to the Israeli-Arab conflict born from Israel's existence in 1948, while in fact they belong to the jihad-dhimmitude pattern established for Jews and Christians from the 7th century.

Yet Europe continues to plan its new Mediterranean Euro-Arab Civilization where the identity will be "Us". This implies the destruction of a European social cohesion linked to Italian or British, French, or German history and culture, in order to replace it by a de-nationalized Mediterranean entity sprung from multiculturalism and the death of history. Through immigration, Europe draws closer to the Muslim bloc while increasing its separation from

America and losing its Judeo-Christian spiritual roots and its secular freedoms. In order to impose on Europeans a multicultural Euro-Muslim civilization — presumably to prevent war and the clash of civilizations — the European Council has established a vast array of networks promoting dialogue, intertwining of populations at all levels, solidarity with Muslim and immigrants causes, and multiculturalism. As the EU based its concept of peace and the increase of its supranational powers on the destruction of local European nationalisms, it has also applied this same dynamic to the Euro-Arab context in order to create this Euro-Arab symbiosis. European integration and Mediterranean Partnership are two interconnected systems, one mirroring the other.

On 19 June 2000, the European Council adopted a [Common Strategy on the Mediterranean Region](#) that reaffirmed this strategy of building peace by establishing a partnership in social, cultural and human affairs with the southern Mediterranean countries. This document states that “particular attention will be paid to the media and universities”. In clear words media and universities – i.e. culture – will be framed by politics. The document requests that each incoming presidency of the European Council implements the Common Strategy with a view to reinforce the political, strategic and human links between the South (the Arab countries) and the North (Europe).

On 15 June 2004, the Austrian Secretary General of the Council of Europe, [Walter Schwimmer](#), declared to the ministers of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) that the Islamic component is an integral part of Europe’s diversity and he asked them to consider joint projects on history teaching and religious diversity.

After the murder of Theo van Gogh (October 2004) and the Cartoons **affair** (30 September 2005), the triangular and interconnected poles in the European policy of “culture – immigration – politic”, became preeminent. In early December 2005 the Organisation of the Islamic Conference, which counts 56 Muslim countries plus the Palestinian Authority and represents over a billion Muslims, met in Mecca for The Third Extraordinary Session of the Islamic Summit Conference. It issued several resolutions, amongst which: 1) making the Palestinian problem a [central issue](#); 2) building the unity and solidarity of the world *Ummah* by rooting it in the [Qur’an and the Sunnah](#); 3) fighting Islamophobia at the international level; 4) asking the West to fight Islamophobia through the media and education.

I wish to call your attention to the policy conducted with international bodies, particularly the OIC, the Arab and Muslim Leagues because they impact strongly European policies.

For instance the OIC reacted strongly to anti-immigration movements in Europe, to their request for integration and security after the discovery of indigenous Muslim terrorist cells, to complaints of general insecurity and objections at reconstitution of *shari'a*-type societies among millions of migrants. Such trends are considered by the powerful Organization of the Islamic Conference as racist, Islamophobic and xenophobic. Hence Doudou Diène, the Senegalese UN Special Rapporteur on Racism, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance at the Human Rights Council (Geneva), links immigration controls, security measures and European cultural and national revivals to Islamophobia. He has submitted several reports to the Council and the UN General Assembly where he drew attention to two developments of particular concern: the rise in racism and xenophobia in the West as a result of identity constructs and the mistreatments of aliens, asylum-seekers, refugees and immigrants. Diène attributes the rise of racism to the identity factor and called the attention of “European Union member States to the urgency of giving special attention, in building the [identity of the new Europe](#), to its ethnic, cultural and religious pluralism.” He highlighted the danger of racism “under the guise of combating terrorism, defending the 'national identity', promoting 'national preference' and combating illegal immigration.” He condemned the impact of xenophobic trends in “legislation and administrative and security practices that criminalize non-nationals, immigrants, refugees and asylum-seekers.” (August 2005 Report)

Such accusations were emphasized in his UN report to the General Assembly of 20 September 2006, and later on 21 August 2007, in which he denounced religious defamation and the impact of the fight against terrorism on human rights. He judges negatively “the trend and sometimes the ideological position of many Governments to consider that the security of the country and its people constitute the sum and substance of all human rights.”

Diène criticizes the new security context that undermines the respect of human rights, and deplores the discrimination practiced over two main issues: security and identity. His reports do not mention the fact that jihadist terrorism, the right to kill indiscriminately, is the greatest violation of human rights and that illegal immigration is also a violation of the laws of a national group. For Diène, the defence of national identity and the fight against both terrorism and illegal immigration, obstruct the general trend towards multiculturalism.

EU leaders could not have been more receptive to such criticism. They think that increasing dialogues at all levels, developing multiculturalism and immigration, as well as the mixing of populations and the dilution of European local national identities, will guarantee world peace. For this reason, the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union chose for the [European Year of Intercultural Dialogue \(2008\)](#) the themes of racism, xenophobia, asylum, immigration and multiculturalism. A multiplicity of programmes on intercultural dialogue in numerous sectors was planned to combat exclusion, racism and xenophobia. It was published in the *Official Journal of the European Union* on 30 December 2006. Point 9 of this program states that “the notion of 'active European citizenship' should cover not only citizens of the EU as defined in Article 17 of the EC Treaty, but any individual living permanently or temporarily in the EU.” Respect for cultural diversity and the highlighting of the contribution of different cultures are among the many objectives listed. This is why we now have museums and numerous exhibitions on the Muslim cultural contribution and immigration to Europe.

This position echoes the requests of Doudou Diène and of the OIC regarding the multicultural identity of Europe and its duty to fight Islamophobia. The frenzy of dialogues and soul searching on Europe’s multicultural identity with its Islamic component appears to culminate in the compliance of the EU to the demands of the OIC. The aim is a vast campaign of re-education of the Europeans. Yet, none of these efforts toward multiculturalism are planned in the 57 countries of the OIC, which are building the unity and solidarity of the world Ummah on the Qur’an and the Sunnah. This is totally the opposite to what they are demanding from the West. What sort of multiculturalism exists in Saudi Arabia, Iran, Pakistan, Egypt, Turkey, the Maghreb, although all these countries – including Mecca and Medina – had Jewish, Christian, Parsi, Buddhist and Hindu indigenous pre-Islamic cultures? And in our multicultural societies, are we going to refer to two types of human rights: one inspired by the *shari’a* and the other based on secular laws?

Moreover, European leaders claim that Islam is an important part of Europe’s civilization. This assertion is necessary to the Euro-Arab symbiosis of the Mediterranean project that – according to Eurabian belief – guarantees peace. They think peace is a matter of continual European concessions on its culture and identities, and of its own disintegration. Yet how European identity is defined is very important, because if it includes Islam it will legitimize the development of mosques, *madrassas* and a *shari’a* parallel culture and policy in Europe.

In other words, is Islam returning rightfully to its European homeland or rather does it represent a foreign immigrant population that ought to integrate into the majority indigenous non-Muslim population?

The OIC pressures the EU to force the Europeans to accept that they are multicultural, in spite of their refusal. European nationalisms, history and culture, are labeled Islamophobic and racist. It looks as if we have no right to our history or culture, that we are a mass of illiterate people, occupying illegally a land that should be Muslim, like Israel. In the same way, our right to security is denied and security measures are labeled Islamophobic. We are not seen as victims of terrorism, we are guilty of defending ourselves against the multifaceted jihadism – guilty like the Israelis fighting for their security on their own historical homeland.

It seems that Europeans are considered as a mass of anonymous dhimmis, a collective chattel without history and political rights, which is there temporarily, and must make place for Muslim immigrants, give them accommodation, work and education, and be conditioned to praise the greatness of Islam and respect Muslim sensitivities. In other words it echoes the spirit of the “dhimma”, the charter of tolerance given to the masses of infidels, Jews and Christians newly conquered.

In all their meetings with Muslim organizations, Europeans leaders are requested to control the media, the text-books, to monitor the publications in order to impose multiculturalism and punish any lack of respect toward Islam. The vocabulary should be sanitized, the media expurgated. The tone of these requests implies that if these conditions are not imposed peace might be endangered, like we saw in the Cartoons affair. We see the Turkish blackmail to bring France, America, Israel, all of us to deny the genocide of the Armenians, a well-known fact of history. Such intolerable pressures, exercised to curtail European freedoms, emanate from dictatorships whose laws, customs and populations are most intolerant toward non-Muslims. Like the Israelis, Europeans are denied the right to decide freely about immigration in their own countries. They are accused of Islamophobia if they put obstacle to the spread of Islam, their national identity, their culture and their laws are irrelevant.

[The Alliance of Civilizations](#), created to oppose the clash of civilizations, that is jihad, has also added pressure. On 13 November 2006, the High-Level Group of the Alliance of Civilizations presented its report which sums up the request of the OIC at its Mecca Summit

in 2005, after the Cartoons affair. First, it adopts the Islamic view of history and politics by claiming that everything was fine between the three monotheistic religions until the 19th century, when the evil of European colonialism and Zionism destroyed this harmony. Then it affirms that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is the main source of Christian-Muslim antagonism, not the jihadist war and ideology that deny for others the right to exist. It proclaims that this conflict “remains one of the gravest threats to international stability” and formulates recommendations that again echo the OIC requests. Such views mirror Hitler accusing the Jews of fomenting World War II, or the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, praised in the Hamas charter, the Palestinian branch of the Muslim Brotherhood which denies Israel’s right to exist.

The recent meeting of the [Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe](#) (and here) (OSCE Conference on intolerance and discrimination against Muslims, Cordoba, 9-10 October 2007) is much of the same, a charter of dhimmitude. It examines the means to condition Europeans to respect Muslim immigrants and accept their culture. Although racism against Muslims as well as against any other should be punished, nowhere do we see in any of these texts a genuine desire to understand the fears of Europeans aggressed in their own country by local jihadist cells, their anger at the Muslim scriptures and history loaded with anti-Jewish and anti-Christian stereotypes which they bring into Europe, the continual incitement to hate and war against the infidels, particularly against Israel and America, the inferiority of women and the legal oppression of non-Muslims. The accusations of Islamophobia totally overlook these facts as if they emerge from a vacuum. The Eurabian moral dishonesty that incriminates Israel’s self-defense in order to exist is now projected onto Europe, guilty when protecting itself against Islamic terrorism. Our self-defense is considered an aggression that victimizes Muslims. We are in fact in a logic of dhimmitude within Europe.

When we reflect on this sad state of affair, we see that this situation emerges from Europe’s weakness in matter of security, a consequence of its policy of multilateralism, collusion and support for jihadist ideologies against Israel which has made it a satellite of the Muslim bloc. This policy in many ways is similar to that of the Christian leadership in Lebanon which relied for its security and economy on Arafat’s protection and its Arab alliances, until they destroyed the Christian power and democracy. This is why the Lebanese germs have been imported into Europe.

As a conclusion, I will say that I do not see how this situation can change. I am not a politician, I am a researcher and writer. My job is to analyze situations. Europeans cannot understand the opacity of the EU machinery, the unaccountability involved in a policy conducted by networks of networks. They ignore the complexity of this situation with its historical implications. We are taken into the web of globalization and of jihadic terrorism. Europe has lost the war against jihadism by denying it and even supporting it by accusing its victim – Israel – to provoke it by its sole existence. The EU is driven by its ambition to destroy the European nation-states, in order to create with the OIC countries, a supranational global world governance where international institutions will dominate politics, culture and conditioned people into becoming robots. An inhumane and Kafkaesque world.

However I want to end on a positive note. This immigration brought to our shores some wonderful persons, those Muslims who could develop in our free societies, their talents and brilliant intelligence. What a shame for us that we cannot protect them from the fanatical reprisals of their coreligionists, that they live here in fear and danger because they share our views on universal human rights and freedoms. Their presence with us is a reminder of a common and not a sectarian cause. These precious friends whom we are privileged to have in all countries, help us not to lose our humanity in our united struggle to keep our freedom and dignity against a jihadist ideology of religious and gender apartheid.