



Dr. Fred Schwarz



Dr. David Noebel

The Schwarz Report

Volume 50, Number 5

May 2010

Islam: The New Marxism?

by Darrell Ferguson

Some say that Islam is a peaceful religion. But if that is true, why have there been more than 9000 terrorist attacks¹ by Muslims since 9/11? Looking at history, it is clear that Islam has never really been peaceful at all—not during Mohammed’s lifetime, and certainly not after his death in 632 AD. By 732 AD, in fact, Islamic armies had conquered much of the Middle East, and were nearly victorious in their attempts to conquer Europe. It was only the determination of Charles Martel that saved Europe from becoming Islamic in an historic battle at Tours, France in 732.

So why do many of our political leaders—and sadly, many Christian leaders too—get it so wrong? The answer lies in understanding the nature and function of a worldview. Islam is a comprehensive worldview—just like Marxism. If we are to understand the events unfolding in the world today, we must understand the Islamic worldview. For it is clear that people live according to their ideas, and ideas have consequences. This article will examine three of the most important features of the Islamic worldview that guide militant Muslims today—and will help us understand the political events currently going on in the world. They are: 1) Islam is a political ideology first, and a religious observance second, 2) Warfare (Jihad) against unbelievers is divinely mandated, and 3) Islam aims to rule the world, politically and militarily.

1) Political Ideology

Islam is first and foremost a political ideology, not just a religious practice. It therefore embodies a political vision. Abdul a La Maududi, one of the fathers of modern Islamism clarified that vision when he said: “Islam wishes to destroy all States and Governments anywhere on the face of the earth which are opposed to the ideology and program of Islam. Islam requires the earth—not just a portion, but the whole planet”²

The first mistake our leaders in the West are making today, then, is in their naïve belief that Islam is just a “religion”, rather than a comprehensive worldview, with global military and political aims. Donald Smith goes even further in outlining the nature and character of the Islamic vision, likening it to Marxism. He says, “It would be difficult to exaggerate the intensity with which Islam approaches its mission of establishing on earth a divinely revealed social order. . . . Among the profoundest convictions held by the world of Islam are that there is inherent in the structure of this world and its development a proper course, a right social shape—and that the meaning of history lies in the degree to which these become actualized. In these vital respects, Islam approaches history with almost the total commitment of Marxism.”³

Islam also has strategies that are parallel with Marxism, including threats, violence, intimidation, and revolution to

1 “The Problem For Our Country,” David Horowitz, *FrontPageMagazine.com* November 23, 2007 <http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/Read.aspx?GUID=BBD66F69-31AF-40AB-8D14-E565EEACC055>

2 S.A.A. Maududi, *Jihad in Islam*, Lahore, 1991

3 Donald Smith, “The Political Implications of Asian Religions,” *South Asian Politics and Religion*, Donald Smith, ed. Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1966, p. 16

achieve their political objectives. Both are totalitarian in the political institutions they produce, and both use propaganda to deceive their targets. . . including the oft repeated “mantra” that their intentions are “peaceful.” No political ideology can be “peaceful,” given that political ideologies underpin and define the foreign policy of a nation state. Certainly Marxism, as a political ideology, was not “peaceful” in its methods and objectives, and the same is true for Islam. Maududi makes it absolutely clear when he explains Islam’s program: “God’s Law (Sharia) should be enforced in the world by force of arms.”⁴

And Ayatollah Khomeini confirmed Islam’s global ideology of conquest when he said, “The Governments of the world should know that Islam cannot be defeated. Islam will be victorious in all countries of the world and Islam and the teachings of the Qur’an will prevail all over the world.”

2) Islam is at War

The second feature of Islam that inspires many Muslims into militant political action today is the concept that Islam is continuously at war. According to Islam, the world is divided into 2 camps—the *Dar Al-Islam* (Abode of Islam) and the *Dar Al-Harb* (Abode of war). As Montgomery Watt explains, Jihad is legitimated when non-Muslims make attempts to hinder the political expansion of Islam. The two may peacefully co-exist if the latter makes no attempt to destroy the *Dar Al-Islam*. If it does, then the doctrine of Jihad (struggle or Holy War) legitimates offensive and defensive measures to safeguard the political sanctity of Islam.⁵

Warfare (Jihad) against unbelievers is thus divinely mandated. This is nothing new, however. Mohammed himself received many “revelations” instructing him to fight and kill non-believers.

Infidels, he said. . . .

“Are the ‘worst animals’” (Qur’an 8:55)

“. . . will be killed or crucified, or have their hands and feet on alternate sides cut off.” (Qur’an 5:33-34)

“I will instill terror into the hearts of unbelievers, smite ye above their necks and smite all their fingertips of them.” (Qur’an 8:12)

Christians and Jews were not spared either. Mohammed received revelations to “Wage war on the people of the Book, who . . . do not accept the religion of Islam”. (Qur’an 9:29) “Fight against them (the Jews and Chris-

tians)! Allah shall punish them at your hands.” (Qur’an 9:14)

One of the consequences of this Jihad vision was the slaughter of more than 900 men from the last Jewish tribe in Medina, the Banu Qurayzah. Mohammed decapitated 800-900 men in front of their families, in 627 AD.

If Islam is a peaceful religion, as many claim today, then Mohammed himself must not have been a Muslim, since he was involved in leading more than 28 battles and slaughtering many non-Muslims.

3) Islam will rule the world

The third feature of Islam that inspires militant Muslims in their drive to Islamize the nations is their belief that one day Islam will rule the world, politically and militarily.

a) Expansion 632 AD-1922 AD

The drive to conquer nations is evidenced in the history of Islamic expansion after the death of Mohammed in 632 AD. Between 625 AD and 644 AD, the second Caliph, Umar, brought much of the Middle East under Islamic rule. This included Iraq, Iran, Egypt, Syria, Palestine, and North Africa. In addition to the Middle East, Islamic armies also attacked and slaughtered tens of thousands of Hindus in India, beginning in 712 AD, and Buddhists in India (1193 AD).

From 644 AD to 1094 AD, Muslim armies continuously attacked Europe, and in 711 Spain was conquered. In 719 Cordova became the seat of an Arab governor, and Spain remained under Islamic influence until 1492 when—in a desperate survival move—King Ferdinand expelled the Muslims back into North Africa. This action, like Charles Martel’s victory in 732 AD, likely saved Europe from becoming Islamic.

Despite some measure of success against Muslim armies, Europe was continuously oppressed and attacked; Kosovo was conquered in 1389, and Constantinople in 1453. Islam again invaded Europe, and would continue to reach further, attacking Vienna in 1683. The Armenian Christians learned the hard way that Islamic “peace” does not mean the same thing as Christian “peace” when nearly 300,000 were slaughtered in “ethnic cleansing” or driven out by the Turks between 1915-1922.

Serge Trifkovic explains the result of Islam’s drive for global supremacy, “Unleashed as the militant faith of a nomadic war band, Islam turned its boundary with the outside world into a perpetual war zone.”⁶

4 S.A.A. Maududi, *Jihad in Islam*, Lahore, 1991

5 William Montgomery Watt, *Islamic Fundamentalism and Modernity*, Routledge, London, 1988, pp. 98-102

6 Serge Trifkovic, *The Sword of the Prophet*, Regina Press, Boston, 2002, p.96

"The House of Islam is in a state of permanent war with the lands that surround it; it can be interrupted by temporary truces, but peace will only come with the completion of global conquest."⁷

b) Target USA & Israel

Contrary to the theories and wishes of utopian academics in Western universities, the Islamic obsession with global domination has never ended, but continues today as a prominent and visible theme in contemporary political events. The most important target for Islamic militants is the USA, which acts as a military and political bulwark against the ambitions of tyrannical Marxist and Islamic regimes. Hizb-ut-Tahrir, the Party of Liberation, made it clear when they said, "We want Islam to be a source of governance for all of mankind. And we also believe that one day America will be ruled by Islam."⁸

Even within the USA itself, Muslim leaders openly declare their aim to Islamize (and thus defeat) the USA. In 1988, the chairman of CAIR, the Council on American Islamic Relations, stated matter-of-factly, "Islam isn't in America to be equal to any other faith, but to become dominant. The Koran should be the highest authority in America and Islam the only accepted religion on Earth."⁹

Muslim leaders have not even tried to hide their plans and strategies to conquer the West; they don't have to—such is the political correctness, naïveté and self-delusion of Western political leaders who continue to declare that Islam is a peaceful and noble religion. Islam's objective was made very clear in 2006, when Hamas spokesman, Hamed Bitawi declared, "The Qur'an is our constitution, Muhammad is our prophet, jihad is our path, and dying as martyrs for the sake of Allah is our biggest wish."

Interestingly, however, Christian leaders are finally coming to realize that the violence endorsed in Islam stems not from a few "extremists" but from the Muslim god himself. Allah is not the same god as the God of the Bible (the Jews call God YAHWEH) because Allah commands Jihad, evil, and the slaughter of non-believers. In fact, a former member of the PLO believes the Christian convert and son of a Hamas terrorist got to the crux of

the situation when he recently said the biggest terrorist is the god of the Qur'an.

Mosab Yousef testifies that he now worships a God who will never disown him, and since leaving Islam, Yousef has come to believe that the more closely Muslims follow Allah and Muhammad, the more they become "inhuman" terrorists.¹⁰

Despite warnings like these from Muslims who have come out of Islam, significant numbers of Americans (and Westerners in general) continue to convert to Islam. As a result, U.S. authorities have been increasingly worried about the presence of Americans now supporting jihad inside the country. According to Joel Rosenberg, for example, out of the 2,350,000 Muslims in the USA,

- 5% (117,500) have a favorable view/agree with Bin Laden & al Qaeda,

- 13% believe suicide bombings against civilians are justified,

- 7% of younger Muslims (18-29 yrs) are MORE RADICAL, & agree with Bin Laden,

- 25% increase in mosques in the last 5 years.¹¹

The danger of further Islamic terrorism due to the increasing number of Muslim jihadists in the West is becoming all too clear. Over the past week, (March 12-17, 2010) a Pennsylvania woman, who went by the name "Jihad Jane," was accused in a plot to kill a Swedish cartoonist. From June 2008 through her Aug. 23, 2009 departure, the woman went online to recruit male fighters for the cause, recruit women with Western passports to marry them, and raise money for the holy war.

She had also agreed to marry one of her overseas contacts, a man from South Asia who said he could deal in bombs and explosives, according to e-mails recovered by authorities. He also told her in a March 2009 e-mail to go to Sweden to find and kill the artist, Lars Vilks. "*I will make this my goal till I achieve it or die trying*," she wrote back, adding that her blonde American looks would help her "*blend in*."

In another incident, a Yemeni-American Muslim preacher known for his ties to extremists operating in the U.S. called on American Muslims in a new audio message

7 Ibid, p. 103

8 *World Net Daily*, July 9, 2007 http://wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=56503

9 CAIR Chairman Omar M. Ahmad, speaking to a crowd of California Muslims in July, 1998. (full Cal Thomas commentary at <http://www.townhall.com/columnists/calthomas/printct20030520.html>)

10 Shoebat: Yousef went 'to the crux of the problem', Chad Groening—*OneNewsNow*—March 8, 2010 <http://www.onenewsnetwork.com/Culture/Default.aspx?id=925572>

11 *Inside the Revolution*, Tyndale, Illinois, 2009, p.146-147.

to turn against their government because of its actions against Muslims around the world. Anwar al-Awlaki's latest message, excerpts of which were aired on CNN March 17, 2010, described his own radicalization after U.S. operations against Muslims and called on those in the U.S. to follow his path.¹² "These cases," said Attorney General David Kris, the top counterterrorism official at the Justice Department, "*underscore the constantly evolving nature of the threat we face.*"

In other recent incidents, a New Jersey man was held by authorities in Yemen, and five young Pakistani-American men from Northern Virginia were charged by Pakistani officials with planning terrorist attacks in the South Asian country.¹³

A study released in January, 2010, by researchers at Duke University and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, for example, found 139 Muslim-Americans involved in alleged or confirmed terrorism incidents since Sept. 11, 2001. "We have a problem," said David Schanzer, lead author of the study and director of the Triangle Center on Terrorism and Homeland Security.¹⁴

In 2008 Sen. Myrick (R-NC) wrote the foreword to a book, *Muslim Mafia: Inside the Secret Underworld That's Seeking to Islamize America*, which accuses CAIR of conspiring to support international jihad against the United States.¹⁵

Myrick has said Islamic extremists "... are working their way into U.S. Muslim communities, infiltrating government institutions, and influencing American citizens to attack their own country."

One recent example is Major Nidal Hasan, the American Muslim who shot and killed 13 soldiers at Fort Hood Texas. Adam Gadahn, Al-Qaida's American-born spokesman, hailed Major Hasan as role model for other Muslims, especially those serving in Western militaries. And he called on Muslims serving in the U.S. armed forces to emulate the Army major. "*Brother Nidal is the ideal role-model for every repentant Muslim in the armies of the unbelievers and apostate regimes,*" he said. Gadahn further encouraged US Muslims to attack other "high-value targets."

"You shouldn't make the mistake of thinking that

military bases are the only high-value targets in America and the West. On the contrary, there are countless other strategic places, institutions, and installations which, by striking, the Muslim can do major damage. . . ."

Gadahn grew up on a farm in Riverside County, California, and converted to Islam at a mosque in nearby Orange County. He has been wanted by the FBI since 2004 and two years later was charged with treason.¹⁶

Some homegrown terrorists take much longer to show their militant leanings. In the case of North Carolina contractor Daniel Boyd, federal prosecutors say he nursed his ambitions for jihad over decades.

Boyd is accused of leading a group of men, including two of his sons, who planned to kidnap, kill, and maim people in other countries in the name of jihad. Boyd decried the U.S. military, praised the honor in martyrdom, bemoaned the struggle of Muslims, and said "I love jihad" on audiotapes obtained by federal authorities.

Some other U.S.-born terrorists were inspired by the U.S. involvement in the Iraq and Afghanistan wars. Others, like "Jihad Jane" wanted to avenge what they considered an insult to the Prophet Mohammed. Many traveled overseas to get terrorist training. Some used home computers to plan their attacks. These cases underscore the new reality that there is a threat from violent Islamic extremism from within the U.S.

Why is all this a surprise to the average Christian in the USA? Why do most Western leaders fail to comprehend the nature of the danger Islamic ideology poses to the Western civilization? I believe there are two main reasons for this: 1) It is because of their ignorance of Islam as a comprehensive worldview with a political military vision, and 2) Many of our leaders have been educated in Western universities, have learned "self-loathing" from their professors, and are therefore reluctant to defend the freedom that they now enjoy.

Daniel Shayesteh, a former Shi'ite radical who converted to Christianity, confirmed these themes when he wrote,

The West has become indifferent to its own history and cultural values. The shame of co-

12 <http://www.onenewsnetwork.com/AP/Search/World/Default.aspx?id=941316>

13 *Associated Press*, Feb 25, 2010

14 *Ibid.*

15 <http://www.newsobserver.com/2010/02/25/357589/us-rep-myrick-meets-nc-muslims.html?storylink=misearch>

16 "Hasan 'role model' for Muslims in U.S. military" Patrick Quinn, *Associated Press*, March 7, 2010, <http://www.onenewsnetwork.com/Headlines/Default.aspx?id=927362>

lonialism, parochialism, racism, and slavery in the past has rid many westerners of national responsiveness. Added to these is the altruistic multiculturalism of the West that gives equal or greater validity to Islam than to other religions and beliefs. If you are indifferent to your values and the rights of your own nation, of course the enemy will penetrate and demolish easily. Westerners need to return to the roots of their cultural values and find the key factors that helped them to establish democracy in order to once again protect them.

Many Christians have also given up and do not want to pay a price in order to encourage their weary people to take on the light yoke of Christ in order to rid themselves of the political, social, educational, or financial burdens that are leading to yoke them to Islam. If we give up, our enemies will take over.

It seems painfully obvious, then, that the West is facing the biggest ideological and political challenge in its history. Abdul Ibrahim reconfirms this challenge by stating the Islamic vision, “We aim to establish Allah’s religion in its entirety, in every soul and upon every inch of this earth, in every home, institution, and society.”¹⁷

In conclusion, I have examined three of the most important features of the Islamic worldview that guide militant Muslims today—and will help us understand the political events currently going on in the world. They are: 1) Islam is a political ideology, 2) Warfare (Jihad) against unbelievers is divinely mandated, and 3) Islam aims to rule the world, politically and militarily. Given this nature, vision, and strategy, I think it is clear that Islam is indeed “the new Marxism.” Daniel Easterman summed it up well when he warned, “With the end of the Cold War, it is Islam that will, in the next few decades, come to fulfill the role of Communism as a rival to the ideological power of the West”.¹⁸

REFERENCES

CAIR Chairman Omar M. Ahmad, speaking to a crowd of California Muslims in July, 1998. (full Cal Thomas commentary at <http://www.townhall.com/columnists/calthomas/printct20030520.html>)

17 Ibrahim, Abdul-Maajid, & Darbaalah, *In Pursuit of Allah's Pleasure*, Al-Firdous, London, 1997, p. 55.

18 from Daniel Easterman, *New Jerusalems Reflections on Islam, Fundamentalism and the Rushdie Affair*, Grafton, London, 1993

[umnists/calthomas/printct20030520.html](http://www.townhall.com/columnists/calthomas/printct20030520.html)

“Hasan ‘role model’ for Muslims in U.S. military” Patrick Quinn, *Associated Press*, March 7, 2010

<http://www.onenewsnetwork.com/Headlines/Default.aspx?id=927362>

In Pursuit of Allah's Pleasure, Ibrahim, Abdul-Maajid, & Darbaalah, , London: Al-Firdous, 1997, p. 55.

Inside the Revolution, Tyndale, Illinois, 2009, p.146-147.

Islamic Fundamentalism and Modernity, William Montgomery Watt, Routledge, London, 1988, pp. 98-102

Jihad in Islam, Maududi, S.A.A , Lahore, 1991

New Jerusalems Reflections on Islam, Fundamentalism and the Rushdie Affair; Daniel Easterman, Grafton, London, 1993

Associated Press, Feb 25, 2010, <http://www.newsobserver.com/2010/02/25/357589/us-rep-myrick-meets-nc-muslims.html?storylink=misearch>

The Problem For Our Country, David Horowitz, FrontPageMagazine.com November 23, 2007, <http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/Read.aspx?GUID=BBD66F69-31AF-40AB-8D14-E565EEACC055>

The Sword of the Prophet, Serge Trifkovic, Regina Press, Boston 2002, p.96, 103.

World Net Daily, July 9, 2007 http://wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=56503

‘Yousef went ‘to the crux of the problem’ Chad Groening, OneNewsNow, March 8, 2010 <http://www.onenewsnetwork.com/Culture/Default.aspx?id=925572>

A Pretentious Word for a World Without Rules

by Victor Davis Hanson

Given thirty years of postmodern relativism in our universities, we were bound to get a postmodern president at some point.

Postmodernism is a fancy word—in terms of culture, nihilist; in terms of politics, an equality of result and the ends justifying the means—that a lot of people throw around to describe the present world of presumed wisdom that evolved in the last part of the 20th century.

“After modernism” or “beyond modernism” can mean almost anything—nihilistic art that goes well beyond modern art (think a crucifix in urine rather than the splashes of modernist Jackson Pollock). Or think of the current English Department doggerel that is declared “poetry”

(no transcendent references, echoes of classicism, no cadence, rhyme, meter, particular poetic language, theme, structure, etc.) versus Eliot's or Pound's non-traditional modern poetry of the 1920s and 1930. In politics, there is something of the absurd. The modern age saw life and death civil rights marches and the commemoration of resistance to venomous racial oppression; the postmodern civil rights marches are staged events at the DC tea party rally, as elites troll in search of a slur, or Prof. Gates's offer to donate his "cuffs" to the Smithsonian as proof of his racial "ordeal."

Genres, rules, and protocols in art, music, or in much of anything vanish as the unnecessary obstructions they are deemed to be—constructed by those with privilege to perpetuate their own entrenched received authority and power. The courage, sacrifice, and suffering of past American generations that account for our present bounty are simply constructs, significant only to the degree that we use the past to deconstruct the race, class, and gender power machinations that pervade contemporary American exploitative society. History is melodrama, a morality tale, not tragedy.

But the chief characteristic of postmodern thinking is the notion of relativism and the primacy of language over reality. What we signify and brand as "real," in essence, is no more valid than another's "truth," even if we retreat to specious claims of "evidence"—especially if our aim is to perpetuate the nation state, or the primacy of the white male capitalist Westerner who long ago manufactured norms in his own interests.

"Alternate" realities instead reflect those without power speaking a "truth," one just as valid as the so-called empirical tradition that hinged on inherited privilege.

OK, so how does this affect Obama?

He was schooled in the postmodern university and operates on hand-me-down principles from postmodernism. One does not need to read Foucault or Derrida, or to be acquainted with Heidegger, to see how relativism enhances contemporary multiculturalism. Keep that in mind and everything else makes sense.

Try health care. By traditional standards, Obama prevaricates on most of the main issues revolving around health care reform—from the fundamental about its costs and effects, to the more superficial such as airing the entire process on C-SPAN or promising not to push through a major bill like this on narrow majoritism. And recall the blatant bribes for votes to politicians from Nebraska to Louisiana. Look also at the enormous borrowing and cuts from Medicare that will be involved.

Well, those were not misstatements or misdeeds at all.

You, children of privilege, only think they are, since you use antiquated norms like "abstract" truth to adjudicate the discomforting efforts of a progressive president.

He, on the other hand, is trying to force the privileged at last to account for their past oppressions (insurance companies that gouge, surgeons that lop off legs or tear out tonsils for profit, investors who private jet to the Super Bowl, or the lesser but equally selfish Joe the Plumber types who do not wish to "spread the wealth") by extending care to the underprivileged. Your "Truth" about his past statements is something reactionaries evoke to thwart such progressive change; in fact, the constructed truth of Obama's is that a child will now have regular check-ups. All the other "gotcha" games about abstract truth and falsehood are just semantics.

Look at supposed hate speech. An empiricist would ignore Obama's recent warnings about the new wave of right-wing tough talk from Limbaugh and Beck, and determine instead whether the president remembers the novel Checkpoint, or the award-winning film about killing George Bush, or the venom of a Michael Moore or Keith Olbermann.

That is, a traditional inquirer would weigh the furor of the right against left, in ascertaining whether hate speech is at all partisan or simply politics of all stripes. And he would remind the president that it was Barack Obama himself who asked of his supporters to "get in their face" and bragged "if they bring a knife to the fight, we bring a gun," and who used graphic examples in damning his opponents (cf. the taunt to Hannity ("he'll tear him up").

But, you see, all this is not so. The postmodernist constructs a different reality. A person of color who is striving to level the playing field against oppressive interests speaks the "truth" to power. Of course, from time to time he draws on emotive language to drive home his points—quite unlike the cool, detached, and deliberate attack narratives of those seeking to protect corporate or entrenched interests.

When Obama attacks Beck, or Hannity, or calls for someone to bring a gun to a fight, or has Rahm Emanuel curse a fence-sitting representative, these protocols seem extreme only to those whose economic interests are threatened. Poor children in Detroit or in the barrios of El Paso don't get the opportunity for tit-for-tat score-keeping, as if millionaires "think" they are entitled to the same "fair" treatment as their victims. When Limbaugh rails, it is to protect his Gulfstream 550; when Obama "distorts," it is the expediency needed to wring from the wealthy salvation for the voiceless.

Race is the same. A person of color can hardly, given

the history of oppression accorded to non-whites, himself be guilty of dividing people by race.

So if Obama says “typical white person,” or entitles his book from the sloganeering of a racist preacher he courted for 20 years, or stereotypes rural Pennsylvanians, or dubs police as acting “stupidly” in matters of supposed racial confrontation, or has an attorney general who damns the country as “cowards” on race, or appoints a Supreme Court judge who thinks a “wise Latina” by virtue of race and gender has superior wisdom, or recruits a Van Jones who characterizes everyone from polluters to mass murderers by race (I could go on), well, all this is not at all racial stereotyping with an intent to deprecate.

Why? Because constructs of language, expression, and reality hinge on status and class. Obama is seeking to dethrone traditional nexuses of power. So when he, from time to time, muses on real racial inequality, reactionaries retreat to “objective” “standards” of reciprocity to thwart his proposed changes.

And those “take-overs”? Take-over from what to what?

An outraged managerial and capital laden class feigns victimhood when working folks at last have a say in how the nation’s profits are derived and enjoyed, originating from their own labor in banking, insurance, and auto production. All these retreats to “private” income, “my property,” “liberty,” “The Founders,” and the “Constitution” simply can be deconstructed to “don’t dismantle a system that is weighted in my favor!”

No wonder “they” construct all sort of scary “narratives” about the Postal Service, Amtrak, Social Security, Medicare, and other shared collective enterprises that are branded “insolvent” and “unsustainable,” despite serving the people—the economic gobbledegook talk from those who really mean they are not willing to transfer their own unfairly obtained capital to more deserving working folks through legitimate “redistributive change.”

Finally, examine foreign policy. Now, many of us are upset that we court enemies and shun friends, and seem to be reaching out to the most authoritarian regimes imaginable, whether Putin’s Russia, or Iran, or Venezuela. Well, once again, that is only because you construct reality on the norms predicated upon your own comfortable globalized privilege—that, in fact, as Obama thankfully grasps, is a result of thousands of daily oppressions, both here and abroad, of which you are not even aware.

Consider the trumped-up crisis with Iran. We hold Ahmadinejad to our artificially constructed standards of “civil” discourse and “fair” play—forgetting (but not Obama) the 1953 Western-inspired coup, the profit-mon-

gering of the global oil companies, and the neo-imperialist role of the United States in the Gulf. We hide all that with constructs like “the mullahs,” the “theocrats,” “Islamofascism” and other demonization rooted in class, gender, race, and religion.

If Iran had been behind a past U.S. coup, if Iranian warships were off the coast of California, if an Iranian coal company were buying and selling our national energy production, then we too might sound somewhat unhinged as we sought to employ language to offset our oppressor’s ill-gotten material advantages.

In an American constructed world order, we artificially adjudicate Iran a rogue would-be nuclear menace for wishing five or six small nuclear weapons to protect its vulnerable borders (American troops now abut them); we have thousands of such devices, and have used them, and yet are deemed “responsible” and “peaceful,” we of all people, who, as the president once reminded us, have alone used them on real people.

So what Obama has done is “contextualized” the world, and “located,” as it were, the seemingly hostile anti-American rhetoric of “enemies” into a proper race/class/gender narrative.

And what he has found is that nationalism and the construct of the state have fooled us into thinking that there are “allies” and “enemies,” when, in fact, these are mere labels used by the privileged to “exaggerate” “difference” that only enhances Western entrenched economic, racial, cultural, and political hegemonies.

Once, thanks to Obama, we “unpack” that “reality,” then we can see that most Americans have much in common with Venezuelans, Russians, Iranians, Syrians, and others who likewise struggle against the same enemies that brought us the 2008 Wall Street meltdown and now oppose health care reform, cap and trade, amnesty, and the take over of the automobile, banking, and insurance industries.

So a postmodernist looks at the Falklands and does not rely on archaic notions of “sovereignty” or a “history” of a prior war. Instead, one sees a postcolonial power once more claiming “ownership” of a far distant island, proximate to a Latin American people, with long experience with European and American economic and political exploitation. Presto—we are now “neutral,” which means we don’t see anything intrinsically convincing in Britain’s claims to the Falklands.

Note Israel. What are we to make of the Netanyahu humiliating smack down, the seeming indifference over the Iranian nuclear program, the nominations and appointments on the Middle East front of a Freeman or Power, the

reach out to Syria and Iran, the interview with al Arabiya and the Cairo speech, the bow to a Saudi royal, the ritual trashing of George Bush juxtaposed to the praise of a Saudi king, the strange past outbursts of Obama advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski about hypothetically shooting down Israeli planes on their way to Iran, the ranting about Jews from the former spiritual advisor Wright, etc.

In short, the answer is that Israel is a construct of Western privilege—its democratic, capitalist, and Western customs hinge on the oppression of a vast “other” that is far more egalitarian, socialist, and antithetical to Western consumer-capitalism with all of its pathologies of race, class, and gender exploitation.

In that context, in archaic fashion, we struggle to damn any effort to end such hegemony and empower the voices of the oppressed. We are not, in fact, “allied” to Israel, but properly speaking instead should be to the underprivileged in the Gaza slums, to those without health care on the West Bank, and, yes, to the progressive Israelis of noble spirit who are trying to battle the reactionary Likudniks and instead do something about the tentacles of their own discriminatory state, whose capital is derived from exploited labor and resources of a silenced other.

I could go on, but you get the picture of our first postmodern presidency. For 14 months we have tried to use abstract benchmarks like “did Obama contradict himself?,” “did Obama break another promise?,” “did Obama really think borrowing another \$2 trillion won’t help to bankrupt us?,” “did Obama indeed think another entitlement ‘saves’ money?,” “did Obama snub another ally and court another enemy?,” “did Obama apologize again?”—when, in fact, such linear thinking, such artificially constructed “norms,” such “facts” are nothing of the sort at all. To Obama, our first postmodern president, such facts and truth are mere signatures of privilege, and so he is offering us another—a postmodern—way of looking at the world.

—www.pajamasmedia.com, April 4, 2010



World Congress of Families Mourns Polish President Lech Kaczynski

(Rockford, IL—USA) World Congress of Families Managing Director Larry Jacobs expressed shock and sadness at the death of Polish President, Lech Kaczynski, who died Saturday in a plane crash on route to a ceremony commemorating the victims of the 1940 massacre of Polish officers in the Katyn Forest.

“President Kaczynski was one of the strongest pro-family leaders in Europe,” Jacobs commented. “Despite intense pressure from the European Union, he stood firm for the right to life. The late president also opposed the legalization of prostitution and the normalization of homosexuality.”

Even before he became president, Kaczynski was an outspoken defender of the family. As mayor of Warsaw, he twice blocked gay-pride parades.

President Kaczynski was a patron of World Congress of Families IV, which took place in Warsaw, May 11-13, 2007.

“We were honored by President Kaczynski’s support for our fourth World Congress,” said Jacobs. “In fact, the initial meeting of the International Planning Committee for the Warsaw Congress was held with his encouragement in the office of then-Prime Minister Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz.”

In a letter of support, read at the opening session of WCF IV, President Kaczynski declared, “I cordially welcome all of you assembled at the World Congress of Families IV . . . I accept with satisfaction the kind words of International Secretary of the Congress, Allan Carlson, about Poland as the bastion of strong faith and strong families in the increasingly laicizing Europe whose inhabitants are getting older.” To read the full text of President Kaczynski’s letter to the World Congress of Families, go to <http://www.worldcongress.pl/docs.php?view=14>.

Jacobs observed: “Lech Kaczynski was a faithful servant of the Polish nation, a good friend of the World Congress of Families and a champion of the natural family. We join the people of Poland in mourning his passing.”

For more information on World Congress of Families, visit www.worldcongress.org. To schedule an interview with Larry Jacobs, contact Don Feder at 508-405-1337 or dfeder@rcn.com.