

Purging the minds of academic creatures in “liberal” institutions of pre-established misconceptions about the Middle East

Islamophobia is Credible

Here's Why

Afshin Azad and Yusof Ruyanfar

كُنْتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ تَأْمُرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَتَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَتُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَلَوْ آمَنَ أَهْلُ الْكِتَابِ لَكَانَ خَيْرًا لَهُمْ مِّنْهُمْ
الْمُؤْمِنُونَ وَأَكْثَرُهُمُ الْفَاسِقُونَ (١١٠)

You (Muslims) are the best Ummah (group of people) produced [as an example] for mankind. You enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong and believe in Allah. If only the People of the Scripture (Jews and Christians) had believed, it would have been better for them. Among them are some believers, but most of them are venial sinners (Surah Ali 'Imran, verse 110)

The First Amendment protects the freedom to practice any religion and the right to criticize any religion or belief without restriction on the depth or intensity of that criticism. While criticism of Christianity or any other belief system is widely accepted and often encouraged in public discourse, this is not the case when it comes to Islam.

One example of this is the 2018 European Court of Human Rights ruling against an Austrian woman who called Mohammad a pedophile. The court argued that her comments “could only be understood as having been aimed at demonstrating that Muhammad was not worthy of worship,” as if a “defamation lawsuit” against an Arab Bedouin who died over 1400 years ago would have any effect on his one billion and something current followers, who are protected by the law to defend the misogyny, pedophilia, and blatant homophobia promoted by their religion.

Following the increase in security measures against Muslims and Arabs after 9/11, “Islamophobia” has been grouped with racism, homophobia, and misogyny, despite Islam being a purely religious and ideological choice, not an immutable characteristic. Anyone from any race or culture can convert to Islam, and it's not tied to a specific geography. Yet, people with Muslim Arab imperialist sentiments aim to present

Islam as an ethnic identity and attach an ethnic component to it.

Before we delve into why equating Islamophobia with struggles like Black rights movements not only dishonors those other marginalized communities but also contradicts the very tenets of Islam, it is important to clarify two points:

1- Antisemitism vs Islamophobia

Unlike Islam, Judaism does have an ethnic component that is integral to its community. What is classified as antisemitism belongs next to other discriminatory practices like racism, sexism, and homophobia. Nazis didn't separate the Jews who were considered “religious” from the ones who were not. Once one is born a Jew, they will stay a Jew regardless of their belief system. Antisemitism targets all Jews, religious or not, attacking their immutable ethnic identity. Islam, however, is a belief system, and criticism of it is not an attack on an inherent characteristic. Conflating antisemitism with Islamophobia is therefore incorrect and diminishes the suffering of those affected by real discrimination.

2- “Profiling”

Claims of Islamophobia often reference “profiling,” drawing parallels with racial discrimination. However, these two instances of profiling are fundamentally different. Racial profiling stems from unfounded assumptions, while profiling related to Islam

stems from the credible threat of radical Islamist ideologies. One does not commit a crime because she is black, and simply being black doesn't translate to being more suspecting of criminal acts, which makes racial profiling inherently racist. However, all instances of Islamic terrorism that have led to the increase in security measures against Muslims have happened because of ideological reasons. Bin Laden didn't organize 9/11 and also happened to be Muslim; he organized 9/11 because of his radical Islamism. While racism towards Middle Eastern people is a real issue, the fingers should be pointed at radical Islamism, not security measures and credible fears incorrectly labeled as “Islamophobia.”

9/11 happened because Bin Laden saw it as a way of following his duty to spread Islam, as made clear in his letters and speeches. The Quran itself promotes the idea of spreading Islam and “enjoining what is right.” As mentioned in the verse above, spreading the religion makes a Ummah – a community of people who share a belief, regardless of ethnicity. Mohammad envisioned this for the future of his religion, and he promoted the concept of a Ummah to prevent Islam from becoming an ethnic religion. Yet, over the centuries, Arab imperialist desires have turned this call for religious unity into a tool of colonization and oppression.

However, what the initial interpretations of Islam and Mohammad's intentions were and how they were altered by the Arab Empire is irrelevant to the modern world. First, it is not the responsibility of non-Muslims to determine the meaning of Islamic concepts and verses related to things like war and jihad, and the decision about how to interpret these verses is a religious matter within the Muslim community itself. Second, Muslims have not yet shown any intent to reconsider these interpretations, so the rest of the world must base its understanding on the interpretations that have been officially accepted and practiced by current Muslims.

Therefore, it is fair to assume that a person who says they're Muslim actually believes in Islam because their belief is what makes them Muslim. And when the Quran calls them to enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong, it's fair to expect that, given the chance, they would follow through. This call to enjoin the right and forbid the wrong, combined with Arab imperialist desires and Islamic nihilism, breeds radicalized ideologies, leading to terrorist actions. To label this reasonable fear of radicalization as a “phobia” is not only inaccurate but also a malicious attempt to strengthen and normalize Arab imperialism under the disguise of religious identity.

Purging the minds of academic creatures in “liberal” institutions of pre-established misconceptions about the Middle East

The Fools’ Dichotomy

Afshin Azad and Eric Calabros

One of the signs of a hollow movement, campaign, or uproar is that it sends out contradictory messages:

“Stop building settlements — From the river to the sea, Palestine will be free”

These two messages create a dichotomy where the 1967 borders both exist and don’t exist. On one hand, they want Israel to stop building further settlements and respect the 1967 borders. On the other hand, they chant slogans for a free Palestine “from the river to the sea,” which completely denies the existence of Israel and those very same borders.

“Call an urgent ceasefire — Globalize the Intifada”

This creates a dichotomy where no shots are fired and the war is supposedly over, yet Israelis are still expected to take damage. They push for an immediate ceasefire to stop civilian casualties, yet simultaneously call for the Intifada, which advocates for the genocide of Jews and Israelis, to globalize.

“Israel is losing the war — Israel is committing genocide”

This creates a dichotomy where the “loser” is somehow committing genocide against the “winner”.

These contradictions are tools for Academic Creatures to modify based on what serves their meaningless arguments, and make them seem intellectually balanced, with no regard for integrity and logic.

After the 1967 War
■ Land occupied by Israel in 1967



-BBC

The Foe Friend

Many have stated that the recent protests in Israel after the murder of six hostages by Hamas on September 4th shows that Netanyahu’s plan to annihilate Hamas is a mistake. What these critics are failing to understand is that in a democracy, there are no virtuous politicians. Each party portrays the opposing party’s representative as a Deev (Persian word for demon) and their own as a Delbar (Persian word for darling). Those who cannot blend in with either party—often calling themselves ‘independents’ in the West—question the demon-and-darling narrative. They claim the competition is demon versus demon, aiming to bring their own alternative darling to power. But often, politicians are more moral than many of their own country’s citizens.

When dealing with hostage-takers who hold someone for eleven months and then execute them once they realize the hostage is no longer useful, it’s clear that rescuing the hostages from the hands of these terrorists needs a miracle, and it’s best to focus on eliminating the hostage-takers. That’s exactly Netanyahu’s plan. He knows that Hamas isn’t looking to negotiate, because only those seeking peace negotiate. But the Palestinians are not after peace; their goal is to carry out a second October 7th, this time targeting all Jews. And they have no shame in stating this while the world praises them.

However, with every hostage being murdered by Hamas, Israel’s leftists pressure the government to stop the war and make peace with the hostage-takers! **Their hatred of Netanyahu is so great that they’re willing to do exactly what Khamenei dreams of them doing.**

Netanyahu is only supposed to be a successful politician, not a moral figure. Yet, without being a righteous person himself, he now finds himself in a position of greater moral clarity than some of his own people, who, driven by hatred, are putting the survival of the entire society at risk. In response, he has no choice but to take the moral high ground and confront these threats to his country’s survival by continuing to eliminate Hamas and prevent further hostage-taking and killings — Afshin Azad

The List

As the world’s largest “state” sponsor of terrorism, the Islamic Republic in Iran funnels most of its annual budget into various organizations, institutions, foundations, committees, and associations to further spread propaganda, embezzle money, micro-manage every aspect of life through its totalitarian approach, and destroy the lives of Iranians—and, in the near future, the world. With the growing worldwide support for Islamic Republic-funded terrorist militant groups like Hamas, this future might be closer than you think. Here’s a short, comical (yet real) list of places where the Islamic Republic likes to spend its terror-earned money. You can read the complete list with previous entries on our website—Yusof Ruyanfar

This edition of The List mostly focuses on how the largest terror state in the world steals our (Iranians’) money to fund terrorists in Gaza, spread propaganda to gather support for them, and celebrate their acts of terrorism:

- 1- Permanent Secretariat of the International Conference in Support of the Palestinian Intifada (Persian: دبیرخانه دائمی کنفرانس بین‌المللی حمایت از انتفاضه فلسطین)
- 2- Supreme Council for Supporting the Islamic Revolution of the Palestinians (Persian: شورای عالی حمایت از انقلاب اسلامی مردم فلسطین)
- 3- Central Intifada and Quds (Jerusalem) Headquarters (Persian: ستاد مرکزی انتفاضه و قدس)
- 4- Intifada and International Quds Day Headquarters (Persian: ستاد انتفاضه و روز جهانی قدس)
- 5- Coordination Headquarters for Quds Day March (Persian: ستاد هماهنگی راهپیمایی روز قدس)
- 6- Committee of the Special Section for celebrating the “Al-Aqsa Storm” (October 7th Massacre) at the National Exhibition of Visual Arts of Islamic Sacrifice (Persian: بخش ویژه طوفان الاقصی (جنایت پانزدهم مهر) در نمایشگاه ملی هنرهای تجسمی ایثار)
- 7- Presidential Committee for Supporting the Islamic Revolution of the People of Palestine (Persian: کمیته حمایت از انقلاب اسلامی مردم فلسطین نهاد ریاست جمهوری)
- 8- Supreme Council of Humor (Persian: شورای عالی طنز)

For the mullahs and their sympathizers in Western countries to sit back and laugh at the pain and misery of the people of Iran after allocating dozens of councils and organizations to support terrorism and antisemitism while the Iranian people are denied fundamental human rights and are struggling to survive.