# TRANSCRIPT

A BAN SHARIA WEEKLY WEBINAR SERIES

## Is Sharia a 'Religion of Peace' or a Strategy for War?

Wednesday, May 27, 2026

https://bansharia.com/webinar-is-sharia-a-religion-of-peace-or-a-strategy-for-war/

Media File: Webinar_Sharia_Peace_War.mp4

BEGIN TRANSCRIPT:

[00:00:00] **Frank Gaffney:** Welcome to an important new webinar series. We're calling it BanSharia.com. Why are we doing that? Because it's a call to action, as well as an opportunity for insight into why that action is urgently required across the United States of America.

The reason is that Sharia — the political, military, legal system, program, doctrine, ideology, some actually call it the demonic death cult that is at the core of authoritative Islam — is utterly incompatible with the Constitution of the United States and the freedoms that it guarantees. And therefore, it not only should be, but it must be prohibited.

In fact, I think an objective analysis of Sharia makes it pretty clear that what it entails, by and large — set aside the sort of pietistic practices that offer a kind of patina of religiosity to it — is illegal as well as unconstitutional, by and large. But in virtually no area are the [00:01:00] laws of the land being enforced where they come into conflict with what is widely, but incorrectly, perceived as a protected religious practice in America.

The purpose of this particular webinar is to address that specific proposition. Is Sharia, as some would have us believe, central to a religion of peace, or is it in fact a strategy for war?

We're going to be hearing in the course of the program from several individuals who are both knowledgeable about the actual essence of Sharia — its genesis, its application, [00:02:00] its effects — as well as those who have been in the fight to prevent the insinuation, and worse yet, the submission to Sharia, that is now in the offing not just in wide swaths of the Middle East, whence this program came, but also in other parts of the world, notably in Europe, particularly Western Europe, most especially Great Britain, but other parts of the world to varying degrees as well.

Our object here is to take the insights of such experts, to make accessible the thrust of their findings [00:03:00] and their recommendations, in the hopes that it will translate into action on the part of the American people and their elected representatives.

And a little later in the program, we'll talk a little bit about a campaign to save Texas and save America, which is spawned in part by the extent to which Sharia has been particularly and malevolently metastasizing in what is arguably our most important state of the union, Texas. And should it in fact be lost to those seeking to achieve Sharia's triumph, the rest of the nation is almost certainly doomed [00:04:00] as well.

So we seek to prevent that. A modest goal, but a vital one. And we are going to begin it today with the first in this series with one of our most distinguished and, I think, accomplished non-Muslim experts about Sharia, about Islam more generally, but specifically about this distilled essence of what those who seek to achieve the goals of Sharia through jihad are about and why they must be stopped.

His name is Robert Spencer. He is the director of a wonderful online resource known as JihadWatch.org. He is best known, though, as a [00:05:00] highly — I mean prodigiously — productive author. At last count — and this changes every couple of days, it seems — he has produced 34 books, the majority of them addressing one aspect or another of Islam: the reality of Muhammad, the character of jihad and stealth jihad, and the efforts to achieve Sharia's triumph going back from Muhammad's time to the present through jihad, and on and on.

In other words, a man of deep knowledge and a comprehensive mastery of this very arcane [00:06:00] subject of Islam and Sharia. And we've asked him specifically to speak to this question of whether it is in fact a religion of peace or a strategy for war.

He's joining us by video. Let's go to it now.

[00:07:17] **Robert Spencer:** The fundamental issue over Sharia that makes it difficult today is the persistent assumption that it's only private religious law that has nothing to do with non-Muslims, and that therefore any opposition to it is just motivated by Islamophobia, bigotry, racism, and the like.

When I testified before a House subcommittee on Sharia — that is the great work of Representative Chip Roy — in February, Representatives Jamie Raskin, Steve Cohen of Tennessee, and Mary Gay Scanlon of Pennsylvania [00:08:00] all proceeded in their questioning from the assumption that Sharia was simply on a par with Catholic canon law, or something of that nature that is an entirely voluntary situation and pertains to ceremonial matters as well as to marriage law and things of that kind, but has no significance for the wider society.

They seemed resolutely determined to insist that Sharia had no political extension, and to ignore the abundant evidence that Sharia is not only political, but is supremacist, aggressive, violent, and expansionist.

The same thing happened more recently at another hearing of the same House subcommittee, where a very courageous Texas high school student, Marco Hunter Lopez, and the [00:09:00] redoubtable and courageous Amy Mek testified. And once again, Representative Pramila Jayapal challenged them on the basis of the assumption that Islamic religious law was essentially identical in content to Christian religious law.

All of this could be refuted in a second, in a nanosecond. All anyone has to do is look at the Islamic Republic of Iran, at Saudi Arabia, at Sudan, at Pakistan, Afghanistan — any place that proclaims Sharia as the primary law of the land.

Now, it would be ridiculous on its face to say the primary law of the land is laws covering Islamic religious observance that do not speak about any other issue. Obviously, in the first place, if these countries are basing their laws [00:10:00] upon Sharia, then they consider that Sharia has a political content that they are implementing.

And what kind of societies result from that implementation? Look at Saudi Arabia. Look at Iran. Look at Pakistan and Afghanistan. Do any of them secure equality of rights for women? They do not. Do any of them secure equality of rights for non-Muslims? They do not. Do any of them protect the freedom of speech? They do not.

On what basis, then, do these representatives — Scanlon, Raskin, Cohen, and Jayapal, and others, of course, as well — continue to assume not only that Sharia is not political, but that it's benign? They cannot point to, and never have attempted to point to, any other country [00:11:00] where this supposedly nonpolitical and harmless manifestation of Sharia is implemented. There is no such place, and there never has been and never will be.

The unpleasant fact is that Sharia has been remarkably similar in character everywhere that it has been implemented throughout the history of Islam — from the rightly guided caliphs to the Abbasid caliphate, to the Ottoman caliphate, to all the other smaller caliphates, to the Mughal Empire in India. Everywhere that there has been a Sharia state, it has had this same character, because Sharia is considered to be the immutable and perfect law of Allah.

It has not been changed. It has not been reformed. It does not have significantly different versions. There are different sects of Islam. There are different schools of jurisprudence. But [00:12:00] 80 percent of Sharia across all those different sects and schools is identical.

And in every place that it has been implemented, once again, women are denied basic rights, non-Muslims are denied basic rights, the freedom of speech is nonexistent, apostasy is punishable by death, criticism of Islam, of Muhammad, of the Quran is punishable by death. There's no pluralism, there's no multiculturalism, there's no diversity.

And so it's kind of ironic — more than ironic, bitterly ironic — that the primary proponents of multiculturalism, diversity, and pluralism in the United States today are those who are the fiercest defenders of Sharia. But they are, and it's hard to escape the impression that they're not doing it deliberately. But whether they are or not, they are obfuscating and outright [00:13:00] lying about the nature of Sharia.

Sharia, in its contents, is extraordinarily clear. The nations that are implementing it are not misunderstanding Islam or Sharia. They are not misinterpreting Islam. They do not represent a tiny minority of extremists who have hijacked Islam that has somehow gained control of these countries. They do not represent a regime that is going against the will of those citizens of those regimes that are Sharia-adherent.

Certainly in Iran, most of the people in Iran hate the regime, but they're not Sharia-adherent. They hate Sharia too. And actually they hate Sharia because they've lived under it for so many years. They know what its contents are, and they [00:14:00] have no more patience for it after 47 years of Islamic rule.

As a matter of fact, there was a poll survey, a quite extensive and carefully conducted survey, that was done several years ago in the Islamic Republic of Iran, where most of the respondents — which was a very broad swath of the Iranian population — actually refused to identify themselves as Muslim at all. Less than 40 percent of the people of Iran, according to this survey, still consider themselves to be Muslims in any sense.

Now, this is extraordinary because the Islamic Republic of Iran is officially 99 percent Shiite, Twelver Shiite Muslim. And so if you have over 60 percent of those no longer professing Islam, it is because they identify the regime with Islam. And why do they identify the regime with Islam? Because the [00:15:00] regime itself identifies itself with Islam, and it implements Sharia.

To turn around and pretend that Sharia will cause no damage or destruction in the United States, and will not result in the denial of any rights to women or to non-Muslims, is to close one's eyes to reality. The record is abundantly clear, and it's time that our political elected officials be honest about it. Thank you.

[00:15:33] **Frank Gaffney:** Thank you, Robert Spencer. As ever, your clarity, your unswerving fidelity to the facts, bring you to the place where I believe our political leaders, as well as our people, must arrive as well, which is that Sharia is not a protected religious practice and [00:16:00] must be resisted in every way we can.

We're going to turn next to Dr. Karen Siegemund. She is an extraordinary thought leader in the public policy arena on a whole host of subjects, ranging from our culture to our history, to our morality and social norms, as well as, of course, governance and what we must do to assure that, as is the title of her wonderful organization, the American Freedom Alliance, preservation of our American freedom is the core of its mission.

Dr. Siegemund has a PhD as well as a lot of extraordinary experience, notably during the Cold [00:17:00] War as a consultant to the United States Navy on antisubmarine warfare technologies that were at the core of our triumph over that very evil empire. She has, in the years since, worked in education at every level and is imbued with not only a deep understanding of the role of education in our national security, but also the extent to which we have been poorly served by education in that regard for years.

We've asked her to bring all of these skills and insights and abilities to bear on this topic because among other things, she has been sponsoring in her organization for years now [00:18:00] extraordinarily impressive programs in which those in the front lines of the fight for freedom are invited to speak and to share their insights as well as their recommendations with important audiences, often in Los Angeles, where the alliance is headquartered, but also across the country.

I had the privilege of working with her on a roadshow in the run-up to the 2024 election, in which we took many of the programs and best experts that we will be showcasing in the course of this series and on other platforms to American cities, notably in swing states, for the purpose of making sure they understand what is at stake, what is on the line.

And we do so again [00:19:00] today with Karen Siegemund's help on this very foundational question: Is Sharia a religion of peace or a strategy for war?

Karen, welcome. Over to you.

[00:19:15] **Dr. Karen Siegemund:** Thanks so much. It is an absolutely crucial topic. And as you know, because you were part of it, the very first event that I did when I became head of the American Freedom Alliance was a conference literally on the topic, "Islam and Western civilization: can they coexist?" This was in 2016, and the resounding answer, of course, at that time and even more so now, was, of course, no, they cannot.

Islam is predicated entirely on the notion of global conquest, on dominance. It in itself means submission. That is not in any way who we are. It seeks [00:20:00] supremacy, as Robert pointed out. It is a political ideology that seeks global dominance, wrapped in, of course, the patina of religiosity that gives it all kinds of protections and language that makes it seem harmless. But to the contrary.

And since that time, we have held events that include — we just hosted Tommy Robinson, one of the fiercest freedom fighters and advocates for Western civilization, and specifically Christianity in the United Kingdom, in the face of what one can only term as civilizational jihad, conquest, invasion throughout Europe. We also hosted Geert Wilders for this exact same purpose, parliamentarian in the Netherlands, all too aware of what happens when you open the floodgates to those who seek to [00:21:00] destroy you, again under the patina of religion.

Europe has essentially been conquered. Its dominant cities are, if not majority Islamic, they're certainly on the way there, just from sheer numbers coming in and birth statistics.

So just to take a step back, who are we? Athens and Jerusalem have been the foundations of the West. These include reason, science, inquiry, self-rule, rule of law, Judeo-Christian values. All of these are the underpinnings of who we are. We have unleashed the mind. We protect property. We have a God of love. We promote equality, meeting challenges, inquiry, and so on. All of these are exactly counter to [00:22:00] Islam, to Sharia.

These are all precepts that underlie all of who we are, that make us free, safe, and strong, and that have created the world that not even our grandparents could have imagined. And again, Islam is the complete opposite. It is premised on submission, as I said, which is the opposite of who we are. We are born out of the casting off of slavery, servitude, unquestioned subservience. Submission is not us.

It is an obligation for Muslims to convert or kill non-Muslims. That is not a way to coexist. It also has a primary tenet of taqiyya, which is the requirement to lie in order to advance Islam. Deceit is a key element, deceit in order to advance conquest. What of that has to do with peace? To the contrary, it is a method of war.

How does all this play out? Well, for one, the very notion of calling it a religion of peace. The absurdity is patent, and yet the more absurd the thing that they can [00:23:00] get you to believe, or at least parrot, the greater the domination.

Religion of peace? We've seen massacres at churches, news magazines, drawing contests, schools, meetings, people on the street — not to mention the hijacking of our planes and flying them into our buildings. Peace is not at issue in the slightest. Only once we have submitted — and then, of course, we would be living on our knees.

It is not a religion of peace nor of coexistence. The extent of the lie is breathtaking, and all of that is a feature, not a bug. Jihad itself takes many forms. It is sold to our students as an inner struggle. That is patently absurd. There is, of course, the violent kind. We're aware of that. But there's also civilizational jihad, rape jihad, birth jihad, other means of unrestricted warfare waged on us.

We don't need to imagine it. It's [00:24:00] not an abstract thing. We have their playbook, and we see it again played throughout Europe, and it's coming here unless we take steps — and soon — to stop it.

It always comes with the suppression of free speech. It comes part and parcel with fomenting fear. We saw a textbook battle literally about textbooks in Texas, the rewriting of Texan and U.S. history, the rebranding of landmarks that are uniquely Texan and putting them in an Islamic frame of reference. These are deceit and deception, a disdain for truth, and only oriented, again, toward domination.

We see creeping attacks through the culture: the mandatory halal food, the request to be mindful of dogs that are seen as unclean. We see the notion of freeing Palestine and "from the river to the sea." These are, of course, part of Islamization and [00:25:00] civilizational jihad in our streets, yes, on campuses. And of course, at the core these are anti-Israel, anti-Judaic, anti-Semitic.

There's a commensurate shaming of the United States, of our history, that is paired with the elevation of Islam. Again, I was just at a rally in London with Tommy Robinson where they overtly warn us of what happens. There were mothers there whose daughters were raped by gangs, killed by Muslims. There were girls who had been imprisoned for speaking out. Tommy Robinson himself was imprisoned for making a documentary on how these gangs operate, how they foment fear and prey on girls, destroying the girls, the family, society. Tommy himself was imprisoned. There are cities where over 42 percent — that's just the latest number — of children are in fact Muslim, and these numbers are increasing.

The U.K. is highly [00:26:00] sensitized to this. They see it, they're living it. It is not abstract. We also saw an inversion in London, that those protecting the country are painted as evil and those attacking it are protected. This is part and parcel of unrestricted warfare, and it's extremely dangerous.

Not only is the government not on the side of the patriots, but it foments a deeper hatred and propensity to violence, as we see time and again. Where patriots are painted as evil, people are too willing to take this perverted justice into their own hands. We've seen it before, we will see it again. This perversion is something else that they and the left have in common, part of the red-green alliance, and it is wildly dangerous.

I've been thinking too that, as there is O'Sullivan's Law that posits when an organization is not deliberately, overtly, mindfully, in everything it does, [00:27:00] conservative, it falls to the left, I think the same holds true, excuse me, with Christianity or Judeo-Christianity. If an organization or a nation does not have as a deliberately mindful effort maintaining its Christianity or its Judeo-Christianity, it will fall prey to an invasion of evil, including of Islam.

When deceit is a precept, when conquest is a fundamental goal, when the entire edifice is built on destruction of the West and on Judeo-Christianity specifically, when submission is the exact meaning, when it's described by themselves as seeking global dominance, we need to take heed.

This is not about peace. It is about conquest by any means necessary. As Robert Spencer said, it is supremacist, expansionist, [00:28:00] totalitarian. It seeks global conquest. Sharia is clear. It is nothing to do with peace. It is everything to do with dominance, and we must absolutely stop it wherever it surfaces, wherever it takes place, and at every opportunity. We have to stand up for what we know to be right and against this invasion and incursion. Thank you.

[00:28:24] **Frank Gaffney:** Dr. Siegemund, thank you. What a powerful call to action.

I'm thrilled to say that we have with us a man who has probably studied as closely as anyone the history of this strategy of conquest in practice. His name is William Federer, an extraordinary historian as well as raconteur of history. He too has published, I think, dozens of books. I've lost count, I will confess. But among them is *What Every American Needs to Know About the Qur'an*.

And we've asked William Federer to join us, and in particular I hope he will focus on [00:29:00] what's not just a matter of speculation about where today's Muslims in this country or elsewhere—

And let me simply say, we're not talking about all Muslims. We are talking about the Muslims who embrace Sharia and seek to impose it. The others — what some might call good Muslims, people perhaps you know or work with or are neighbors of, seemingly disinterested, to say the least, in any of this, perhaps they came here to get away from Sharia where they hail from originally — those are [00:30:00] called by those who are authorities of the faith bad Muslims, not good ones. Indeed, they have a name for them. They call them apostates. And we'll talk in the course of, I think, today's program, but certainly in future ones, about what that implies, what that entails, what that does to the Muslim population.

But suffice it to say, what we hope that William Federer will enumerate for us are the myriad examples throughout the history of the past 1,400 years, dating back to Muhammad's time, in which the character of this program, the sacred texts that inform it, and the fatwas that execute it up to this moment are evidence of the answer to this fundamental question: Is Sharia a religion of peace [00:31:00] or a strategy for war?

William Federer, welcome. Over to you, sir.

[00:31:06] **William Federer:** It's great to be with you, Frank. One of the things I look at is history, and so I go pre-Muhammad. What are the belief systems in the area of the world that he lived in?

Now, Muhammad was born in 570 A.D. His father dies before he's born. His mother dies when he's six. Grandfather and guardian die when he's eight. He's orphaned, taken in by an uncle, Abu Talib, who's a merchant who takes him on camel rides, goes to different cities, hears about different religions.

One of the popular ones was Manichaeism. As a matter of fact, St. Augustine was a follower of Manichaeism till he rejected it and became a Christian. But Mani said there are little bits of truth in every religion. And then there's the Zoroastrian religion in Persia that believed that paradise was filled full of virgins that would fulfill all of the guys' desires, and Muhammad heard that. It got incorporated into his belief system.

Mecca had 360 different pagan gods. The most popular was Hubal, the moon god, and their calendar began with the first sight of the crescent moon over the [00:32:00] desert. And they had where a meteor hit the hot desert sand, melted it into this brown glass, and so they put this rock in this square building, and they kissed it for centuries pre-Muhammad. And Muhammad kissed that rock. It got incorporated into his belief system.

The Jewish faith — Muhammad was illiterate. He could never read, but he heard their oral traditions, and a lot of those got incorporated into his belief system.

And then even *Encyclopaedia Britannica* says the Gospel was made known to Muhammad through apocryphal and heretical sources. So he thought the Trinity was the Father, Mary, and Jesus. Apocryphal — what's that? The *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*, written by someone several centuries after Christ who knew nothing of Jewish life, so it's filled full of so many errors no scholar takes it seriously. But it had little fanciful stories, like Harry Potter. Jesus made clay birds clap and they flew away, raised a clay man from the dead, spoke from the cradle. There's no other place that these stories appear other than this *Infancy Gospel* that nobody takes seriously, but Muhammad heard those stories. They're now in Islam taken as fact.

Muhammad is 25 years old, marries a wealthy widow, Khadija. She's 40. And [00:33:00] a movement was sweeping through Christianity at this time called monasticism. St. Anthony of the Desert came up with this idea of going into a cave and praying. So Muhammad goes into a cave and prays. A spirit appears to him, commands him to read. He says he cannot. It happens three times. And then Muhammad begins to recite, and somebody says, "How can somebody that's illiterate memorize these verses?" Well, in Arabic they had a little rhyme to them, very similar to rap music.

He goes back to his wife Khadija, tells her he thinks he's demon-possessed. She decides to test the spirit by removing her veils, and when she removes enough of them

and he says he doesn't see it anymore, she says, "Well, it must have been from God because it was embarrassed to look upon me without all my veils on."

610 A.D., he goes into Mecca and he feels there's something in his faith for everyone, and nobody likes it. And when his rich uncle dies, Abu Talib, they chase him out of town. Tries going to Al-Ta'if. They don't want him.

In 622 A.D., he flees north to a Jewish city called Medina. Three Jewish clans let him in, and they have intertribal warfare. They don't like each other, but they let Muhammad in. He goes into [00:34:00] the minority neighborhoods, organizes a following like a community organizer. When his following gets big enough, he pressures the Jews to a treaty. Now he's a political leader.

When his followers get confrontational, chased out of Mecca, he allows them to rob caravans headed back, and he gets verses from his Allah that Allah has given you the slave girls as your booty.

And so, 624 A.D., the Meccans send a thousand soldiers to protect their caravan. Muhammad defeats them at the Battle of Badr, and this convinces him to be a military leader. He fights in 66 battles and raids in the next eight years before he dies, killing 3,000 people.

And then the Meccans in 627 send ten thousand soldiers to Medina. Muhammad digs trenches all around the city. It's called the Battle of the Trench, which throws off the cavalry of the Meccans, and so they retreat.

Muhammad goes into the Jewish town and gets offended at the smallest of the three Jewish clans, confiscates their property, chases them out, and the other two clans sort of stand down. They had Trump-derangement [00:35:00] syndrome, like, "We hate that tribe. We're so glad they're gone." And now there are only two Jewish tribes.

Muhammad picks on the second one, confiscates their property, chases them out, and the big Jewish tribe stands down. "Well, they were always competition for me." Now there's one Jewish tribe.

And according to the Hadith, Muhammad is taking a bath and the spirit appears to him and says, "How can you rest when all his enemies are in your midst?" He says, "Where?" Points at that last Jewish neighborhood. He surrounds them for 25 days, brings them into the market, chops off their heads — six or seven hundred — sells women and children into slavery.

So within five years of Muhammad coming into the Jewish city of Medina as an immigrant, there is not a Jew left in the city of Medina. They were chased out, killed, or enslaved.

And so when Bandi Ahmad, February 26, ’26, said, “Islam is a religion built on a narrative of migration. The story of the Hijra reminds us that Prophet Muhammad was a stranger too. He fled Mecca and was welcomed in Medina.” Five years later, there was not a Jew left in Medina. They were chased out, killed, or enslaved.

And so it’s a three-step process: immigrate, [00:36:00] increase, eliminate. Immigrate as a religious refugee into a host community. Increase the number of your followers among the minorities and get involved in politics. And then you have random outbreaks of violence — acid attacks, knifings, rapes — and the previous inhabitants of the neighborhood no longer feel safe, and they move out, and you take over the neighborhood.

And so the fast way is you spread Islam with a sword. The slow way is you spread Islam through immigration, called dawah.

And so, five years after his death, every preexisting culture in Arabia is wiped out. And then they attack Jerusalem, which was a Byzantine Christian city. But because of a seventh-century war with Iran, Persia, they had beat each other up and left a power vacuum. So the bishop negotiates a deal. Instead of two choices — convert or die — you get a third choice. You can be a dhimmi, where you ransom your life once a year and pay Islam taxes to your new Muslim overlords. So that’s why when you have Somali Muslims coming into Minnesota, they have no problem living off the [00:37:00] tax base of the host country.

648 A.D., the Muslims conquer Syria, which was the first country that was completely Christian, evangelized by the Apostle Paul. The name Christian was first used in Syria.

And then in the 640s, the Muslims invade Egypt. You had Amr ibn al-As. The situation was the Byzantine Christians had been persecuting the Coptic Christians. And so the Muslims say, “Well, we’ll help you Copts drive out the Byzantines.” They did, and then they stayed and they took over. And the caliph Al-Hakim, the mad caliph, cut out the tongues of anybody caught speaking Coptic, eradicated an entire language.

And then they conquered North Africa, the Umayyads, in ten years. Why? Because of that monasticism movement, that if you’re really Christian, you’ll go into a cave and withdraw. It was their version of separation of church and state.

And so then in the year 711, they invade Spain. Same thing happens. You have Visigothic Christian kingdoms that do not get along. The Muslims would pick on one, the others would stand down, pick on another, and in ten years they conquered all of Spain, crossed the Pyrenees, conquered southern [00:38:00] France. They’re finally stopped outside of Paris at the Battle of Tours in 732 A.D., just one hundred years after the death of Muhammad in 632 A.D. It’s a military campaign. Now, if you read their version of the history, all their battles were defensive. It’s like, you’re Arabs and you’re outside of Paris

and you're calling this defensive? Right? So they can twist history to advance their agenda.

Then they conquer into Persia. And because of the seventh-century war between Persia and the Romans, you had Khalid ibn al-Walid, the Drawn Sword of Allah, undefeated in a hundred battles. He conquers Persia around 632.

Now, Persia was civilized. This is where Cyrus and Darius and Esther and Daniel were. And so now there's a moderating effect on Islam, and it's called the Islamic Golden Age. And you had Al-Rashid, and he has Buddhists in his court and Christians and women, and received a delegate from Charlemagne, sends back some presents, [00:39:00] and has a big library. And if you were to take a snapshot of the world, you would have thought Islam was about to experience the Renaissance.

But it all gets slapped down by al-Ghazali, a renewer of the faith, and he says, "Stop reading Greek stuff." And then the Mongols come through and sack Baghdad, kill about 100,000, burn the big library, and then the Turks take over.

And for 700 years the Turks are the main Muslim power, and they had made it to what is today Turkey, and all seven churches mentioned in the Book of Revelation were wiped out by the Muslim Turks. The Christians begged the West for help. The West sends help. It's called the Crusades. The Crusades end. The Muslims pick up where they left off, invade Serbia, Albania, Hungary, and then surround Vienna, Austria, in 1529.

Anyway, when they're conquering the East is when Columbus sets sail looking for the West. And so Columbus would have never set sail over here had it not been for jihad [00:40:00] conquering over there.

I could go on. They're stopped again at the Battle of Vienna in 1683 by Jan Sobieski. You had one of the descendants of Genghis Khan, Tamerlane, and he kills 17 million across Central Asia, wipes out Christianity. And then his descendants are the Mughal Muslim leaders of northern India.

You do have an anomaly with the Nusantara Muslims in Indonesia because they mixed in some Buddhist culture and became a little more moderate. And when the Dutch took over Indonesia for three centuries, whenever an imam would speak violence, they would arrest him. Another imam would speak violence, they would arrest him, until pretty soon the imams stopped speaking violence and again, it came up with a more moderate version of Islam in Indonesia.

But then the same thing happens in Europe. The king of France does not like the king of Spain, [00:41:00] and so the king of France, Francis I, makes a Franco-Ottoman treaty with Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent. And so now for three centuries you've got France continually upgrading the Ottoman military. And believe it or not, Napoleon was going to

be sent over to upgrade the Ottoman military, and he resigns. And then they get him back in the military. He later conquers Egypt.

And then, building up to World War I, the British need oil, and so they make a treaty with Iran. It's called the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, better known as BP. The Germans need oil, and they make a treaty with the Turks. Half of World War I was fought in the Middle East over oil.

After World War I, the Ottoman Empire is gone. That's when you have the British Mandate giving lands to the Jews. And you have leaders like Atatürk wanting to be more secular in Turkey. He said, "Muhammadism is [00:42:00] nothing more than Arab politics. It may have suited tribes in the desert. It's no good for a modern progressive state." You have Abdullah in Jordan, and he's friends with the Jews. And you see this pro-West movement until the Muslim Brotherhood is started in 1928, and they say, "We've got to get back to following Muhammad." And they based their agenda on the two cities Muhammad lived in, Mecca and Medina.

So the Muslim Brotherhood said, "Infiltrate countries as religious Muslims and then flip and become political and militant and do assassinations." And so they assassinated Abdullah on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem. They assassinated Anwar Sadat in Egypt. And so the Muslim leaders are wanting to be more friends with the West, but they don't want to get assassinated.

And then you add in the Soviet Union. And here they are doing their critical race theory, wanting to cause crises in countries so they won't be pro-West. And they have Yuri Andropov invent this concept called anti-Zionism in [00:43:00] 1964, recruit Yasser Arafat, and put him through his Soviet training. And the whole goal is to divide the Middle East so it won't be pro-American.

So you have this dynamic working where you have the red-green alliance. You have communists working together with Islamists against the West. And they'll fight it out among themselves if they ever win. But nevertheless, they both hate the West. Why? Because we have rights from a Creator, and this Creator is not a respecter of persons, so men and women and everybody are equal, and they don't like that. So I'll pause with that.

[00:43:55] **Frank Gaffney:** William Federer, nobody packs more history into less time than you do. And in the arc of that story, you have really helped, I think, very authoritatively answer the question we've set before us today. This strategy for war is not just an abstraction. It's been practiced for 1,400 years relentlessly and devastatingly.

Some of the numbers you've tossed out — Tamerlane alone's — are simply staggering, as are other examples one might cite of the use of Sharia as a means of changing the

course of history. And that is what its adherents are up to as we speak, including in the United States of America.

Let's open this up to a conversation with Dr. Siegemund and William Federer. I'm struck, Karen, by something you said about your recent [00:45:00] experience in Britain, where we saw possibly over a million people on the streets of London, a city now, as I understand it, populated by something like 20 percent Muslims, governed by a mayor who is, I believe, a Sharia-adherent Muslim, and increasingly subjected to various strictures that are essentially part of this program of domination.

What is the takeaway for the people of Britain, and what lessons are they suggesting we must learn now? You've mentioned Tommy Robinson as one. Another is our colleague Peter McIlvenna. This is not, again, an abstraction. This is happening in real time, this conquest. How is Britain dealing with it, [00:46:00] and what do you think are the most important lessons those who are fighting it would have us take away?

[00:46:05] **Dr. Karen Siegemund:** It was an extraordinary experience being there. We hear about it here, and as we had Tommy Robinson here, we had Geert Wilders here, as you mentioned Peter McIlvenna. We're all following what happens. Frank, you've been talking about it. Robert, William Federer, all of you, all the community I've been part of.

But here, much as it's very real to us, for the most part it is an abstraction. In London, on the other hand, it is anything but. When such a large proportion of the population is fully garbed, when you're reminded of aspects of Islam being penetrated into your daily life, and you feel it every day in every way — from halal signs to prayer calls to [00:47:00] halal food signs and so on — it is everywhere.

And when you know your own mayor feels that you are in the wrong, and when literally the prime minister shut off visas for other Christians, for other nationalists, to come into the country — Dominik Tarczyński, for example, from Poland, was denied entry, his visa was revoked. He was going to speak at the conference, at the rally. The rally was simply in support of the United Kingdom as it had been, the Kingdom of Great Britain.

When you feel that your government is against you, when people like Tommy are imprisoned and the rapists are not, when there's this massive inversion, when there's the policing of free speech, of public speech, of private speech, when it really takes [00:48:00] place every day in every way, when people are self-censoring — and the number of people I've spoken to who do self-censor, people you and I know, because you can be imprisoned or fined or worse, you can get fatwas against you. We know Geert Wilders again lives under this, Amy Mek here in this country. The dangers imposed by adherence to this so-called religion — which, of course, as we've been saying, is a totalitarian ideology that seeks full supremacy.

In London, they feel it daily in every way. But Tommy made the point at the rally that when he started doing this several years ago, numbers were smaller and there was far greater fear. His feeling — and this is one reason I support them the way that I do, and I know you're the same — is that we hope courage is contagious. [00:49:00] As fear and cowardice can be, so too we hope courage can be.

And Tommy, by standing up, Katie Hopkins by standing up, you by standing up, all the people who are warriors for this, Geert Wilders, Dom Tarczyński, who was beamed in, by the way — Tommy Robinson said, "You seriously, Keir, you don't think we have the internet?" — there is a ferocity that's developing, and I mean that just in terms of courage about speaking out, not in any violent way.

But there's also a serious harking to a restoration, a resurrection, if you will, of people's adherence to, and bitter clinging to, Christianity. England has always been a deeply Christian nation, much more than [00:50:00] we've allowed ourselves to consider that we are. There is a very real harking to Christianity. God and country are first and foremost in the fight against the Sharia invasion.

So they're getting increasingly courageous, not only in standing up against it, but in standing up for everything that made Britain great. Now, as an American, it was a little odd to be making Britain great again as we're celebrating our 250th independence from that same kingdom. But they are finding their own civilizational confidence again.

They're farther down the road, as you say, to have a Muslim mayor. But look, we've got it in New York City. One of our dominant contenders here in Los Angeles is a Muslim. It is creeping everywhere. It is creeping in at that level. It's creeping in school-board fights. It is creeping [00:51:00] everywhere.

So their warning to us is: it's very hard to turn the clock back. Don't let it get to where it's gotten with us. I have to believe that Tommy's rally really did light a fire of confidence under people. As he pointed out, the police were on their side, even in the face of their government, so—

[00:51:22] **Robert Spencer:** Mm.

[00:51:23] **Dr. Karen Siegemund:** The time to prevent it here is now. Learn from them, from Geert, from Tommy, from Katie, from Dominik Tarczyński. Look what just happened in Hungary.

We used to look to them as one of the bulwarks against this. Now we look to Poland. Stand up where you can, and don't let it get so far down the path that it is. Also, let's not forget about the numbers. You mentioned 20 percent. When they are having babies at five times the rate [00:52:00] we are, those numbers are very hard to fight. That math is ugly.

So there are many fronts on which we have to fight this. And it must be practiced.

[00:52:10] **Frank Gaffney:** Amen.

Bill, let me just ask you — again, it may be implicit in the story you've just laid before us, but just to put a fine point on it — the alternative to treating Sharia as a strategy of war is to accommodate it.

And I would ask you, throughout history, as well as in the inherent nature of the doctrine, the program, the agenda, the ideology, whatever you want to call it, the death cult, you have the instruction that when people don't resist, when the unbeliever, the infidel, the kafir, is [00:53:00] accommodating, there is a certain doctrinal response that is expected. I think it has something to do with making the enemy, making the unbeliever, feel subdued.

Could you speak to that? Because we're at a moment where, in Western civilization, Judeo-Christian civilization, that's being prescribed as the response. Is that what we would likely get a lot more of if we come away from this imparting to them the idea that we are weak, we are irresolute, we are accommodating in ways that will trigger that response?

[00:53:44] **William Federer:** Yeah. When they see weakness, they think that is Allah giving them their enemy. The word Islam means submission to the will of Allah. A Muslim is one who has submitted to the will of Allah, and they think there will be world [00:54:00] peace when the whole world submits to the will of Allah. So it is a religion of peace. It's just that their definition of the word peace is different from ours. Our definition is different groups getting along. Their definition is world Islam.

Now, a moderate Muslim thinks the world will submit to Allah later, maybe in the distant future, maybe at the end of the world, maybe it's even figurative. And since it's so far off, they really don't think about it, and they just want to live their lives. They're wonderful people, and they want to have you as a neighbor, as family, and as a friend.

The fundamental Muslims think the world is supposed to submit to Allah now, and they're really excited. They want to help make it happen. And the dilemma is, the fundamental Muslim is just as happy to kill a moderate Muslim as they are to kill an infidel, because they view the moderate Muslim as having departed from the way of Allah — being a religious leader, a political leader, and a military leader.

And so when terrorists do an attack and the non-Muslim world comes down strong, the moderates are happy to shelter under the Western umbrella, [00:55:00] enjoy the food, the fashions, and so forth. But when the non-Muslim world does not come down strong and the terrorists are threatening to kill them, they think, "Well, if you're not going to

defend us and they're threatening to kill us, I guess we have to lean into becoming more in line with the fundamental viewpoint."

I liken it to if a drug gang's taken over your neighborhood and they're on your front lawn. You call the police, and the police show up and arrest them. Are you going to call the police again? Well, yeah. But if you call the police and they don't show up — worse, the gang leader comes to your door and says, "We have somebody on the inside of the police department, and they said you snitched. If you do it again, we'll kill you." Are you going to call the police anymore? Probably not. And so that's the dilemma.

Weakness invites aggression. And when they see a weak response, they get more aggressive. I actually talked to soldiers who were there in Iraq. When we first took over, there was peace. But then when we started handing out soccer balls and candy to show how nice we were, that's when the [00:56:00] violence began.

Very similar to Napoleon. When he conquered Egypt, those Muslims were afraid of the French. But then when the British destroyed the French fleet at the Battle of the Nile and Napoleon was trapped in Egypt, and he tried to start accommodating the Muslims and becoming nice to them, that's when they started attacking the French soldiers. And Napoleon said, "Every day we had to kill a few more of them because they only respect strength." And they finally took up their last stand inside the mosque, because a mosque is a religious building, a political building, and a military building. It's all three.

I actually talked to a soldier one time, and he had been assigned a deployment over there in the Middle East. He was opening up his MRE, Meals Ready to Eat, and these little Muslim boys are coming around, and he gives a couple of them his chocolate candy bar. And one of them stabs him in the arm, and he's like, "Ah, ah." And this soldier — he's out of the military now — looked at me and said, "Why did he stab me?" And I said, [00:57:00] "You're showing weakness. You're inviting aggression."

Kamal Saleem is a former Muslim terrorist who came to America to recruit, gets in a car accident, and has to have neck surgery. The doctor took care of him for six months recuperating, and the doctor was a Christian, witnesses to him, and he tells his testimony. He says, "I could kill everybody in the house. Nobody would know." But he didn't. And then when he's leaving, he says, "But at least the doctor confronted him and said, 'You're worshiping Satan.'" And he says, "I was so mad at him, but he was taking care of me."

Then when he's leaving, the doctor gives him keys to a used car and says, "Your car was smashed." So he goes back to his apartment, and he kneels down and says, "Oh Allah, I was supposed to hate these people, and they're so nice." And he says, "You know what Allah told me? Nothing." So he pulls out a gun. He's about to kill himself, and he says Jesus walked into the room. I don't know if figuratively or however, but He said,

“You’re about to take your life. Why don’t you give it to me?” That’s when he became a Christian.

But Kamal Saleem [00:58:00] talks about how, when they sense you’re afraid of them, they take that as an indicator from Allah that they’re supposed to attack you. Very similar to if you run from a dog, the dog will chase you, right? But if you stop and turn and yell at the dog, it will stop. If you show fear, fear invites aggression. It’s the law of the jungle.

There’s a psychologist, Nicolai Sennels, and he says, “Muslims instinctively see our lack of reaction as fear. It is an invitation to attack.” So they only respect strength. Historically, whenever they lost major battles — Battle of Malta, September 11, 1565, this was the first loss on the Mediterranean — they went back and were peaceful for a while. When they lost the Battle of Lepanto in 1571, 230 Muslim ships were captured or sunk, they became moderate and peaceful for a while. And then when they lost the Battle of Vienna on September 11, 1683, this major defeat, [00:59:00] they were less violent for a generation or so.

Whenever they experienced a strong response, they go back and lick their wounds. Unfortunately, they usually kill a lot of the minority people in their own areas. They want to take out their aggression on their minorities. But as far as aggression on the outside, they are not. Trump’s response was to show strength, and that causes them to back up. Biden, Obama, John Kerry, Hillary Clinton — they were giving them money and giving them guns, and that was doing nothing but encouraging them.

And then here we are with Trump. We have to realize that the very fact that you’re negotiating, they view as meaning you’ve already lost.

[00:59:50] **Frank Gaffney:** Yes.

[00:59:51] **William Federer:** They think they’ve lost when they’re begging you to negotiate. But when you’re wanting to [01:00:00] negotiate with them, they think, well, you haven’t defeated them. It’s like Muhammad at the Battle of the Trench. When the Meccans came up with their 10,000 soldiers and they weren’t able to defeat him and they left, he considered that a victory.

[01:00:12] **Frank Gaffney:** I think it’s fair to say that were we to do the same with the Iranians at the moment, they would perceive it not only as a matter of survival, but actually a victory as well.

Could I just ask you to drill down on something you touched on there a moment ago, Bill? Because, as you know, one of the major impetuses behind the Sharia-supremacist drive to take down the United States of America has been the buildout of infrastructure,

notably with the impetus of the Muslim Brotherhood, but foreign funding from Saudi Arabia and Qatar and Turkey and other places.

Would you just describe a little bit more the nature [01:01:00] of the mosque, going back to the day of the so-called perfect man, Muhammad, what he did with mosques, how he utilized them as a template for what is happening — if not in absolutely every single one of them, certainly in some — and what that might portend in terms of the homeland security of our nation?

[01:01:28] **William Federer:** Yeah. They view it as a military beachhead.

I've talked to people who had been Muslims. One young man, a Black man in prison, had converted to Islam, and then he left. He says, "Yeah, the mosques, they have basements, they have false closets, they have machine guns, they have artillery." I said, "Like artillery?" He said, "Yeah, they've got everything in there." He said, "They're going to take over America eventually." I said, "What?" He said, "Yeah, they're just waiting for the right signal."

And so they view it as conquest. I talked to another Muslim who had become a Christian. His name's Mark Christian. His dad was a famous imam in Egypt who tried to kill him, and he tried to flee the country. He says whenever they build a mosque, they think they're building themselves a palace for the next life. [01:02:00]

[01:02:22] **Frank Gaffney:** Hmm.

[01:02:23] **William Federer:** So the wealthy Muslims want to build these mosques, whether people go to them or not. They still think they're securing their future. And then they think whatever neighborhood is within sight of the mosque, they claim for Islam. It's sort of similar — if you were in a foreign country and you happened to see a church on a hill with a cross, just being in sight of that church, you'd feel, "Well, I guess I'm a little bit safer in this neighborhood." But they view it that if they can see the mosque, everything within sight of it belongs to Islam.

[01:02:56] **Frank Gaffney:** Is it also the case that they're sort of [01:03:00] multiuse facilities, in the sense that, again, going back to Muhammad's time, they are not only used to organize and dominate and direct the community, it provides certain social services and the like, education in Islamic studies and that sort of thing, but also the idea that, as this little book about the Muslim Brotherhood's plan for the United States talks about — it's called the *Explanatory Memorandum on the General Strategic Goal of the Group in North America*, written by a top Muslim Brotherhood operative, as you know, Bill — that spoke of the battalions associated with the mosques.

And is there a tradition, is there a history, is there likely a continuing emulation of Muhammad in today's mosques, where they would be used as arsenals, perhaps to train in the use of weapons as [01:04:00] well as to plan such use?

[01:04:02] **William Federer:** Yeah. And it's interesting — the Muslim Student Association, they're getting millions of dollars, and they're probably the largest student associations on most big campuses now. They have hundreds, and they'll be the ones to push back when you have Charlie Kirk-type people wanting to do debates. The Muslim Student Association will say, "They're accusing us, they're intolerant of us, they're spreading hate," and so they get them all shut down.

But yeah, I actually talked to this one Black man again who had been in prison, and he said he had to join the Black Muslims because, he said, if you don't join any gang, they all pick on you. So you have the white Aryan gang and the Asian gang, the Latino gang, but then the Black Islamic gang. And he said that they would station people at the door to watch for the guards, and then they would practice fighting, practice disarming, practice all this killing stuff. And then when a [01:05:00] guard would walk by, they'd quickly act like they were just praying.

Then he said they would chant verses until they got, like, high — like a negative pep rally. They would just keep chanting these verses and verses.

So then he gets out, and he's been Islamicized, and he goes to the mosque for a while, but he's living with his parents. And then he says his mom kept cooking food with pork in it that he ate when he was a kid, and he'd get all mad at her and yell at her. And then finally he ate some, and he said, "Well, I guess I'm not a Muslim anymore."

But they use prisons as recruiting places. On campuses, they use their twisted history, and they say that just like the New Testament superseded the Old Testament, the Quran supersedes the New Testament — very similar to Joseph Smith and Mormonism, right? An angel appears to him and says you can have lots of women. And so Muhammad had this spirit appear to him, say you can have lots of women, and anybody [01:06:00] can probably start a movement if you tell male followers that they can get lots of women.

And so it's a unique cocktail of motivations — lust and religious fervor. St. Thomas Aquinas said Muhammad seduced the people by promises of carnal pleasure. Those who followed him were brutal men, desert wanderers, who Muhammad forced to become his followers by the violence of his arms. Muhammad was illiterate, his original followers were illiterate, and he says, "If you join, you get four wives plus as many extra women as your right hand possesses. And if you die, you get 72 women. And if you don't join right now, we'll kill you." And so it's a pretty convincing argument to illiterate men.

[01:06:48] **Frank Gaffney:** Karen Siegemund, one of the other lines of attack, or jihad, if you will, is in the educational arena. As I said earlier, you've spent your life in [01:07:00] it. Bill has talked a little bit about what's taking place on campuses, but what about in the curricula? We've seen, particularly in the state of Texas recently, a major thrash in the State Board of Education over the K-12 social studies curriculum.

Can you talk us through the role of organizations like the Council on American-Islamic Relations? First of all, remind us of the designation of that group along with the Brotherhood. But what they're doing to wage this jihad through the classroom.

[01:07:36] **Dr. Karen Siegemund:** Absolutely. We see this time and time and time again throughout history. Those who seek total global domination — totalitarian dictators, anybody with a mindset in that general direction — know that the best, most efficient, most effective way to effect that is through the kids, and therefore through [01:08:00] the schools.

We saw this with China, and now we're seeing this also with jihad waged in this exact same way through the curricula. First, to Bill's point, first you take Christianity out. You take the God of the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament out, and you're left with a tremendous vacuum, just for starters.

Then you whitewash Islam as another religion, and jihad, Islam, is taught as the religion of peace. Jihad is the inner struggle. It's all absolutely whitewashed from the get-go, so it's just this lovely, peaceful thing.

And where Christianity is denigrated, Judaism is denigrated, the United States is denigrated, Islam on the other hand is painted as this wonderful thing. This is what kids then therefore are taught. They know this as [01:09:00] the truth. They also know "from the river to the sea." They know "free Palestine." They know Israel is genocidal. They know poor Palestinians are beset by all kinds of bad things imposed upon them by Israel.

[01:09:15] **Frank Gaffney:** Victims. Victims.

[01:09:15] **Dr. Karen Siegemund:** They are victims. And so it's, again, this utter inversion. And it is what they are taught, so it does become what they believe to be true.

The riots that we saw on October 8 and October 9, instead of being in defense of Israel, were completely anti-Israel. This is the direct result of a long-term infiltration of our schools, so that kids see this happening and feel that, oh my gosh, this was a completely justified reaction on behalf of the Gazans against the genocidal Israelis.

And when you talk about [01:10:00] jihadi schools or Muslim schools as they're trying to put in place in Texas, it's only that much worse. When you have kids taught to bow down to Allah as part of just a studies class, as you say, this is deeply, deeply disturbing

because not only are they learning that that's okay, but at the same time they're learning that the religion that is their birthright in these United States, the religions that form our load-bearing walls to all that we are and all that we have, when they're taught that those are evil but bowing to Allah is good, there's a perversion throughout our culture that [01:11:00] is very hard to unwind.

And let me just also add to Bill's point. Donald Trump was invoked a lot at this rally because of his — putting aside the deal-making—

[01:11:10] **Frank Gaffney:** In Britain.

[01:11:10] **Dr. Karen Siegemund:** —in Britain — the strength, the confidence, the saying, "Make America great again," allowing people to feel that this kind of thing is okay. Who would imagine that we need someone to say that this is okay, but they do. And we have as well.

So leading with strength, peace through strength, having that confidence is absolutely key. They will attack where they feel there is weakness, so standing up with strength is absolutely key. We [01:12:00] need to make sure that this doesn't happen in our schools as well.

[01:12:10] **Frank Gaffney:** Bill, on the school thing — and Karen, you may want to comment on this too — I've been struck by the fact that one of the textbooks that is often used in American education, higher education so-called, is something called *The Qur'an, the Early Verses*. And one finds in such a text the pieces of the Quran — you've chronicled them in your wonderful book about what every American needs to know about the Quran — that are relatively peaceable and tolerant, specifically loving of the people of the book, the Christians and Jews.

And it is in part the promotion of those verses, whether in academic settings or otherwise, often at the hands of Muslim Brotherhood propagandists, by the way, that we are encouraged to believe it is a religion of peace, it's a great Abrahamic faith, it's got [01:13:00] a lot in common with both Judaism and Christianity.

You've mentioned the parts of those faiths that have been expropriated by this operation. Could you just speak quickly to the point that if you don't understand that those early passages have been abrogated under Sharia, and thereby replaced by those that came later, which are decidedly not peaceable, not tolerant, and certainly not loving of Christians and Jews, then you fall prey to this false narrative that really it isn't, well, a strategy of war at all?

[01:13:36] **William Federer:** Yeah, so there are two sets of verses in the Quran: the verses Muhammad got in Mecca and the verses he gets in Medina. In Mecca, he was just a religious leader, so those verses are more moderate. As you mentioned, "be

friends with the Christians and the Jews." If he has any doubts about his revelation, he should ask the people of the book.

Then he's driven out of Mecca, goes to [01:14:00] Medina in 622 A.D., and the verses he gets there are political and military. And the later verses supersede the earlier verses.

By way of comparison, in the Bible there are two sets of verses. The Old Testament has some violence in it — Moses and Joshua wiping out tribes. The New Testament — Jesus and the apostles never killed anybody. So what do we say? Well, the last example is the one we're going to try to follow.

It's the same way in Islam, only in reverse. Their peaceful verses came first, when Muhammad was a religious leader in Mecca. They are called weak verses, and they're superseded or abrogated by the verses he gets in Medina. They're called strong verses. So yeah, they can pull out some of those weak verses, but among themselves they know they don't follow those, the same way Christians are not encouraged to follow Joshua's example of wiping out tribes.

Another interesting thing is drive, neutral, reverse. [01:15:00] Western civilization has gone from a Judeo-Christian past — like a thousand years of Catholic cathedrals in Europe, a Protestant Reformation, and Jewish neighborhoods — to a secular neutral with the French Revolution: free sex, anything goes, there's no God, do whatever you want, and John Lennon's song "Imagine": "Imagine there's no heaven. It's easy if you try." And no religion too.

And so now they don't have any religion. They don't have any guidelines, and they tolerate everything. They actually guilt-trip Christians into being more tolerant than Christ. So if you're Christian, they say you'll tolerate us teaching the trans agenda. Would Jesus teach it? Well, no. And they say, "Well, you've got to tolerate this if you're Christian. You've got to tolerate that," until pretty soon you're tolerating everything.

And then Islam comes in and says, "Well, you've got to tolerate us too."

[01:15:50] **Dr. Karen Siegemund:** Mm.

[01:15:50] **William Federer:** And then they have an aggressive agenda to take over. It's very similar to an immunodeficiency syndrome.

[01:15:58] **Dr. Karen Siegemund:** Mm-hmm.

[01:15:58] **William Federer:** What's that? It's where your immune system doesn't work, [01:16:00] and a virus comes in and is allowed to grow and multiply, and your immune system does not recognize it as a threat.

So when the Muslims first came into India, they had 300 million different gods for centuries. And when Islam comes in under Muhammad bin Qasim, they're like, "Oh, a new religion, a new god. Fine, the water's warm, jump on in." The Hindu mind could not conceive of an exclusive religion. "It's just our Islamic ways. We've had millions of gods for millennia. It'll be fine. You just come on in." No, no, no — it's not just our Islamic religion.

The Hindu mind was incapable of recognizing the threat.

Then what happened? As a result, the Muslims conquered northern India. The woke mindset is incapable of identifying the threat. The woke mindset says, "We've got to tolerate this, we've got to tolerate that. We've got to tolerate every kind of sexual behavior," [01:17:00] 72 different genders, 150 different genders, it can change every day. You've got to tolerate, tolerate, tolerate until finally they tolerate Sharia, which has a 1,400-year track record of coming in sort of like an invasive species.

[01:17:13] **Dr. Karen Siegemund:** Mm-hmm.

[01:17:13] **William Federer:** Right? So you have domestic species and then invasive species. You've got ants and you have fire ants, and you have bees and killer bees. Somebody let pythons loose in the Everglades, and there are no natural predators, and they're growing 20 feet long, swallowing 80 percent of all these ground critters.

Islam comes into a host country, and when the host country has this woke immunodeficiency syndrome, they don't recognize the threat and it comes in. That's why the Eastern Europeans — Poland and Hungary, until fairly recently — have a fresher memory of [01:18:00] Islamic fighting.

[01:18:02] **Frank Gaffney:** Yes.

[01:18:02] **William Federer:** But the Western Europeans had none of that because the Eastern Europeans were the cushion in between the Ottoman Empire—

[01:18:10] **Frank Gaffney:** Right.

[01:18:10] **William Federer:** —and Western Europe.

[01:18:13] **Frank Gaffney:** Bill, this is so important, and I hate to truncate your recitation of history, which is unbelievably impressive always. But we have to wrap.

I want to thank both Dr. Karen Siegemund and William Federer, as well, of course, as Robert Spencer, for tremendously important responses to this very fundamental question. And it is hard to overstate how vital it is that we get this right.

If we fail to appreciate that Sharia is not a religion of peace, is not a religion, period, we are condemned to giving it protections, giving it latitude, giving it a weak response,

however you want to characterize it, that assures it will [01:19:00] be, once again, the instrument, the plan, the strategy, however you want to describe it, for conquest and war. And in the process, this nation, like so many before it, will be forced to submit, will be subjected to bloodlettings of an unimaginable size, and will in the end cease to be the bulwark against not only this totalitarian ideology, but all the other ones, and the end, ultimately, of what's left of the free world.

I'm fond of pointing out, as my old boss Ronald Reagan did, that every generation faces an existential threat to freedom. This, ladies and gentlemen, is ours. And what is next is either, as he put it, [01:20:00] telling our children and our children's children what it was like to live in the United States when men were free, or protecting it and assuring its survival and, indeed, its greatest days, which we want to have ahead of us, because that's what we want to bequeath to our children and our grandchildren.

Thank you so much for joining us for this first of the series. We hope that you will be part of those going forward. And in the meantime, that you will stay abreast of all the work we're doing with our campaign to save Texas and save America at BanSharia.com. Join us there, and support our work if you would, please: BanSharia.com.

God bless you all. Over and out.