

## What Does “Never Again” Mean?

Obama penned an op-ed in the *Los Angeles Times* on February 17 in which he addressed “Our fight against violent extremism.” His only references to Islam were to emphasize what he calls a “true peaceful nature” which terrorists “betray,” and to insist that the United States is not at war with the religion.

To be blunt, what Obama wrote is unadulterated drivel. He begins by stating, “The United States has made significant gains against terrorism.” Although there have been some welcome gains against terrorism in the past, ISIS is growing in strength. That “core” al-Qaeda leadership may have been temporarily “decimated” is irrelevant because ISIS is gaining every day far more fighters than al-Qaeda may have lost. Tens of thousands of loyal foot soldiers willing to be martyrs for a religious and ideological cause more than makes up for the killing of a few leaders in a drone strike.

Tellingly, Obama refers to the Islamic State/ISIS as “the terrorist group we call ISIL.” Arguably, it is mostly Obama and members of his administration who use the term ISIL—largely because Obama is afraid to label it an “Islamic State.” Obama nonchalantly lists a handful of terrorist atrocities “in recent months” as if they were few and far between: “In Nigeria and neighboring countries, Boko Haram kills and kidnaps men, women and children.” In fact, Boko Haram has brutally killed *thousands* of innocent people. “In the face of this challenge,” states Obama, “we must stand united internationally and here at home.” But stopping the viciousness of ISIS, al-Qaeda, Boko Haram, and other such groups is far more than a “challenge.” It is a *moral imperative*.

“We know that military force alone cannot solve this problem,” writes Obama—although no one is making that claim. Reasonable and thinking people, however, understand that overwhelming military force should be used to defeat the advancing enemy before worrying about addressing root causes of Islamist jihad. When one’s house is burning down, putting out the flames takes precedence over determining the cause of the fire. But while the world’s terrorist fires burn, Obama keeps busy insisting there is a non-Islamic accelerant. He wants to “confront” the terrorist recruiters, propagandists, and “enablers.” No, Mr. Obama, they should not be *confronted*. They should be *eradicated*, and eradicating their recruits on the battlefield should take priority.

Laughably, Obama’s “important step” in combatting terrorism is a summit that will “focus... on empowering local communities.” (The United States defeated Nazi Germany by bombing Dresden and Berlin, not by engaging in dialogue with German-Americans in Milwaukee biergartens.) Predictably, Obama maintains, “Groups like al Qaeda and ISIL promote a twisted interpretation of religion that is rejected by the overwhelming majority of the world’s Muslims.” Some might argue that the jihadists are not *misinterpreting* Islam; they are following it *to the letter*. That, however, is largely irrelevant. The terrorist armies must be defeated, regardless of the purity of the color of their ideological uniforms. Obama calls on the world to “lift up the voices of Muslim clerics and scholars who teach the true peaceful nature of Islam.” But Obama himself seems unable to find such clerics and scholars, inasmuch as he surrounds himself with and seeks advice from

supporters of the radical Muslim Brotherhood—which he naively (or deceptively) claims is “moderate.”

Note that Obama has named Rashad Hussain to head the State Department’s Center for Strategic Counterterrorism Communications. Hussain has spoken out on behalf of Sami al-Arian, a Florida professor and activist who pleaded guilty and who was convicted of conspiring to aid the Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ). Former Attorney General John Ashcroft once called the PIJ “one of the most violent terrorist organizations in the world.” Walid Shoebat has called Hussain “an infiltrator whose allegiances lie with the OIC [Organization of Islamic Conference], not the U.S. Constitution he swore an oath to uphold,” and “...Hussain was at the fourth annual ‘Istanbul Process’ summit, held in Doha, Qatar. During his speech, he actually boasted about working with a confirmed Muslim Brotherhood front group that seeks the destruction of the United States from within.”

Obama continues with more insanity: “We can help Muslim entrepreneurs and youths work with the private sector to develop social media tools to counter extremist narratives on the Internet.” Obama apparently believes the right Facebook message will persuade jihadists to throw away their suicide vests and put down their AK-47s so they can open “Prayer Rugs R Us” stores in al-Baghdadi. He goes on: “We know from experience that the best way to protect people, especially young people, from falling into the grip of violent extremists is the support of their family, friends, teachers and faith leaders.” He “knows” that? What evidence does he have that they have been successfully keeping young people from being brainwashed by radical Islam? On the contrary, many young ISIS recruits have been lured into the war by extremist friends, family members, madrassa teachers, and faith leaders. Many mosques are, in fact, hot-beds of recruiting activity. Obama thinks “community leaders” with “innovative partnerships in their cities” will “empower communities to protect their loved ones from extremist ideologies.” Where is the evidence of that? It is not “innovative partnerships” that are needed. What is needed is the arrest, conviction, and imprisonment of the men and women who plot to take down Western civilization—or killing them on the battlefield if they get that far. Obama believes “The world has to offer today’s youth something better” in order to keep them from becoming terrorists. The world already *does* offer them something better. *It is called Western Civilization.*

Obama absurdly argues, “Governments that deny human rights play into the hands of extremists who claim that violence is the only way to achieve change”—as if radical jihadists will go away if only Saudi Arabia would permit gay marriage and give women drivers licenses. Obama fails to recognize the obvious: the extremists do not seek *more* human rights; they seek to *limit* human rights. More claptrap: “Efforts to counter violent extremism will only succeed if citizens can address legitimate grievances through the democratic process and express themselves through strong civil societies.” What are the “legitimate grievances” of the radical Islamists? That gays are allowed to live? That Jews, Christians, Buddhists, Hindus, and atheists have not been eradicated from the face of the earth? That music has not been outlawed world wide? That the Kardashians expose too much skin? The simple truth is that the radical jihadists have no legitimate grievances.

Nor did Adolph Hitler, Joseph Stalin, Mao Tse-Tung, John Wayne Gacy, Jeffrey Dahmer, or Charles Manson. *Evil must be eradicated, not given therapy sessions.* Obama's solution to terrorism is to provide "economic, educational and entrepreneurial development so people have hope for a life of dignity." Was Major Nidal Malik Hasan denied any of those things? Is Obama claiming that if the Fort Hood command had been more concerned with "Soldier of Allah" Hasan's "entrepreneurial development" perhaps he would not have taken the lives of 14 people in a shooting spree? (Yes, I am counting in that total the unborn child of his pregnant victim.)

Obama states that al-Qaeda and ISIL are "peddling the lie that the United States is at war with Islam." But he refuses to accept that radical Islam is at war with the United States—and all of Western civilization. The United States *should* be at war, not with all Muslims, of course, but with the radical Islamists. Reasonable people can differentiate between peaceful Muslims and Muslim terrorists. (During World War II, the U.S. military certainly did not seek to kill all Germans and Japanese; it attacked those who sought our destruction.) That Obama refuses to accept or state that there even *are* radical Islamists who seek to destroy all who disagree with them is the problem—not a lack of after-school programs for young people.

With radical Islamists now killing tens of thousands of innocent people every year, Obama reaches back to 2012 to note "killings at a Sikh temple in Wisconsin" and "at a Jewish community center in Kansas last year." He apparently got the message that bringing up the Crusades was preposterous, yet he could not resist again preaching—albeit at a smaller scale—that "Christians can be evil too!" Obama further declares that "many Muslim Americans across our country are worried and afraid." He does not explain why—beyond implying that the recent terrible North Carolina shootings over a parking space dispute were motivated by religion. But there has been no widespread discrimination against Muslims. Jews face far more persecution and violent acts in the United States (and especially in Europe) than do Muslims. In fact, Americans seem to bend over backwards *not* to offend Muslims, because being labeled an "Islamophobe" is fast becoming as objectionable as being called a racist. "Americans of all faiths and backgrounds," writes Obama, "must continue to stand united with a community in mourning and insist that no one should ever be targeted because of who they are, what they look like, or how they worship." Perhaps Obama should be delivering *that* message to terrorists, rather than worrying that the unemployment rate in Copenhagen might be pushing Muslims toward jihad.

Obama concludes, "Our campaign to prevent people around the world from being radicalized to violence is ultimately a battle for hearts and minds. With this week's summit, we'll show once more that—unlike terrorists who only offer misery and death—it is our free societies and diverse communities that offer the true path to opportunity, justice and dignity." Obama is blissfully unaware that the radical Islamists *do not want* "free societies and diverse communities." They want strict Sharia law and communities *without* diversity. Further, the "battle for hearts and minds" is necessarily secondary to killing the savages who would just as eagerly cut out the heart of his enemy as behead

him. Obama is not only putting the cart before the horse, he seems uninclined to ever bother harnessing the horse.

While the generals in command of our military beg to be free of the burdens of political correctness and free to unleash the terror of U.S. weaponry and manpower against ISIS, al-Qaeda, and Boko Haram, Obama works to staff an army of Twitter and Facebook nerds to “offer opportunity, justice and dignity” to crazed lunatics whose evil ideology has been drummed into their heads since they were old enough to sneeze. “If only we had more Marie Harfs with hashtags” Obama may be thinking.

While we conducted as many as 1,100 air strikes per day against Saddam Hussein, Obama’s “strategic patience” doctrine seems to allow only 7-10 per day against ISIS. What the battle needs is not 140 characters per tweet, but 140 rounds per second. What the war needs is a leader, one who will speak forcefully and drop some bunker busters, not one who endlessly preaches sophomoric drivel when not carrying a nine-iron. What the nation needs is be reminded that when “Never again!” was said after World War II, the message did not pertain only to Zyklon B; it also pertained to beheadings, crucifixions, and burning and burying people alive. The United States has a *moral obligation* to defeat radical Islamists. If we do not do it, no one else will. That Barack Hussein Obama refuses to lead is certainly a shameful hindrance, but it should not prevent this nation from doing what it needs to do to restore sanity and civility to the world. All civilized people must *demand* action. If we fail to do so, we should never again dare utter the words, “Never again!”

*Don Fredrick*  
*February 18, 2015*