

Australia Foolishly Grants Citizenship to a Muslim Man Who Beat His Sisters

As reported by the ABC just this week.

A story to boggle the mind, especially as right now all over social media people are pushing the meme that because to date more people have been killed by domestic abusers than by terrorists, we should focus on countering domestic violence rather than on counter-terrorism, or even that the – to date – higher death toll from domestic violence means that terrorism – the global jihad – isn't real or isn't important (people who make this second "argument" tend to glide over the fact that it is only the vigilance of our police and homeland security people, combined with a dollop of luck, that has prevented would-be jihadis from mass murdering rather a lot of us.) But what if Islam and its adherents are strongly correlated not only with jihad but with violence against women? Why are not those who are worried about domestic violence just as unenthusiastic about the importation of Muslims, as those who are worried about Jihad? And so to our sister-beating Afghan Muslim, now the possessor of Australian citizenship.

<http://www.abc.net.au/news/2015-06-09/afghan-man-wins-legal-battle-for-citizenship-despite-assault/6531100>

"Afghan Man (sic: "Afghan Muslim Man" – CM) Wins Legal Battle for Australian Citizenship, Despite Beating Sisters with Tree Branch".

'An Afghan man (that is, "An Afghan Muslim man" – CM) has won a battle for Australian citizenship despite admitting to beating his sisters with a tree branch.

'When the man arrived in Australia in late 2008, he took over

the care of his two younger twin sisters.

'While living in Mildura in Victoria, he found the then 14-year-old girls having a conversation of a sexual nature with an older man on Facebook.

*I would like to know what hard third-party external evidence there is for this "conversation" having happened at all, and if it did, exactly what it involved, given that an Afghan Muslim's view of what constitutes a conversation "of a sexual nature" is not necessarily the same as ours. What if everything boils down to "he **said** he found..."? – CM*

'He hit them with a tree branch and said their behaviour was against their culture.

*Note that his first reaction seems to have been to punish his sisters, not to report the online predator (**did** he report the predator?) Let us consider, for purposes of comparison, what might happen if an Aussie – or British, or American, or Canadian – elder-brother found his under-aged sister or sisters being "groomed" on FB by an older man. Would the older brother's first reaction be to grab a broomstick and thrash his sisters? Or would it not, rather, be to identify the older man and report same to the police, at once? Followed by a stern lecture to little sister/s on the subject of staying safe in cyberspace? – CM*

'Teachers at the girls' school noticed bruises (*the bruises must have been pretty obvious, to draw attention like that – CM*) and the man was charged over the incident.

'Incident". Rather – Assault, or attack. Hitting two 14 year old girls hard enough, with a branch – how big and heavy was it – to leave bruises, on face or arms or legs, big enough and long-lasting enough for a schoolteacher to notice and be worried enough to notify the police, is a criminal assault, not an 'incident". – CM

'The charges were later dismissed, after he completed a behaviour change program.

So he went through the motions, glibly repeated whatever he thought the silly infidels would like to hear, and slithered free without even going to jail. Even common-or-garden domestic abusers of the infidel variety are notorious for recidivism. So why is everyone so sure that this Afghan Muslim is a changed man? – CM

'However, authorities refused his application for Australian citizenship because they said he was not of good character.

True. He was not. – CM

'The man appealed against the decision in the Administrative Appeals Tribunal (AAT) and described it as a one-off incident.

Suuure. Until the next time...and can we really be sure that there won't be a next time? What if one of his sisters decided she wanted to go out with – or even marry – an Aussie Infidel who wasn't converting to Islam? What if one of his sisters showed signs of wanting to apostasise, or merely wanted to doff the hijab, or evinced other signs of rebellion and independent-mindedness? What then? – CM

'He told the tribunal he now had a good relationship with his sisters.

And the external evidence for this, was...? In any case: anyone familiar with Phyllis Chesler's discussions of "honor" murders or with the descriptions of the numerous cases that have happened within Muslim families within the West knows that the "good relationship" of today can morph into something else entirely, tomorrow. That girls marked for death have been lured into the family bosom by smiling kin – even mothers, sisters, aunties – expressly in order that they may be killed.

– CM

'The AAT found that the man was genuinely remorseful (really...how can they possibly be sure of this? what if they have got it wrong? why is not the precautionary principle being applied – CM) and should be granted citizenship.'

And so we have awarded Aussie citizenship to a Muslim man who bashed his little sisters with a tree-branch. A man who grew up in Islam-addled Afghanistan. If, further down the track, he again attacks or even kills his sisters – or, in time, his wife or his daughter/s, should he acquire a wife and daughter/s, or should he attack or even rape or kill some infidel "uncovered meat", then the AAT will have egg on its face and blood on its hands. And unless the laws are changed in the meantime, having given him citizenship, we will find it difficult or impossible to send him back to Afghanistan, whence he should never have been permitted to enter Australia in the first place.

For more on why it is such a foolish idea – especially if one wishes to curb and even reduce the incidence of domestic violence within one's country – to import Muslims by the boatload or the planeload and give them citizenship, see the following classic article by Spengler, entitled "Wife-Beating, Sharia and Western Law".

http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle_East/LE25Ak01.html

Excerpt:

"The practice of wife-beating, which is found in Muslim communities in Western countries, is embedded too profoundly in sharia law to be extracted.

"Nowhere to my knowledge has a Muslim religious authority of standing repudiated wife-beating as specified in Surah 4:32 [4:34] of the Koran, for to do so would undermine the foundations of Muslim society.

"By extension, the power of the little sovereign of the family

(usually the father; but a son can act as his deputy in the absence of the father – CM) can include the killing of wayward wives and female relations.

“Execution for domestic crimes, often called “honor killing”, is not mentioned in the Koran, but the practice is so widespread in Muslim countries – the United Nations Population Fund estimates an annual toll of 5,000 – that it is recognized in what we might term Islamic common law....”.

And yet, resolutely shutting their eyes to this, our societies go on importing Muslims such as this sister-beating Afghan now ensconced in Australia, Muslims steeped in an alien and violent and misogynistic set of attitudes – attitudes that are sufficiently described, identified as rooted in Islam, and roundly criticised by brave ex-Muslims such as Ayaan Hirsi Ali and Wafa Sultan and Nonie Darwish – and we give them citizenship! And then at the same time we are wringing our hands about the prevalence of family violence, particularly against women, within our society! Even as we import Muslims whose sacred text commands them to beat women from whom the beater merely “fears” “rebellion”! – CM