Paris Attacks Were Not 'Nihilism' but Sacred Strategy

LEADING commentator Janet Daley's article in Saturday's *Telegraph* 'protection of civilian persons'.

Yet the first step in understanding a cultural system alien to one's own, is to describe it in its *own* terms.

ISIS does not subscribe to the Geneva Convention. Its actions and strategies are based upon medieval Islamic laws of jihad, which make no use of the modern Western concept of 'civilian'.

They do, however, refer to the category of disbelievers (*mushrik* or *kafir*). ISIS believes that killing disbelievers is a moral act, in accordance, for example, with Sura 9:5 of the Qur'an, which states :'Fight and kill the idolators (*mushrik*) wherever you find them'.

Not nihilism

Daley writes: 'The enemy has stated explicitly that it does not revere life at all' and 'Civilians are not collateral damage in this campaign: their deaths are the whole point.' She goes on to lament that the latest French attacks lack any purpose, but are 'carried out for the sheer nihilistic thrill of it'.

The claim that ISIS does not 'revere life' seems to refer to any number of statements by Islamic radicals, including an ISIS militant who vowed to 'fill the streets of Paris with dead bodies', and boasted that ISIS 'loves death like you love life' (see <u>here</u>), and they consider being killed in battle against infidels a ticket to paradise, in fact the killings do serve a strategic purpose. This is to make infidels afraid, and thereby to weaken their will to resist Islamic dominance.

This strategy is commended by the Qur'an, for example in Sura 8:12, 'I shall cast dread into the hearts of those who disbelieve. So strike above (their) necks and strike (off) all their fingers!', as well as by the successful example of Muhammad in fighting the Jews of Medina, referred to in Sura 33:26-27, 'He brought down from their fortifications those of the People of the Book who supported them, and cast dread into their hearts. You killed a group (of them), and took captive (another) group. And he caused you to inherit their land, their homes, and their wealth, and a land you had not set foot on.' A similar passage is Sura 59:2, which ISIS has in fact been referred to in a prescient 1993 interview as the 'relativization of religion, a self-critical view of the history of Islamic imperialism'.

Instead the elites of Europe embarked on decades of religiously illiterate appeasement and denialism.

There is still much that European states could do to defeat ISIS. They could, for example, inflict catastrophic military failure upon it as a powerful counter-argument to its theology of success. This will not deliver decisive, final victory against jihadism, but it will make the supremacist claims of ISIS less credible and hurt its recruitment. Islam's laws of war allow Muslims to suspend their battle with infidels temporarily if there is no immediate prospect of victory and the risks to their cause are too great.

Europe also needs to act to suppress incitement of jihadi ideology by its clients, including the anti-Israeli jihadism of the Palestinian Authority. It must put more pressure on the militarily vulnerable Gulf states to stop funding Islamic radicalism throughout the Middle East and exporting jihadrevering versions of Islamic theology throughout the whole world.

One hope for Europe is that Islamic populations will get tired of the doctrine of jihad and all its bitter fruits. There are some signs that this is already happening, and many of the Muslims who are now seeking asylum in their hundreds of thousands will have come to this conclusion. However it seems likely that Muslim communities now established within Europe will be the last to reconsider their dogmas and their take on history, because they have not had to suffer first-hand the harsh realities of life under Islamic dystopias such as the ISIS 'caliphate' or Iran's Islamic Revolution. A