Ryanair's Michael Leary Dares to Display Common Sense

by Hugh Fitzgerald

Ryanair's Michael O'Leary has demanded extra anti-terror checks for Muslim men at airports as "that is where the threat is coming from." This observation has brought cries of outrage from the Muslim Council of Britain and from Khalid Mahmood, a Muslim member of Parliament.

You can find the story [here](#).

> *The budget airline chief, 58, believes terror suspects flagged at airports would "generally be males of a Muslim persuasion."*

> *Michael O'Leary believes Muslim men should be subjected to extra anti-terror checks at airports.*

> *The Ryanair boss's comments were condemned by charities and an MP.*

"You can't say stuff" but not "because its racism." Rather, "because people will immediately call it racism." What O'Leary means is this: too many of us have been frightened of being thought bigots, so the false, absurd charge of "racism" keeps being brought up by Defenders of the Faith of Islam, hoping to shield the faith from any kind of criticism.

Even those who are most opposed to the ideology of Islam cannot be described as "racists." It has to be endlessly repeated, urbi et orbi, that Islam is not a "race" and Muslim defenders should not be allowed to get away with pretending otherwise, and attempting to persuade us to agree. Ask the Muslim Council of Britain point-blank: "Is it your contention that there is a Muslim race? If so, what are the identifiable characteristics of that race which distinguish it from other races? How can Islam, which like Christianity lays claims to being an universal faith, with adherents worldwide, of all

races — black, brown, yellow, and white — at the same time insist that it constitutes a race? No one suggests that critics of Christianity, and of Christians, are "racists." Why should Islam, and adherents of Islam, be uniquely privileged to invoke "racism" to deflect criticism?"

A spokesman [for the Muslim Council of Great Britain] said: "He openly advocates discrimination against "males of a Muslim persuasion', which presumably is not based on specific intelligence but solely whether someone 'looks or acts like a Muslim'."

An extra check, as O'Leary recommends, on Muslims at airports does not constitute impermissible "discrimination." The state's first duty is to protect the lives of its citizens. That justifies a higher level of scrutiny of those who have posed the greatest threat to those lives. Today, in the Western world, the data about past terrorist attacks involving airplanes supports the conclusion that those most likely to engage in such attacks are single male Muslims. Does the Muslim Council of Britain wish to deny that data?

The "specific intelligence" which Mr. O'Leary believes justifies giving extra scrutiny is this: according to the data accumulated in the last few decades, almost all those who have attempted terrorist attacks using planes — either by hijacking them, or by blowing them up in flight, or by using them as missiles deliberately flown into buildings — have been Muslims. That is all the intelligence one needs to give an extra level of scrutiny to male Muslim passengers. Think of the El Al flight flying from Tel Aviv to Paris, that Black September took over and flew to Entebbe, where the Jewish passengers were held hostage until rescued by Israeli commandos led by Jonathan Netanyahu, the brother of Prime Minister Netanyahu. Think of the Sabena Flight hijacked to Tel Aviv by four Muslim terrorists. Think of the attempts to blow up American planes by the Underwear Bomber, Umar Farouk

Abdulmutallab, the Shoe Bomber, Richard Reid, both of which failed. Think of the four planes hijacked on 9/11 by Muslim terrorists, with two of them flown into the Twin Towers, a third into the Pentagon, and a fourth that had been headed to the Capitol instead crashed into a field in Pennsylvania when passengers rushed the cabin in a vain attempt to retake the plane. And if we were to look at the incidence of Muslim terrorism of all kinds — not just that involving planes — we discover that more than 36,000 attacks by Muslim terrorists have taken place since 9/11. That's a colossal number. Or is it "Islamophobic" to say so?

Michael O'Leary is dealing in probabilities, likelihoods, just as the security services do everywhere. He does not claim that all Muslims, or most Muslims, are terrorists. That charge against him is palpably absurd. He only states what should be obvious, and that Muslims are trying to shout down with cries of "Islamophobia": a very high percentage of terrorist acts, and a very high percentage of terrorist acts involving planes, have been committed by Muslims. What O'Leary says is either true or false. If true, then no one should reasonably object to acting on that knowledge, in order to save lives. That means "extra checks" on Muslim passengers.

   "This is the very definition of Islamophobia."

The "very definition of Islamophobia" according to this spokesman for the Muslim Council of Britain, is for anyone — such as Michael O'Leary — to dare to state that Muslims constitute the greatest number, by far, of terrorists who seize planes, blow up planes, or use planes as flying missiles to bring down buildings, like the Twin Towers, that are full of Infidels.

The charge of "Islamophobia" is merely another way for Muslims to say "Shut up" to Infidels. O'Leary runs an airline; he is responsible for the safety of his passengers. He has both a

right and a duty to point out, should he bother to reply to his Muslim critics, that "Islamophobia" is a word deliberately coined and put into widespread use since 9/11, in order to make the Infidels believe that all criticism of Islam, no matter how fact-based and sober, bespeaks "an irrational fear" of a peaceful faith. If you express misgivings, say, about the more than 100 Qur'anic verses that command Muslims to fight, to kill, to smite at the necks of, to strike terror in the hearts of, non-Muslims, you are an "Islamophobe." If you note that the Qur'an tells Muslims that they are the "best of peoples" and non-Muslims the "most vile of created beings," you will be called an "Islamophobe." If you dare to quote such well-known hadith of Muhammad as "war is deceit" and "I have been made victorious through terror," you are surely an "Islamophobe." If you point out that Muhammad consummated his marriage to little Aisha when she was nine years old and he was 54, you are only doing this because you are an "Islamophobe." Your intention in raising such matters, in quoting such verses, is to promote "Islamophobia." Only an irrational hatred of Islam could have led you to bring up these verses; no fair-minded person would do such a thing.

Khalid Mahmood, Labour MP for Birmingham Perry Barr, who is Muslim, blasted Mr O'Leary's comments, which came two days after a far-right terrorist massacred ten people in a shooting in Germany.

Of what relevance is that news about a "far-right terrorist" who "massacred ten people in a shooting in Germany"? None at all. It is simply dropped in by the reporter — or is it Mahmood himself — a red herring intended to deflect our attention from Muslim terrorists, a way to undercut O'Leary by suggesting that "see, here's an example just two days ago of far-right terrorism, so why don't we talk about that?" But why? No one has denied the existence of far-right terrorism. And right now, all over the world, it is Muslim terrorists who are the greatest threat, claiming by far the most victims.

Michael O'Leary is talking about the need to provide an extra check on passengers who are single, male, and Muslim because single male Muslims are the ones behind most terrorism. If far-right terrorists had, during the last two decades, been hijacking planes, blowing up planes, using planes as missiles, no doubt Michael O'Leary would be calling for greater scrutiny of passengers who are known to belong to or support far-right groups. But because they haven't, he hasn't.

Mr Mahmood said: "He's effectively saying 'everyone is game — if they look like a Muslim then they must be a terrorist'.

Mr. Mahmood knows perfectly well that O'Leary did not say, nor imply, that all Muslims are terrorists. Yet he simply carries on with this idiocy, knowing he won't be laughed off the stage, so confused have the world's Infidels become, so fearful of offending Muslims, that common sense is now, in the court of public opinion, called "Islamophobia" and few dare to appeal this judgment.

"It doesn't improve community relations; it gives succour to people of a fascist mindset.

"In Germany this week a white person killed eight people. Should we profile white people to see if they're fascists?"

Is that what we should be worrying about, if we own an airline and are responsible for the safety of passengers? Since when did it become an airline owner's duty to "improve community relations"? And who says that the only way to "improve community relations" is to yield to every Muslim demand, to refrain from any Islamocriticism, to take care not to wound the tender psyches of Muslims who simply cannot abide any hint that they, or their faith, are less than wonderful?

Of course the word "fascist" — no surprise — had to be brought up by Muslims intent on blackening O'Leary's name and

undermining his sensible request for "extra checks" on Muslim passengers. To be an Islamocritic is not only to be an Islamophobe, but to have a "fascist mindset" which, in the very next sentence, grades into being a "fascist." If you are disturbed by many Quranic verses, those that command Muslims to engage in violent Jihad — to fight, kill, smite, and strike terror in the hearts of the Infidels — then you must be a "fascist." Who else could be disturbed by any of the verses in the immutable Qur'an? And again, this defender of Islam brings up a recent killing of eight people in Germany by a white man and asks, sarcastically and idiotically, "should we profile white people to see if they're fascists?"

> *"He's being very blinkered and is actually encouraging racism."*

One last time: Islam does not define a race. Muslims are not a race. Criticism of Islam is not "racism." Criticism of Islam does not "actually encourage racism." It encourages only the exercise of common sense. Look in the Qur'an — what does it say? Look around the world at the observable behavior of Muslims — what does that behavior tell us? O'Leary is saying aloud what any owner of an airline, any airline pilot, any members of a cabin crew, are thinking: "Never mind Muslim feelings and these absurd charges of "racism" and "Islamophobia." Of course we want extra checking of Muslim passengers, just as O'Leary requests. We fly all the time. We want to be safe. Is that really so hard to understand? Please, Michael O'Leary, don't be dissuaded. We're with you. Keep it up.

First published in