

What Was M-103 Really About; Islamophobia or a Money Grab for Radical Islamic Groups?

A petition urging the Canadian government to take action in regards to ISIS returnees in Canada.

by Geoffrey Clarfield



This week Canadians were stunned to hear that after the near unanimous passing of Motion 103 on Islamophobia in the Canadian parliament last March, the government has decided to use this “non-binding motion” as a reason to [give 23 million dollars of hard-earned Canadian Tax payer’s money](#), to organizations that sympathize with the Muslim Brotherhood, an organization that supports radical Islam and which has been linked to known terrorist groups in the Middle East.

“This money will go to NCCM (National Council of Canadian Muslims) & Islamic Relief “ said MP Iqra Khalid, the Muslim Brotherhood-associated Liberal MP who was the “godmother” of

M-103.

By the way, this a charity that once lost its charitable status but seems to be back in action under the Liberals.

Simply put, Khalid, with the full backing of Prime Minister Trudeau, just got 23 million dollars for potentially radical Islamic groups in Canada. So much for being “non-binding.”

It is therefore important for Canadian taxpayers to understand the ideological background for this almost predictable disaster.

The US media, preoccupied as it is with the ongoing attack on the Trump presidency has not reported that the Canadian Parliament spent much time in a debate about Motion 103.

On March 23, 2018, the motion passed by a vote of 201–91. It is a “non-binding” piece of legislation if that is the right word to use. And so, for the moment, there is no way of enforcing it.

We can be sure, that it will not stop there.

If we look toward Europe and similar legislative trends there, we may expect to see upcoming draft legislation that substantially reduces the rights of Canadians, whether they be Muslim or not, to criticize regimes or organizations that define themselves as Islamic.

We can be sure that the soon to be better funded NCCM will be at the forefront of such initiatives. We must bear in mind that Canada has no equivalent to the first amendment and undefined “hate speech” is one way to erode freedom of speech in this democracy just north of the US border.

23 million dollars can fund a lot of legal action against believers in free speech. So, the government has now decided to fund the declared enemies of freedom of speech.

Let us remember that the Muslim Brotherhood whose semi-clandestine existence in Canada is dedicated to “hollowing out” our English common law and replacing it with Shariah, especially when it comes to the rights of women and adult daughters.

That rogue regime, the Islamic Republic of Iran, whose goal is Jihad, regional domination and both the economic and political infiltration of Europe and North America with its anti-democratic agenda is no doubt encouraged. Surely, the Iranians must be reassured with this funding announcement after their temporary setback by the near bogus liberal support for a recent anti-Iranian statement in parliament a few short weeks ago.

As supporters of free, democratic debate, one must put forward five public questions to our MPs on both sides of the aisle who have now publicly supported this motion and allowed for its weaponization through government funding.

The concern, plainly stated, is this motion when examined closely is most hurtful to freedom-loving Muslims here in Canada and clearly funds their anti-democratic enemies through a massive government hand out. That money will be used to silence them and their organizations.

First Question-What is Islamophobia?

The non-binding Motion 103 introduced by Iqra Khalid, Liberal MP for Mississauga-Erindale, declares the government should “condemn Islamophobia and all forms of systemic racism”. Canadians readily approve “all forms of systemic racism” should be condemned, and reasonable effort made to eliminate them within Canada.

But what is Islamophobia?

The term is not defined.

Iqra Khalid, we assume, cannot on any reasonable ground suggest that Canadians are or might be afflicted by an “irrational fear” of Islam as a world religion. And if this is what she is suggesting, then it begs the question why an “irrational fear” of Islam only, and not of any other of the world religions practiced within Canada.

People inventing the term Islamophobia are not physicians or psychologists. They are Islamist ideologues insisting Islam is not simply a religion but also a political ideology for a theocracy based on Islamic code of law or the Shariah. This is the worldview of the Muslim Brotherhood in the Arab world, and of the Jamaat-i-Islami in South Asia and what follows from this ideology is terrorist acts, here and abroad.

Islamists believe those who disagree with their political ideology, or reject and oppose it, need to be fought and defeated. This is what is occurring across the Muslim world – a war waged by Islamists, both Sunni and Shia against Muslims who reject Islam as a political ideology.

In Canada, and elsewhere in the West, Islamists have been openly demanding official recognition of Shariah by the state. This would mean agreeing with Islamists they are the only true Muslims and representatives of Islam, making allowance for a parallel legal system contrary to the values of secular law.

Proponents of Islamophobia have adopted psychiatric jargon to put anti-Islamist Muslims and Muslim reformers on the defensive, and make non-Muslims feel guilty of what the left calls “unconscious bias.” This ironically can only be detected, if at all, by a psychiatrist working confidentially with full client disclosure. Unfair dislike of someone because of religion is usually called “religious prejudice” and that is never in short supply.

Islamophobia is, therefore, an epithet largely used to silence Muslim reformers in the West, while within the Muslim world

they are victims of violence as heretics, apostates and infidels.

Our parliament has been duped by the Brotherhood. Let me explain.

2) How do the Inventors of the Word Islamophobia Usually Use It?

Muslim Brotherhood activists use the word Islamophobia to shut down any critical discussion of Islam.

As “thought police” they act consistent with the 13th-century worldview of men who codified the Shariah, and for them, Islamophobia signifies racism as synonymous with blasphemy.

Those familiar with the history of Christianity in the West may recall the time when any criticism of Christianity was considered blasphemy. Even philosopher Baruch Spinoza was excommunicated by his own Jewish community in Amsterdam for his “free thinking” about the Bible.

The making of the modern secular West was bitterly contested, and it came about through the rational criticism of religious beliefs and related practices and customs. This is not yet the situation across the world of Islam where Shariah is the basis of public law.

In Saudi Arabia, for example, it is still forbidden for a Muslim to convert to Christianity. A Muslim convert is condemned for execution. For unlawful acts – drinking alcohol, theft, rape, sodomy, adultery, etc. – Shariah prescription is harsh from public lashing and delimiting to beheading.

According to Shariah provisions, a woman’s testimony is not equal to that of a man’s, polygamy is lawful, inheritance law favours male over female offsprings, apostasy is a capital crime, and homosexuals are condemned to death.

Jews and Christians do not have equal rights in these Shariah dominated societies. And non-Muslim minorities, such as the Yazidis in Iraq, and now by the Turks in Syria, have been targeted for genocide based on the religious rulings (fatwas) of the ulema or religious scholars who advise or sympathize with the Islamic State.

A vague and undefined notion of Islamophobia, and which could then easily be used as a term for censure by public officials, would silence Canadians discussing these matters freely in public.

3) Who are the Statistical Victims?

Although attacks against Muslims have risen, attacks against Jews in Canada have risen even more. Yet we do not hear of any new government funding to fight anti-Semitism.

Nor would this have been necessary if the government had maintained that the basic principle of our system is the equality of all citizens regardless of race, religion, creed, colour or language, and the equal protection of all.

Demand for legislation based on collective grievance and identity politics can be endless, and instead of making for social harmony such demand breeds disharmony.

4) Can Islam be criticized?

Comedy clubs in Canada, or in the West generally, are where the young gather and banter about their various religious backgrounds.

Those few Muslim comedians who similarly banter with their own religious upbringing are now, more than ever, risking the hostility of their co-religionists, since proponents of Islamophobia as racism are often the same people calling for Shariah law and silencing any criticism of Islam.

Will they now be sued with money from this 23 million dollar windfall?

Surely the atheists amongst us should be able to criticize Judaism, Christianity, Islam or any other faith tradition. Surely, they should be protected under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms to opine publicly that religions are products of the human imagination. There are numerous writings of Canadians available on the falsity of religion. Hence, we should hold either all religions are open to criticism, or they are not; but it is unacceptable we privilege one religion over others and prohibit criticism of it.

5) Is Federal Member of Parliament Iqra Khalid Trustworthy?

The TSEC (Terrorism and Security Experts of Canada) network has provided Canadians with background on Member of Parliament Iqra Khalid, the member responsible for introducing the Islamophobia motion in the Parliament. This TSEC disclosure is alarming.

'Iqra Khalid was [President of the Muslim Student Association](#) when she was a student at York University (early 2000s). The Muslim Student Association was [founded by adherents of the Muslim Brotherhood](#) in 1963. The Muslim Student Association has a series of alumni who have become [suicide bombers, ISIS fighters and ISIS propagandists](#). The Muslim Student Association at York University handed out a book at Islam Awareness Week with the title "[Women in Islam & Refutation of some Common Misconceptions](#)."

The chapter on WIFE DISCIPLINING (page 99 of the online version) makes the following observation: **Submissive or subdued women. These women may even enjoy being beaten at times as a sign of love and concern.'**

6) Last Question-Which Muslims Speak with Authority?

What makes democracies different is that citizens may speak freely according to their conscience and without fear of persecution.

There are many Canadian Muslims who wish to be protected by the same laws that all other Canadians live under. Some are Canadian secular critics of Islamic fundamentalism such as Tarek Fatah, some are believers such as Raheel Raza and Farzana Hassan who reject Sharia and embrace universal human rights and freedom of speech.

Given what we discover about Iqra Khaled's ties with the Muslim Brotherhood-related Muslim Students Association, and support for her politics among members of the Islamic Society of North America connected with Jamaat-i-Islami and other radical Muslim fundamentalist organizations in Pakistan, there is every reason to view M-103 as part of the "stealth jihad" waged by these organizations in Canada and other Western democracies.

The history of these Islamist organizations is riddled with the culture of bigotry, violence, misogyny, terrorism and genocide. Their political ideology has brought ruin across the Middle East, North Africa, and South Asia. And over the past many years they have imported their illiberal culture into Canada.

Canadian journalist Tarek Fatah has questioned publicly Iqra Khalid. Fatah has written,

'If systemic racism was an issue for Khalid and other MPs, I asked her why she did not, to my knowledge, react when it was reported by cijnews.com that an Islamic cleric in Montreal, uttered the following words to a congregation: "O Allah, give victory to our brothers who engage in Jihad...O Allah, give them

victory over their enemy...0 Allah, destroy the accursed Jews...0 Allah, make their children orphans and their women widows.” If this prayer was in fact spoken to a congregation, then perhaps MP Khalid will have the courage to amend her motion and include a denunciation of this prayer, variations of which are read at most mosques every Friday... Will she label such hateful statements as an example of systemic racism that is anti-Semitic, anti-Christian, anti-Hindu and anti-atheist?’

This motion, M-103, driven largely by Iqra Khalid should be rescinded by Parliament and the 23 million dollar hand out should not be implemented. But that may only happen when and if there is a change in government after a national election. In the meantime, Prime Minister Trudeau’s advisors may ultimately climb down from their recent criticism of Iran to reopen the Canadian embassy in Teheran. M-103 opens the door to this kind of more serious change in Canadian foreign policy.

Will public criticism of this move now be considered, “Islamophobic?” At the same time, M-103 does nothing to protect the human rights of Canadian Muslims, nor of any other citizens. It will take away rights precious to all, including freedom-loving Muslims.

Lastly, anything that comes in the garb of parliamentary decisions, binding or not, can be used to set precedents. Now that 23 million dollars will be going to support radical Islamic groups what will the Liberal government and their radical Islamic supporters do next?

We would not be surprised if Islamophobia may soon be used against those who criticize the totalitarian nature of states such as Iran. Our government just gave Iran 100 million dollars to sweeten a potential trade deal with Canada.

Would Iqra Khalid have the gall to accuse anyone opposing such a deal “an Islamophobic critic of the Islamic Republic of

Iran?"

It just may come to pass, and what was once beyond belief, may be funded by the government. This will mean that we have lost another part of our personal freedom.

Clearly, that is the price the liberals are willing to pay as they cynically buy the votes of Canada's growing Muslim population and confirm the values that many have brought to this country, not the values that this country offers them as an enlightened substitute for living under Shariah law.

First published in the