

ISLAM and OCCIDENT

Two incompatible civilizations

by Irnerio Seminatore

The armed and murderous attacks in Paris and those that have followed since September 11 in New York, London, Madrid, Calcutta, Montreal and Sydney prove that an open and declared war going on between Islam and Occident. This broad spectrum war will be long and will take over an increasingly sharp and total pace.

It is a true clash of civilizations characterized by an asymmetric and symbolic nature. In this regard, the denials of general hostility motivations by the false unanimity of the French and European establishment lead to the disarmament of minds and to the occultation of dangers. In order of essential causalities an evidence is necessary: there is no Islamism without Islam and these two taboos are integral parts of our repressed society.

Ethnically, philosophically and politically, Islam and Occident are mutually incompatible and a civil coexistence, an inter-religious tolerance and an interfaith dialogue are impossible and suicidal.

All forms of experienced coexistence so far have been a failure because European Islam became an intransigent and hostile subculture, it does not live with other faiths, does not share the common good, does not understand the century, their community lives in isolation and does not accept the world. It is "foreign" to modernity, with its customs and manners, it is in revolt against civilization in short. This hostility commutes in contradictory egalitarianism and visceral hate against the modern beliefs of society and against the state. Where it takes root, its strategy aims to remove other currents of thought. Islam and Occident are also in war for fourteen centuries, and Islam is in conflict with itself, because of spiritual heritage since the death of the Prophet (seventh century). Its bloody ecumenism dates from the origins of and the "cult of murderers" to convert the other by the murder, from the ninth century.

Islam bases its coexistence on the physical elimination of rivals (jihad) or social exclusion of his critics and his reformers (fatwa). Islam preaches an autocracy, the Caliphate, folded on itself and self-sufficient. Violence and death to guarantee a solution to its problems, on earth and in the hereafter.

Past and present

From Avicenna and Ibn Kaldoun (ninth century), fatality and inertia are the fundamental principles of the Islam believers psyche and theocracy is a reality and a justification of an intangible hierarchy. Allah guarantees the world government for the reign of "pure", where the

woman, incapable of purity, represents the principle of corruption and fall, and must live submitted to an authoritarian and misogynist order, hidden by a veil to secure tempting looks. Inside Islam, jihadism appears as an identity assertion and a violent and draconian totalitarianism, out of society. It is what the tutor is to his student, an aberrant boss, a source of diabolic discipline and an advisor of nihilism and a martyr. By symmetry, Occident is seen by Islam as a scarecrow and a Great Satan. As a law of motion of history, the Occidental transgressive and drained of mystic evolution dissolves the blind stagnation and the historical sleep of Muslim countries. Occident responds to a supposed divine law with an anarchy of morals, a materialism of behaviors and a moral system emptied of substance by misleading concepts: denatured gender theory concepts, marriage for all. How can a presumed good and evil coexist? The inhuman rigor of the supreme law and the rapacious cupidity of Mefisto?

The idea of a co-existence between the two conceptions of life and world, Islamic and modern, is perceived by believers of the Ummah as an apostasy and a betrayal, to be stoned or sentenced to death.

His criticism and blasphemy claim punishment and vengeance. What is at stake today by these attacks, is less freedom of expression or undermining of tolerance, than the very existence of Occident.

The non-European immigration is the bed and the soil of this murder and follows a plan of physical, ideological and cultural occupation that is the root of these recurrent and extreme provocations. Today we assist to a massive, deep and molecular substitution immigration, replacing the European strain population and undermining its way of thinking and living at its civilization. This is also for this reason that the people of pro-Islam suburbs has not participated in the popular communion of the People's Republic around the values, in the "cry of democratic and civic conscience" (Le Monde, January 17, 2015). It prefers to believe in a government conspiracy and has self-excluded from a "national sacred union" erected against crime, digging more and more a political and moral abyss between official rhetoric and reality. Pre-modern design and medieval old covenant between faith and reason under the influence of the sacred, which characterizes Islam, cannot make it compatible with Occidental conception of common life. The Occidental conception is based on the agostinian distinction between "Civitas Dei" and "Civitas Mundi" and the separation between church and state, where power and faith characterize two distinct spheres of human beliefs and individual allegiances. The conscience secularization process and the secularism concept are recognized as a pivot of a common tolerance based on ethically "free" confessions.

The radical incompatibility between Islam and the Modern world is philosophical and cultural. It makes any form of theocracy, the Caliphate, irreconcilable with the affirmation of the primacy of the "free policy" about religious dogma.

The Occident cannot recognize the primacy of religion over politics. In contrast, Islam rejects the reasons for the Occident and therefore the distinction and separation between the domain of reason and that of faith.

Thus, this clash of principles and the Gods war are meant to last, as this confrontation is ubiquitous in the tumultuous history of the relationship between East and West for fourteen centuries, transcending historical conjuncture. This shock cannot result in a compromise or an unilateral concession by the Occident.

Any conception of dialogue is also impracticable for the Muslim community in Europe because it is perceived as a blood and God's law betrayal.

The jihadist combat or an impossible dialogue

"I am not Charlie! »

Therefore, the jihadist fight has a double meaning: unconditional obedience to the "verb" and an exemplary witness of faith without borders and in the same time an integrating force of allogeneic group reinforced in the sacrificial value of this action. Confronted with this situation, any multicultural policy is suicidal and illusory. Immigration acceptance cannot mean importing a violent totalitarianism and an obscurantist conception of society, of family and also of the individual. This form of immigration is for Occident an existential threat in the long term and must be fought and stopped.

Furthermore, the slogan adopted by the demonstrators in Paris "I am Charlie" cannot be our slogan nor our flag, which has been for four centuries those of reason and historical enlightenment. Between immigrants and natives, the war will end with the destruction of all dogmatic system of thought. But this system in Europe is based for the last thirty years on the willingness to blunt the brutal effect of blood, violence and death by law economics, scientism and humanitarian. In history, the shading system of a radical antagonism hides the merciless rule of submission to the law of others. Therefore, the Charlie Hebdo derision is our skid of freedom, a corrupt and conformist form of it and can also be our slogan. It is a discount of moral relativism that leads straight to the misguidance of minds and to the collective blindness, unable to recognize his enemy and shoot him. We refuse to fight against mock battles and to adopt false slogans and we are constrained to identify the real threats that are embodied in the figure of enemy.

The notion of "threat" always determines that of defense and security, and it is imposed by a blinding multiculturalism of rejection, by the people, for cultural difference and hostility.

Within a worldwide context of interactive and interconnected global networks, the enemy's profile is cultural and is defined by the "ethical difference."

But the fight against international terrorism is the evidence that we have entered in the era of the permanent asymmetry, which reconfigures the system perceptions of the enemy and change the cultural mapping of the planet.

Asymmetry, preemption and meta-political conflicts.

The era of asymmetry requires States to do not only the prevention against the dangers but also the pre-emption and hence the "Intelligence" to the detriment of individual rights, which in a democracy creates a contrast between "military democracy" and "unarmed democracy."

New paradigms of threat announce a resurgence of belief in their radical expressions.

They transcend the sphere of authority and power and acquire the form of "meta political conflict," out of predictability and calculation", out of prenormative frameworks (law, ethics and morals). These conflicts, inspired by the logic of "sense", accept to assume a hostility and ancestral hate and broke the principle of "balance of risk". Wars and terrorism are wars which collide three dimensions of historicity: the pre-modern, modern and post-modern dimensions, in short the religious, the secular and the post-ideological dimensions. These wars are subjected to three conceptions of liberty and three types of strategic rationality. In this context, the terrorist violence by jihadst matrix, power of negation, inseparable from the human nature, requires a revision of some conception of globalization, misleadingly interpreted in its economic dimension, and a revalorisation of the state security function .

In the political conceptions of the present time, two cultural worlds maintain and radicalise an existential link between violence and political thought; American and Islamic fundamentalists who declare themselves ready to die in the name of their designs and their triumphe¹.

The peaceful people in general and Europeans in particular cultivate the illusion of peace without threat and without "enemies." Machiavelli - Hegel and Fichte, raised in the school of "historical pessimism", wrote in a situation of "ideological defensive" similar to ours.

It would be necessary, therefore, to guard against "the enemy" who prevails inside by the spiritual division and demilitarized concepts (perceived by Islam as housed in the remains of the temporary truce, Dar al Koufi - Europe) and outside by a thought inspiring to violence and an antagonistic view of the world,so finally, against any vision of the just and the unjust, because there are no universally shared standards from which might emerge a common concept of justice.

This view relies, in the current situationt, on the distinction of "People of the Book" to "Dar al Harbi" (the abode of war, the Occident) and "Dar al Islam" (the abode of peace and true religion).

Consequently, the Occident, as a democratised and peaceful constellation of the law states, when attacked, must carry the struggle out of the Jus Publicum system, because the final struggle is always decided out of the field of Constitution and law, out of the intergovernmental and supranational institutions, out of economic interdependence, diplomacy and governance, in the original field of terrible and blood, of the biblical law and the vengeance of God.

Brussels, January 13, 2015