



ISLAM AND LOGOS

BY E. MICHAEL JONES
EDITED BY JOHN BEAUMONT

ISLAM AND LOGOS

E. MICHAEL JONES

Edited by John Beaumont

Fidelity Press
206 Marquette Avenue
South Bend, Indiana 46617
www.culturewars.com
Copyright, 2016, Fidelity Press



CONTENTS

[FOREWORD](#)

[CHAPTER ONE: History of the Revolution](#)

[CHAPTER TWO: The Earlier History of Islam](#)

[CHAPTER THREE: Logos Evaporates](#)

[CHAPTER FOUR: Pope Benedict XVI and the Regensberg Speech](#)

[CHAPTER FIVE: What is Islam?](#)

[CHAPTER SIX: Faith and Reason](#)

[CHAPTER SEVEN: The Logos of Sex](#)

[CHAPTER EIGHT: “So is America the Great Satan?”](#)

[CHAPTER NINE: The Faust Myth](#)

[CHAPTER TEN: Foucault in Tehran](#)

[CHAPTER ELEVEN: “Daimonic Ideals”](#)

[CHAPTER TWELVE: The Mullahs in Mashad](#)

[CHAPTER THIRTEEN: The Philosophy of Salafism: The Islamic Image of Neo-Conservatism](#)

[CHAPTER FOURTEEN: Uncanny Fulfillment](#)

[CHAPTER FIFTEEN: MEMRI](#)

[CHAPTER SIXTEEN: The Nuclear Deal Goes Through](#)

[CHAPTER SEVENTEEN: Islam as the Scourge of God](#)

[POSTSCRIPT: The Magi and the Apartheid Wall: The Author Explores Iran](#)

[About the Author](#)

FOREWORD

Articles on Islam appear almost every day in the press. However, there is much ignorance regarding the exact nature of Islam. Many assume that the religion is one coherent body of doctrine and action. This is incorrect. There are many forms of Islam, including the obvious ones of Sunni and Shi'a. Even these two are vastly different in their approach to religious and social issues.

Over the last few years Dr. E. Michael Jones has done much research on the question of Islam, both from a historical perspective and also from the point of view of contemporary matters. This research has resulted in a number of detailed articles on a variety of specific topics. In the present short book the main parts of these are gathered together in order that the enquiring reader may gain an accurate picture of this whole subject.

The book begins with an introduction to the 1979 Iranian revolution, a key event. This is followed by a history of earlier Islam. Next comes a reference to the significance of the concept of Logos, a crucial matter in almost all of Dr. Jones' writings. This is followed by an examination of what exactly is the nature of Islam in the light of this information regarding Logos. Then comes some detail on the approach of the Sunni and the Shi'a and that of Catholicism in respect of faith and reason, followed by a review of the differing approaches of Western and Islamic philosophy.

These more general issues having been analyzed, the book then embarks upon some specific issues. These comprise most importantly the following: the question of Logos and sex; the allegation that the United States is "the great Satan"; Foucault's contribution to thought in respect of the Islamic revolution; and several other significant matters. Finally, some conclusions are put forward.

The above matters may be said to be the more formal part of the book. There then follows a postscript, which recounts one of the speaking tours made by Dr. Jones to Iran. This is more informal and gives a detailed account of the day to day issues that arise in that country, as mediated by Dr. Jones in his talks and discussions with many representatives of society there.

Once again Dr. Jones shows himself to be at the forefront of modern thinking on the question of the relationship between the Catholic Church

and Islam and readers will be much enriched by his clear and logical analysis of the issues.

John Beaumont

Leeds, England

Feast of St. Matthias, Apostle

May 14th, 2016

CHAPTER ONE

History of the Revolution

On January 16, 1979, His Imperial Majesty Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlevi, the King of Kings, Light of the Aryans and Head of the Warriors, descended from the Peacock Throne, boarded a plane, and flew into exile. Two weeks later Ruhollah Khomeini, a 77-year-old religious scholar, flew from exile in Paris to Tehran, where he was greeted by millions of followers, and became the leader of the first modern Islamic revolution. The Ayatollah Khomeini came to power, not riding on a donkey, but almost as modestly, riding in the passenger seat of a Chevy pickup surrounded by a few million of his supporters, some of whom were sitting on the roof of the truck's cab. What followed was the chaos and violence which accompanies any revolution, revenge killings aimed at the SAVAK, the secret police that had been trained to torture Iranians, the burning of that country's cinemas in protest against the sexualization of the culture which the Rockefellers and the CIA had orchestrated to turn the Iranians into sexual robots and docile consumers (*i.e.*, "Americans"), the hostage crisis, which got prolonged by George Bush and Ronald Reagan to defeat Jimmy Carter in the election of 1980, and enough footage to make a number of movies, the most recent being *Argo*, a gripping CIA propaganda film which obscures everything about the revolution that needs to be explained.

The miracle of the Iranian Revolution of 1979 is that it did not end up like all of the revolutions which accompanied the Arab Spring in 2011. By early 2013 Libya and Egypt had descended into chaos. The reason the Iranian Revolution didn't is Imam Khomeini and Shi'a Islam, which honors Logos (or to give Arash Darya-Bandari's translation of that Greek term, *nezzam I tauhidi*, the order of unicity) in a way that the Sunni Muslims and most certainly the Wahhabis and the Salafists do not. There is no separation of Church and State in the Shi'a version of Islam, but there is paradoxically among the fundamentalist Salafists, who, like the Wahhabis and the more radical Sunni sects, accepted the political hegemony of the caliphate.

Imam Khomeini was able to keep the Iranian Revolution under control because he was able to exercise both political and spiritual authority at a crucial moment in Iran's history. If he had not been able to wield both

swords, that of the emperor and the pope simultaneously, Iran would probably look a lot like what Egypt looks like today. Iran is the only country in the world which has conducted a successful counterrevolution against the American-Zionist Imperium and has lived to tell the tale. At a time when most Islamic revolutions seemed destined to go from oppression to anarchy in the wake of the Arab Spring, the Iranian Revolution still stands as an example of a people who successfully broke the yoke of Jewish-American cultural hegemony and then, in spite of the turbulence of the early years and the devastation wrought by the eight-year long war with Iraq, successfully rolled back the sexualized culture of the '60s without succumbing to anarchy or a new form of dictatorship.

America's Zionist-controlled government is hostile to Iran, not because it possesses or wants to possess nuclear weapons, but because it has taken control of its own culture in a way that the West still finds puzzling, dramatic, and, ultimately, an affront to everything the regime preaches, from sodomy to usury. This was probably the reasoning behind the 2012 release of *Argo*, the CIA propaganda film demonizing Iranians and lionizing Hollywood Jews. *Argo* is a perverse tribute to how unsettling the American elites continue to find this successful provincial uprising against their universal cultural hegemony. The message of *Argo* is what you would expect from the Masonic republic of America. Americans are deceivers. Ben Affleck moves blithely from one deception to another; he forges visas; he is involved in the production of a phony film, which is produced by Hollywood, America's propaganda ministry. He teaches the hostages how to deceive their captors. He coaches everyone in deception, and because of this we are to recognize him as an American hero.

If one were under any illusions that the West had somehow mellowed in the rebellion against God's order that was the essence of the Enlightenment, they would be dispelled by viewing *A Royal Affair* (2012). The film is seriously European but not artsy fartsy. It is a biopic about the life of Johan Struensee, the physician to King Christian IV, king of Denmark when the Enlightenment was raging in France, the continent's most powerful country. By the time Struensee had become his physician, the king had gone mad from (in the film's own words) excessive masturbation. Struensee exploited the situation to become in short order the queen's lover (Struensee seduced the queen by giving her his contraband copies of Rousseau to read. The fish rots first at the head.) and *de facto*

dictator of the Kingdom of Denmark. He then used his position as dictator to introduce the Enlightenment, in the form of freedom of the press and mandatory smallpox inoculation, to Denmark. What followed was heaven on earth — for a while at least — until the forces of evil, otherwise known as church and state, got their pay cut as part of government austerity measures. At that point the déclassé ruling class organized a counterrevolution and Struensee became the Enlightenment's version of Jesus Christ by shedding his blood for the people who rejected him in the name of hatred of all religion and — you're probably expecting this by now — freedom.

The Iranian Revolution, we are told by *Wikipedia*:

was unusual for the surprise it created throughout the world: it lacked many of the customary causes of revolution (defeat at war, a financial crisis, peasant rebellion or disgruntled military), produced profound change at great speed, was massively popular, and replaced a westernising monarchy with a theocracy based on Guardianship of the Islamic Jurists (or *velayat-e faqih*). Its outcome — an Islamic Republic “under the guidance of an extraordinary religious scholar from Qom” — was, as one scholar put it, “clearly an occurrence that had to be explained.”

The movie *Argo* is an indication that Americans are still trying to explain what happened. They found the Iranian Revolution of 1979 puzzling for a number of reasons. In fact, they are still puzzled by it. Islamic revolutions are still with us, and they still need to be explained to an American public that has distinctly impoverished categories when it comes to understanding anything that transcends the sophistication of nightly news broadcasts.

One of the most puzzling aspects of the Iranian Revolution of 1979 was that Americans were held responsible for the actions of a man whose name most Americans could hardly pronounce. The Shah was hated because he was the representative of America, which we were told was the Great Satan. After decades of incomprehension, America's propaganda ministry finally came up with an explanation of the Iranian Revolution of 1979 and its *sequelae* when it floated the phrase “they hate us for our freedoms.”

Americans found events like the Iranian Revolution puzzling because the terms “freedom” and “revolution” were co-opted a decade earlier when the *New York Times* put Wilhelm Reich on the cover of its Sunday magazine and resurrected his phrase, “sexual revolution,” as the explanation of what had happened in the '60s. If what happened in the '60s

was the “sexual revolution” leading to “freedom,” then what happened in Iran in 1979 was clearly something else. It was a counterrevolution. In fact, it was a sexual counterrevolution.

The Islamic Revolution of 1979 was in reality part of the sexual counterrevolution that was sweeping the world at that time. Ronald Reagan was part of that counterrevolution in America. Jimmy Carter’s support for the Shah, as well as his inept handling of the Iranian Revolution of 1979 and the subsequent hostage crisis, helped put Ronald Reagan in office, but the main reason Reagan won the election was the votes of the so-called “Reagan Democrats,” *i.e.*, the Catholics who had finally found a candidate who was willing to oppose the infamous 1973 Supreme Court decision legalizing abortion. If Catholics needed further proof of the counterrevolutionary nature of the Reagan presidency, they could point to Reagan’s alliance with Pope John Paul II to bring down atheistic Communism.

The Republican Party betrayed this counterrevolution when it aligned itself with the Jewish Neoconservatives who led America into the military campaign against Islam in the Middle East that began with the 9/11 attacks and subsequently had Iran in its sights, but that doesn’t change the fact that Reagan won the election of 1980 as a conservative sexual counterrevolutionary who was the tacit ally of the Ayatollah Khomeini, whose hostage crisis helped put him in office.

The idea that the Iranian Revolution of 1979 was the Iranian version of the global sexual counterrevolution explains an event that Americans found particularly puzzling, namely, the spectacle of Iranians burning down their own movie theaters and birth control clinics. During the 1970s, Iranians were subjected to a film- and TV-based barrage of sexual imagery, whose main purpose was the pacification and demoralization of the country. The commercials of the ’70s can be viewed on the internet. They are crude and tame in comparison with the pornography and sophisticated ads which are now common, but their intention is clear. Playing Led Zeppelin’s “Whole lotta love” as background music for a clip advertising an ice-skating rink makes no sense (Wouldn’t the “Skaters’ Waltz” have been more appropriate?), unless we see the entire package (including crotch shots of female ice skaters) as part of the Shah/CIA attempt to turn the Iranians into sexual robots and docile consumers.

Hollywood is the propaganda ministry for the Zionist-American Imperium. Hollywood achieves its hegemonic goals by way of moral corruption. That is the gist of my more than thirty years of research into the use of sexual liberation as political control, and the development of that argument can be found *in extenso* in my book *Libido Dominandi: Sexual Liberation and Political Control* (2000). The Iranians were guinea pigs in the same experiment in social engineering that destroyed Catholic political power in the United States in the aftermath of the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

When Iranians recognized that sexual liberation was a form of political control, they burned down their own movie theaters. Fifty years earlier, Catholics reacted to Hollywood's sexualization of American culture with boycotts. Instead of burning their movie theaters down, American Catholics boycotted them under the leadership of Philadelphia's Cardinal Dougherty and the Legion of Decency.

After meeting with Hollywood moguls during the height of the boycott in 1934, Joseph Breen claimed that Harry Warner, head of Warner Brothers studios, was "crying tears as big as horse turds" because his theaters were losing \$100,000 a week in Philadelphia alone. Eventually Breen became head of the first Hollywood Production Code, which allowed Catholics to keep nudity, obscenity and blasphemy off of America's movie screens.

Even if the realizations occurred decades apart, American Catholics and Iranian Muslims came to the same conclusion: film was an integral part of the sexual revolution. The purpose of sexual liberation was the destruction of the nation's moral fiber as a prelude to sophisticated totalitarian control. The Jewish psychiatrist Wilhelm Reich was the architect of sexual liberation as political control because he explained the importance of "mass situations" in undermining morality and therefore the social order. Film became a tool of sexual liberation because Hollywood was and still is controlled by Jews.

The Jewish revolutionaries have never lost their penchant for producing pornography and using it as a form of political control. When the Israeli military rolled into Ramallah in the West Bank on March 30, 2002, one of the first things they did was take over Palestinian TV stations. This is what conquering armies do. But when the conquering army is Jewish,

something more telling and unusual follows. Shortly after occupying the Al-Watan TV station, the Israeli forces began broadcasting pornography over its transmitter. One 52-year-old Palestinian mother of three children, according to one report, complained about “the deliberate psychological damage caused by these broadcasts.” The only Palestinian station not taken over by the Israelis ran a written message at the bottom of its screen claiming that “Anything currently shown on Al-Watan and other local TV channels has nothing to do with Palestinian programs but is being broadcast by the Israeli occupation forces. We urge parents to take precautions.”

The Marquis de Sade, another architect of sexual liberation as political control, made it perfectly clear that sexual liberation leads to violence and eventually murder. The French Revolution, which the Marquis de Sade started from his cell in the Bastille, was proof of that. The Ayatollah Khomeini was able to focus this violence on the Great Satan that was inciting it and create a successful counterrevolution against it.

The Republican Party betrayed its own counterrevolution, and as a result the violence which sexual liberation naturally creates continues unabated in the form of seemingly random mass killings of the sort that we witnessed in Colorado and Connecticut and other places too numerous to mention. The Aurora, Colorado killer James Holmes, like most males of his generation, frequented adult web sites. After providing his sexual profile to one of them, he was “shot down” by three women he tried to solicit for sex. The random acts of violence that occur in America with depressing regularity are manifestations of the sexual counterrevolution which the Republican Party exploited for political purposes and then strangled in its cradle in favor of Neoconservative-inspired wars for Israel in the Middle East. These attacks will continue until Americans wrest control of their culture from the forces which have been using pornography to enslave them because, as the Marquis de Sade could have explained very well, the same forces that render the majority docile, turn an equally predictable minority into violent killers.

CHAPTER TWO

The Earlier History of Islam

Unlike Christianity, whose seminal texts were written in Greek and, therefore, within the orbit of Greek philosophy, Islam arose in an intellectual backwater in the middle of the largely polytheistic Arabian Peninsula, with a sacred scripture written in a language that lacked a firm foundation in Logos. It then spread like wild-fire through regions of Christendom weakened by Christian heresies. Muhammad began preaching monotheism to the citizens of Mecca around 610 A.D. Forty years later Muslims ruled Arabia, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Palestine and Egypt. Over the next century, Islam became the religion of everyone from the western borders of China to the Pyrenees, and as part of the consolidation of its conquests, it came into contact with Greek thought.

The outcome of that meeting was by no means a foregone conclusion. It would take Christianity, which was rooted in Greek language and culture, roughly thirteen centuries to sort out the relationship between faith and reason and to come up with a measured response to the challenges of thinkers like Tertullian, who wondered famously, “What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?”

Islam, which lacked the cultural patrimony of the Greek language, had to confront Hellenic thought less than a century after the first Hajj, which took place in 630 A.D., when Muhammed led his followers from Medina to Mecca, where he cleansed the Kaaba of its idols and rebuilt it as the house of God. Given the intellectual disparity between the largely illiterate conquerors and the philosophically sophisticated centers of Hellenistic learning that they conquered, conflict between faith and reason was inevitable. The surprising thing about early Islam’s contact with the realm of Greek thought is how well it went at the beginning.

After Abū Ja’far Abdullāh al Ma’mūn ibn Harūn defeated his brother in a battle for the throne in Baghdad and became caliph in 813, he “took the title of imam, and chose a Shi’a as his successor.” The decision was significant because Shi’a Islam’s rationalist heritage would preserve it from

the ravages of fideism which would soon sweep through the Sunni majority. Al Ma'mun gave his official protection to the Mu'tazilites,

who created the first fully developed theological school in Islam, championed the primary role of reason; reason's ability to know morality; the goodness and justice of God as required by reason; the unity of God; and the necessity of man's free will. They represented the beginning of the Hellenization of Islamic thought insofar as they employed Greek philosophical concepts and logic in their consideration of theological questions.

According to Robert Reilly's book, *The Closing of the Muslim Mind* (2010), from which the above quotations come, "Al-Ma'mun, strongly influenced by the Mu'tazilite movement, was the greatest patron of philosophy and science in the history of Islam." The Mu'tazilites were rationalist theologians who felt that God's power was equaled by his reason and that the one could not contradict the other. The Mu'tazilites, according to Reilly, "would have been in accord with Thomas Aquinas's proposition that man can apprehend created things with his mind because they were first thought by God." The Mu'tazilites felt that creation was intelligible because it was created by God, who left his indelible stamp on it. God, in turn, was "guided by the rationality of the universe he created," which meant that man could apprehend the mind of God by studying his creation. The notion that "not acting reasonably" was "contrary to God's nature," was "a respectable theological position within Islam."

This happy state of affairs did not last long. The next two caliphs upheld al Ma'mun's defense of Mu'tazilite doctrine, but:

In the second year of the reign of Caliph Ja'afar al-Mutawikkil (847-861), the tables were turned. The mihrab was shut down and the Mu'tazilite judges responsible for the inquisition were cursed from the pulpits by name. Holding the Mu'tazilite doctrine became a crime punishable by death. The Mu'tazilites were expelled from court, removed from all government positions, and their works were largely destroyed. Al-Mutawakkil released the aged Ibn Hanbal from prison and prohibited "discussing the intricacies of what is creed and what is uncreated in a copy of vocal recitation of the Qur'an."

The defeat of the Mu'tazilites would have far-reaching consequences for Islam. For one thing, it deepened the split between the Sunni and the Shi'a. That chasm exists to this day and brings with it major geopolitical ramifications, of which the civil war in Syria is just one manifestation. The Mu'tazilites "fled to the more hospitable Shi'a areas under the Buwayhid rulers in eastern Persia" at around the same time that the 12th Imam went into the state of occultation that has lasted until this day. The absence of an infallible imam meant that "the Shi'a had to think for themselves,"

something which prevented the excesses of fideism which would ravage their Sunni brethren for centuries thereafter. Eventually, according to Reilly, “the most widely accepted Shi’a teaching contained elements derived from the Mu’tazili school.” The expulsion of the Mu’talizites from Baghdad meant the end of theology (or Kalam) and its replacement by jurisprudence and casuistry. It meant the loss of Logos in public discourse, which meant the rise of fideism, a *sola scriptura* approach to the Koran, and the end of both philosophy and science.

The anti-rationalist view never triumphed in Christianity because Christ’s identity as the Logos incarnate was firmly established in the first sentence of the Gospel of St. John, when the evangelist wrote “*En arche een ho Logos*,” In the beginning, there was reason and order (Logos). “If Christ is Logos,” Reilly writes:

if God introduces himself as *ratio*, then God is not only all-powerful, He is reason. While the Mu’tazilites claimed something similar, they did not have a scriptural authority of similar significance to confirm their position in an unassailable way, while their opponents had ample scriptural material to oppose them.

The turn against reason which began under the reign of Caliph Ja’afar al-Mutawikkil found its completion under the intellectual guidance of Islam’s Tertullian, Abu Hasan al-Ash’ari (873-935), founder of the eponymous Ash’arite school of Islamic thought which viewed God “as pure will, without or above reason.” Al-Ash’ari had been a Mu’tazilite until the age of forty. He then turned reason against reason by making God’s word an expression of his Will rather than an expression of his reason or Logos.

CHAPTER THREE

Logos Evaporates

Logos, at this point, simply evaporated from the Islamic universe. As a result of this turn against reason, as Reilly writes, “there is no rational order invested in the universe upon which one can rely, only the second-to-second manifestation of God’s will.” As a result, “reality becomes incomprehensible and the purpose of things in themselves indiscernible because they have no inner logic. If unlimited will is the exclusive constituent of reality, there is really nothing left to reason about.”

The triumph of the Ash’arite school of thought in Islam meant the end of a comprehensible universe. In the absence of Logos, which is to say, the evidence of reason in creation, everything from politics to physics became a function of will, because as Fr. James V. Schall, S.J. puts it in a passage quoted by Reilly:

The rational creature can only “participate” in the eternal law of God if that law is itself founded in *Logos*, in Word [or Reason]. If it is grounded merely in will, even if it is God’s will, as various theologies and philosophies are tempted to maintain, there can be no real “participation” in the eternal law by the human being.

Why? Essentially, because there is nothing to participate in if what is grounded in and known only by will can, at any time, be the opposite of what it is at first thought to be.

Any notion that God was in any way bound by the rational nature of his Being became in the minds of the Ash’arites an affront to his omnipotence:

The notion that God had to do something was anathema to the traditionalists and to the Ash’arites. For them, Allah is not bound by anything. Nothing is obligatory for Him. If it were, His omnipotence would be compromised. The Mu’tazilite response to this was that God must be consistent with Himself, and that in no way compromises his omnipotence. It simply defines who He is (Reilly).

British-Lebanese scholar George Hourani

claimed that “the turning point in the suppression of Mu’tazilism occurred in the 11th century with creedal proclamations of the caliph Qadir beginning in 1017, followed by Hanbalite demonstrations in Baghdad in the 1060s and the favor shown to the Ash’arites by the Seljuq sultans and their wazir Nizam al-Mulk.” “Thus ended,” writes Pakistani physicist Pervez Hoodbhoy, “the most serious attempt to combine reason with revelation in Islam.” “By the 12th century,” he concludes, “the conservative, anti-rationalist school of thought had almost completely destroyed the Mu’tazila influence. So hard was this reaction, that al-Ash’ari is considered to be

relatively moderate as compared with Ibn Hanbal and later the Wahhabis, who did not allow any form of speculation. (Reilly)

One hundred and fifty years after al-Ashari's death, al-Ashari's disciple Abu Hamid al-Ghazali (1058-1111) completed the demolition of reason which his master began by claiming that "nothing in nature can act spontaneously and apart from God." After abolishing secondary causality and Logos, al-Ghazali put will in their place. Will precedes knowledge. Like the German romantics and American adherents of that school like Ralph Waldo Emerson, "it is the act that produces knowledge" for al-Ghazali. Unlike St. John, who claimed that "In the beginning was the word," al-Ghazali, like Goethe's Faust, claimed that, "*Am Anfang war die Tat.*" Or as Reilly puts it:

"In the beginning was the Word" is transformed into "In the beginning was the Deed." This contrast captures the two radically different theologies of the Mu'tazilites and the Ash'arites. Fazur Rahman summed up the differences by saying that Ash'arism "had rendered God a concentrate of power and will, just as the Mu'tazila had made him a concentrate of justice and rationality." In positing God's will as the antithesis of his justice and rationality, al-Ghazali "broke the back of rationalistic philosophy and in fact brought the career of philosophy ... to an end in the Arabic part of the Islamic world."

In 1180, almost 100 years after the publication of al-Ghazali's book *The Incoherence of the Philosophers*, Averroes (1126-1198) tried to launch a rationalist counterattack against al-Ghazali's defense of the Ash'arite creed with the publication of *The Incoherence of the Incoherence*, which is "an almost line-by-line refutation of al-Ghazali's book." But the attempt failed, and Averroes's books were burned in the town square of Cordoba instead. After Averroes's defeat, "the great majority of Islamic jurists adopted [al-Ghazali's] ideas ... spurning deductive reasoning altogether" and producing ideologies like Wahhabism, which are "even more inimical to the primacy of reason than Ash'arism." The result in the political realm was the degeneration of the caliphate into an inscrutable dictatorship in every Islamic country, except those which espoused Shi'ism, "which has not granted de jure legitimacy to any ruler after the occultation of the 12th imam."

The triumph of Ash'arism had incalculable consequences because it made

moral philosophy, as in Aristotle's *Ethics*, impossible. There is no sense in this form of Islam of man fulfilling his nature, or of the "good" as that which aids him in doing so, or of the fulfillment of man's nature as defining his "good." Rather, the good is understood only as a matter of obedience to the external commandments of

God — whatever they may be — unrelated to any internal logic in man himself or in creation.

That means there is “no entelechy, no such thing as ‘having one’s end within,’ as Aristotle put it. Just as God does not act teleologically, His creatures have no *telos*.” Everything that resolves itself into will, as Shakespeare pointed out, becomes a function of appetite, which eventually destroys itself. In *Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory* (1903), Duncan B. Macdonald came to the same conclusion as Shakespeare: Al-Ghazali’s

primary conception is, *volo ergo sum*. It is not thought which impresses him, but volition. From thought he can develop nothing; from will can come the whole round universe. But if God, the Creator, is a Willer, so, too, is the soul of man. They are kin, and therefore, man can know and recognize God.

CHAPTER FOUR

Pope Benedict XVI and the Regensburg Speech

In his Regensburg speech, Pope Benedict couched his critique of Islam's "relation to reason" in terms of Logos, the Greek term for both human reason and the order of the universe. Unlike Christianity, Benedict said in Regensburg, Islam is not docile to Logos, nor for that matter is Islam's God; God's will is arbitrary, inscrutable.

According to Benedict's reading of Emperor Manuel II Paleologos, "the decisive statement in this argument against violent conversion is this: not to act in accordance with reason is contrary to God's nature." This idea cannot be found in Islam. "The noted French Islamist R. Arnaldez," Pope Benedict continued, "points out that Ibn Hazn went so far as to state that God is not bound even by his own word, and that nothing would oblige him to reveal the truth to us. Were it God's will, we would even have to practice idolatry."

Christianity is different from Islam: The Christian God acts with Logos. In using the term Logos, Benedict situated Christianity and, by extension, the European culture which grew up under its influence, in the tradition of Greek philosophy. Greek philosophy is part of God's plan for humanity, something that became clear when Paul had to change his plans and travel to Macedonia. Greek philosophy is, in other words, not just Greek; it is universal.

Is the conviction that acting unreasonably contradicts God's nature merely a Greek idea, or is it always and intrinsically true? I believe that here we can see the profound harmony between what is Greek in the best sense of the word and the biblical understanding of faith in God. Modifying the first verse of the Book of Genesis, the first verse of the whole Bible, John began the prologue of his Gospel with the words: In the beginning was the λόγος logos. This is the very word used by the emperor: God acts with σὺν λόγῳ, with *logos*. *Logos* means both reason and word — a reason which is creative and capable of self-communication, precisely as reason. ... In the beginning was the *logos*, and the *logos* is God, says the Evangelist.

The marriage of Hebrew scripture and Greek philosophy that begat Christianity and Europe is not mere coincidence, nor is Greek philosophy some adulteration of an otherwise pure Gospel. Europe means Biblical faith plus Greek thought; Europe is based on Logos. "The encounter between the Biblical message and Greek thought," Pope Benedict continued,

did not happen by chance... Biblical faith ... encountered the best of Greek thought at a deep level, resulting in a mutual enrichment evident in the later wisdom literature... A profound encounter of faith and reason is taking place there [in the Septuagint], an encounter between genuine enlightenment and religion. From the very heart of Christian faith, and, at the same time, the heart of Greek thought now joined to faith. Manuel II was able to say: "Not to act 'with logos' is contrary to God's nature."

This means that Logos, far from being some cultural accretion, is part of the nature of God and, therefore, part of creation. The European, and by that term I include both North and South America and Australia, is born into a world that is radically reasonable, radically logical, because that world mirrors the mind of God, who behaves in ways that sometimes go beyond what human reason can comprehend but never in ways that contradict that reason:

The faith of the Church has always insisted that between God and us, between his eternal Creator Spirit and our created reason there exists a real analogy, in which unlikeness remains infinitely greater than likeness, yet not to the point of abolishing analogy and its language. God does not become more divine when we push him away from us in a sheer, impenetrable voluntarism; rather, the truly divine God is the God who has revealed himself as logos and, as logos, has acted and continues to act lovingly on our behalf. Certainly, love transcends knowledge and is thereby capable of perceiving more than thought alone; nonetheless, it continues to be love of the God who is logos.

God is Love, but the manifestation of both to the human mind is Logos. Our faith as Christians is grounded in Logos, and that means that any culture which grows out of that soil will be rooted in Logos. Europe is rooted in Logos; if Europe abandons Logos as transmitted by its Christian roots, it will no longer be in any sense Europe, which is precisely what we are witnessing today in cities like Leicester in England, which is now predominantly Muslim, or Berlin, which is neopagan. European culture is culture saturated in Logos. What Europe now lacks is Logos because it has cut itself off from its Christian roots. Pope Benedict made the connection clear in his speech:

The inner rapprochement between Biblical faith and Greek philosophical inquiry was an event of decisive importance not only from the standpoint of the history of religions, but also from that of world history; it is an event which concerns us even today. Given this convergence, it is not surprising that Christianity, despite its origins and some significant developments in the East, finally took on its historically decisive character in Europe. We can also express this the other way around: this convergence, with the subsequent addition of the Roman heritage, created Europe and remains the foundation of what can rightly be called Europe.

So far so good. We agree wholeheartedly with what Pope Benedict said about Logos, and we can see without too much effort that Islam has a

radically different attitude toward the relationship between faith and reason. Europe has dealt with this threat for centuries, but from an historical perspective, the Islamic threat to Europe is only half the story.

This is precisely the flaw with Benedict's speech. He ignored half the story, namely the Israeli half of the equation. When a neocon commentator on Benedict's speech like Fr. James Schall, S.J., wrote in his book *The Regensburg Lecture* (2007) that the "real root of terrorism" lies in the "logic of sola voluntas as the definition of Allah," he was misrepresenting the issue both metaphysically and historically. Historically, modern terrorism began when Russian Jews blew up the King David Hotel in Jerusalem to drive the English out of Palestine. Schall could have incorporated this fact into his definition of terrorism by showing how the Talmud is every bit as antagonistic to Logos as the Koran, but he chose not to do so. This sin of omission undermines his entire book, especially when he attacks political correctness, "whose effect is in fact to prevent us from naming exactly what we are dealing with."

That is precisely the problem with Schall's book, but it is also the problem with Benedict's speech. At this point we come to the attack on Logos which was not mentioned in the speech, the Jewish attack on Logos, which manifests itself not by the threat of invasion from without, as is the case with Islam, which has sought to spread its faith by the sword and military conquest, but the threat of subversion from within, otherwise known as revolution. If the Muslim is alogos, because of Mohammed's imperfect understanding of the monotheistic traditions he absorbed from his position beyond the borders of a collapsing Greco-Roman civilization, the Jew is anti-Logos, for a very simple reason, namely, because of his rejection of Christ. Islam did not reject Christ. Islam failed to understand Christ, as manifested in its rejection of the Trinity and the Incarnation, and ended up trying to mask that misunderstanding by honoring Jesus as a prophet.

The situation with the Jews is completely different. The Jews were God's chosen people. When Jesus arrived on earth as their long awaited Messiah, the Jews, who, like all men, were given free will by their God, had to make a decision. They had to either accept or reject the Christ, who was the physical embodiment of Logos.

As in his Regensburg speech so in his interview with Peter Seewald (Benedict XVI, *Light of the World: The Pope, the Church, and the Signs of the Times* (2010)), Benedict seems to have a double standard when it comes to Logos. Muslims are guilty until proven innocent when it comes to terrorism and contempt for Logos, but the Jewish rejection of Logos (which is mentioned in Scripture) as well as Israeli involvement in state-supported terrorism, never gets mentioned, certainly not as a cause of Muslim terrorism. The Jewish rejection of Logos is dealt with in great detail, of course, in my book *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit* (2008) and the main aspects of this also can be found in my book *The Catholic Church and the Jews* (2016).

The double standard, then, haunted the Benedict papacy from its inception and it showed no signs of abating. There is no theological or scriptural basis for treating Jews as somehow less inimical to Christian interests than Muslims. Well, maybe it depends upon whom you ask. And in this context, it may very well have depended on which Benedict you asked or which Benedict answered. When it comes to the Jews, the two Benedicts were pursuing two different courses. Benedict the pope affirmed that Jews must accept Jesus in order to be saved, but Benedict the German professor opined that the old prayer for their conversion, the one referring to the “perfidious Jews,” “was offensive to Jews and failed to express positively the overall intrinsic unity between the Old and New Testament.” Hence the need for “a new formulation” which “shifts the focus from a direct petition for the conversion of the Jews in a missionary sense to a plea that the Lord might bring about the hour of history when we may all be united.” All of these conflicting claims would be much easier to adjudicate if there were one pope who had one public persona, and if that public persona, the papal “we,” were the only source of the pope’s public utterances. Then the pope, whether it be Benedict or Francis, would know that every time he opened his mouth in public he would have a clear set of criteria to follow, the main set being embodied in Sacred Scripture. If that were the case, life would be simpler for the pope and for the rest of us as well. But being restricted to speaking only as the papal “we” would have significant consequences, both theological and political. Fidelity to the gospel message of preaching conversion, which is precisely what St. Peter did when he went to Jerusalem, would mean the end of dialogue.

CHAPTER FIVE

What is Islam?

So, what exactly is Islam? To answer the question at least preliminarily, there are in effect two Islams, one at war with the other. There is the Shi'a triad which begins with the Hezbollah-Palestinian faction in the west, moves to the Alawite Assad regime in Syria, which is aligned with the Ayatollah Sistani Shi'a in Iraq, who are aligned with the Shi'a Islamic Republic of Iran. They are now at war with the Sunni/Wahhabi/Salafist triad, which is supported by Israel, Turkey, and the Wahhabi regime in Saudi Arabia. Caught with its pants down when the Arab Spring arrived and deposed American puppets like the Egyptian president Hosni Mubarak, the American State Department, under the leadership of geniuses like Hilary Clinton and John McCain, threw their support to Salafist insurgents like Morsi in Egypt and God-knows-who in Libya and gave their imprimatur to the new boss, who, compared to the old boss, harbored an even more virulent hatred of Israel and was intellectually even less equipped to run a government than the secularist totalitarians they were so avid to depose. The result was chaos, epitomized by the murder of the U.S. ambassador and his staff in Benghazi, brought about by the very people that Hilary Clinton and John McCain put into power.

True to their Enlightenment prejudices and the failed policies of the '70s that drove the Shah from power in Iran, the State Department invited a number of "women leaders" from the Islamic world to take part in a summer-long program of feminist brainwashing at St. Mary's College in South Bend, Indiana. For some reason known to Allah alone, the Joneses were selected to be the host family for one of these young ladies. Fatemah, which is not her real name, had come here fresh from the coup in Libya, newly anointed as a feminist leader of the future who could be counted on to spread feminism and the moral corruption of women that invariably accompanied it among her sisters in Libya — all in the name of freedom, of course.

Feminism, you may remember, was one of the first things that Paul Wolfowitz promoted after the conquest of Baghdad, indicating that it was the appropriate punishment for conquered backward peoples, like the

Catholic parents who send their children to St. Mary's College and the children of the Salafists in Libya. Unfortunately, things never work out as planned by the Masters of the Universe. After lavishing money on fifth-column feminists in Iraq, Paul Wolfowitz nearly got himself killed when an RPG hit the room below his in the hotel where he was staying in Baghdad. The spectacle of Wolfowitz running out of the hotel in his underwear was a sign of hope insofar as it showed that Iraqis understood feminism and how to deal with Jewish revolutionaries intent on corrupting the morals of their daughters. As the result of a gesture similar to firing an RPG at Paul Wolfowitz's hotel room, the U.S. ambassador to Libya got killed by the people he liberated. After an intense late night conversation, Fatemah, the woman leader of the future who got billeted to our home, began to express a hatred for Israel that was even more intense than her hatred for the late Muammar Khaddafi. So Israel and the State Department are sowing dragons' teeth and are in for a rude awakening, of which the murder of Ambassador J. Christopher Stevens is only the prelude.

Shi'a Islam has a magisterium which is not separate from the state. The Islamic Republic of Iran is based on the *Velayat-e faqih*, or governance of the guardians. The guardians, analogous to the *Archons* of Plato, ensure that democracy remains within the bounds of Sharia, which is to say, the laws of God. If any group in Islam has the potential of breaking out of the intellectual impasse which has resulted from the Islamic *sola scriptura* reading of the Koran, it is Shi'ite scholars like Javadi e Emoli, whose thoughts on the relationship between freedom and the moral law I have cited a number of times in talks. Shi'a Islam denies that every Muslim has the right to his own interpretation of the Koran. Shi'a Islam believes that something like a Church, *i.e.*, an organization providing moral guidance, is necessary for salvation and for the proper functioning of the state.

Science was the regnant *lingua franca* under the Shah and all of the other secular regimes which the United States and Britain put in power in the aftermath of World War II. It was based on the bifurcation of Logos which Descartes bequeathed to the West when, disgusted with the legacy of Christendom and the wars of the 17th century (he was a soldier in the Battle of White Mountain when the Magic King of Bohemia was deposed), he divided the world into the *res cogitans*, which was subjective, and the *res extensa*, which was its objective opposite. Morals got banned from that universe because no one, least of all Descartes, could figure out how they

applied to balls moving in space, and the result was economics as pseudo-physics, Capitalism, and the world as we know it now.

By the time Imam Khomeini founded an Islamic republic based on the rule of the guardians and total abolition of the separation of church and state which had characterized all of the secular Islamic regimes in the Middle East, the Enlightenment state was showing signs of strain. In the intervening three decades since then, it has all but completely collapsed. The American experiment in ordered liberty failed completely during the thirty-some crucial years that spanned the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century. Shorn of the religious input that the Catholic Church had provided, however incompletely, America was unable to prevent the complete eclipse of its own democratic principles and their replacement by the crudest form of Jewish plutocracy, symbolized best by the role which casino mogul Sheldon Adelson played in the 2012 presidential elections, or in the twenty-some standing ovations that the entire American Congress gave to Binyamin Netanyahu in the Spring of 2011 in order to keep Jewish money flowing into their coffers. When asked what kind of government America's founding fathers had created, Benjamin Franklin replied, "A republic, if you can keep it." Well, by the time George W. Bush left the White House in 2008, it was clear that we couldn't keep it and that America had entered a state of totalitarian decadence that was the antithesis of everything that America's founding fathers had sought to maintain.

In our quest for the answer to the question "What is Islam?" I made a visit in 2013 to Qom, which is an oasis in the desert roughly one hundred miles south of Tehran, and is the holy city of Shi'ism. I was taken to the house of Hojjatoleslam Nasiri, an Islamic scholar who is editor of the 110 volume edition of the *Hadith*, which is to say, a collection of religious stories, reports, and traditions ascribed to Muhammad and/or his pious companions which number in the hundreds of thousands. The title Hojjatoleslam indicates a rank just below that of ayatollah, and on the following day we would be joined with another cleric, Hojjatoleslam Hosayni, who would make his own contributions to our discussion, and by Arash Darya-Bandari, who studied at Berkeley.

CHAPTER SIX

Faith and Reason

We launched into a discussion of the relationship between revelation and philosophy, which I initiated by citing Pope Benedict's Regensburg speech and the claim he made therein that that Arabic philosophy stopped when Averroes was rejected as a heretic after failing to reconcile Aristotle's claim that the world is eternal with Scripture's claim that it began in time. In coming up with the doctrine of two truths, Averroes was only trying to reconcile a dispute in Sunni Islam between the Mu'tazila, who had been influenced by Aristotle and believed in free will, and the Ash'arites, who believed in predestination, the position of the overwhelming majority of Sunni Muslims. According to a gloss on our conversation which was forwarded to me later,

the Mu'tazila maintained that in the event that there is a conflict between reason and revelation, that reason trumps revelation. The Ash'arites believe the opposite. The Shi'a position is that there can be no contradiction between the two, as revelation is not irrational or anti-rational, but trans- or supra-rational, and conflicts arise only because revelation is not properly understood, because reason is not pure (it is mixed up with emotions and illusion), or that reason has overstepped its bounds and transgressed into the compass that is rightly scripture's. *Waliyic Islam* goes into this at some length also.

The Shi'a position on revelation is similar to the Catholic position. Both religions claim to be based on a canonical set of writings, which are both perfect — which is to say, efficacious for salvation — and complete — which is to say, compiled definitively at a certain period of time, after which no new revelation will be added. This is where the problems start. If all knowledge comes from revelation, and revelation is complete at some point in the past, how do you adjudicate the moral liceity of new technologies like credit default swaps or birth control pills?

The Catholic answer is Sacred Tradition, which is “like a mirror, in which the Church during its pilgrim journey here on earth, contemplates God, from whom she receives everything, until such time as she is brought to see him face to face as he really is” (Austin Flannery, *Vatican II: The Conciliar and Post-Conciliar Documents* (1980), p.754). Sacred Tradition “comes from the apostles” and “makes progress in the Church with the help of the Holy Spirit. There is a growth in insight into the realities and words

that are being passed on... Thus, as the centuries go by, the Church is always advancing toward the plenitude of divine truth, until eventually the words of God are fulfilled in her” (Flannery, p.754).

Any attempt to deal with the relationship between revelation and reason in Islamic thought invariably runs into the Islamic version of *sola scriptura*, at which point all discussions run the danger of hitting a brick wall, ours being no exception to that rule. In retrospect, I think it was a tactical error to talk about Logos when I could have used the more accurate word tradition to convey the same thing. This might have circumvented triggering the Islamic aversion to pagan philosophy, which it sees as a form of idolatry. Nasiri considered Averroes a heretic because Averroes took Aristotle seriously. Given the *sola scriptura* approach to revelation, there is no explanation of how a body of scripture which is complete at a certain period of time can find application to future contingencies which the writers of scripture could not have imagined. *Sola scriptura* forces the believer to misstate the question by asking what the Koran has to say about credit default swaps and birth control pills.

The way out of this dilemma is some form of sacred tradition based on Logos. This allows the believer to claim that “Sacred Scripture is the speech of God” (Flannery, p.755), but it also allows the application of scriptural principles to future contingencies. The Catholic Church rejects *sola scriptura*, because, among other reasons, it invariably leads the interpreter of scripture into an intellectual dead end. The Church “does not draw her certainty about all revealed truths from the holy Scriptures alone” (Flannery, p.755) because that would preclude dealing with any future contingency not included in Sacred Scripture. The task of giving an authentic interpretation of the Word of God, whether in its written form or in the form of Tradition has been entrusted to the living teaching office of the Church alone, which is based on both Scripture and Tradition. In fact, “Tradition, sacred Scripture, and the Magisterium of the Church are so connected and associated that one of them cannot stand without the others” (Flannery, p.756).

Sacred Tradition is bound up with Logos, which is to say, unaided reason’s ability to discern the order of the universe, because it claims that: “God, who creates and conserves all things by his Word, provides men with constant evidence of himself in created realities...” *Dei Verbum*, the Vatican II Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation then cites Romans, 1:19-20:

“For what can be known about God is perfectly plain to them [*i.e.*, the pagan Romans] since God himself has made it plain. Ever since God created the world his everlasting power and deity — however invisible — have been there for the mind to see in the things he has made. That is why such people are without excuse: they knew God and yet refused to honor him as God or thank him; instead, they made nonsense out of logic and their empty minds were darkened.” *Dei Verbum* claims that “God, the first principle and last end of all things, can be known with certainty from the created world by the natural light of human reason.”

According to a gloss sent to me after the interview, Islam would reject Saint Paul’s claim because “The Shi’a position is that [unaided human reason] is necessary but not sufficient. As Hj. Nasiri pointed out: each of the philosophers believes his position to be the most reasonable, and without revelation, there is and can be no criterion with which to assay the correctness of a given position.”

In continuing the discussion, Arash Darya-Bandari makes it clear that the Ayatollah Javadi, however, has a slightly different position, claiming that reason itself sees its own limitations. For example, reason sees that its ambit is conceptual, and that concepts are discrete and finite, that reality is continuous and infinite, and that therefore, its epistemic ambit is limited.

But then, after undercutting what Saint Paul and Sacred Tradition have to say about unaided human reason, the Ayatollah Javadi goes on:

to affirm the importance and indeed the indispensability of reason, stating that a person who fails to abide by its dictates “will be taken to Hell, plea as he might (on the Day of Judgment) that he never saw anything in scripture (pertaining to these imperatives)”: (rather,) he will be told, “you were endowed with intelligence, and (it was) your intelligence (which) decreed these (imperatives) to you.” (Human intelligence is “the proof (sufficient unto) Islam” {*hujjat ol-islam*}, and its dictates are the dictates of (our) religion.

Whether the Ayatollah Javadi would accept the idea that “God, the first principle and last end of all things, can be known with certainty from the created world by the natural light of human reason” is a question I cannot answer. He lives in Qom, but he didn’t take part in our symposium. Catholics believe that there can be no conflict between faith and reason, but Muslims believe that there is no possibility of conflict between the Koran and all ideas because the Koran is the source of all knowledge. The more the mullahs revert to *sola scriptura* the more imperiled any dialogue becomes; in fact, every discussion that starts out with *sola scriptura* as its premise veers perilously close to the story of the Muslims and the Library

of Alexandria. Either what is in the library contradicts the Koran, in which case it is heretical and should be burnt, or it repeats what is in the Koran, in which case it is superfluous and should be burnt. There is no escape from the inexorable logic of *sola scriptura*.

When the discussion turns toward a consideration of creation, I once again complicate things unnecessarily by dragging Aristotle into the discussion. The universe is created by God and, therefore, a manifestation of God's mind. Therefore, we can know the mind of God by studying creation. Every time I make an overture like this I am stopped by the Islamic notion of the word of God. Citing Saint Paul's Epistle to the Romans, I claim that pagans will be held accountable for their actions even though they lack any revelation because unaided reason can derive the moral law from creation. Every time I make a claim like this it has to be translated not only into Farsi but also into the philosophical framework of Islamic *sola scriptura*, which claims that all knowledge comes from the prophets. There is simply no possibility of a figure like Aristotle in this conceptual framework.

And yet Aristotle is vital here. The truth is that Aristotle was on track of the same thought as Thomas Aquinas in his *Summa Theologiae*, namely of God understood as he alone who, having always been there, strictly qualifies as the one who causes everything else to exist, an elaboration of the idea of cause to explain bare existence itself, the existence of anything at all. What is more, in a passage, *Metaphysics*, 1063b37-1064a4, not referred to in the major commentaries, Aristotle says that the natural sciences deal with what is subject to change; and the theoretical sciences — mathematics, logic, rhetoric — deal with what is permanent but not apart from the world, whereas Aristotle's postulate, to explain why there is anything at all rather than nothing, does not change; and being *ex hypothesi* the most permanent thing there is, it exists apart from the world.

Looking at all of this from a less academic perspective, when I was in India in 2015 I visited a class in a Catholic school. When the teacher asked the students if they had any questions, a Hindu named Samil stood up and asked if I could come up with a scientific proof for the existence of God. I said, "Sure", and proceeded to say:

Nothing comes from nothing; there is something; therefore, there was never nothing. This something could not bring itself into existence, because to do that, it would have to exist before it existed. Therefore, something else had to bring it into existence. That something is what Aristotle called the uncaused cause and the

unmoved mover. Aquinas ends his proofs for the existence of God by saying that “this being all men call God.”

On another occasion I wrote the following:

If there were ever nothing, there could never be something. Since it's obvious that there is something, then there was never nothing. Since material beings come into existence, decay, and go out of existence, the something that preceded everything else could not have been material; it had to be a spiritual entity that was dependent on nothing else. That is what all men call God. ("Diary of a Tortured Soul," *Culture Wars*, March 2003.)

What I would also like to have said in the discussion referred to earlier is that if reality is a bridge, then God is the bedrock beneath the river bottom that prevents the bridge from collapsing into the river. When engineers build bridges, they build forms and then pump the water out of the forms to get to that bedrock. Those engineers could pour an infinite amount of concrete into those forms, but if that concrete didn't rest on something that didn't move, the bridge would not stand. The fact that the bridge is standing is an indication that something did not move. If we were to remove that bedrock, the bridge would collapse. The same thing is true of any other reality. The construct that each of us lives in could be called our “world.” These individual worlds are not private, isolated entities, cut off from each other. The fact that you are reading this sentence is some indication that my world has a lot in common with your world. Each individual world is based on a reality which is based on the ultimate reality, the bedrock which keeps the bridge in the air, the thing which all men call God. God infuses the world with its ratio, its intelligibility. The same is true for each personal world. If God were removed from either, each would collapse into non-intelligibility and non-being.

God cannot be removed from the universe, even though Nietzsche imagines that he could be murdered. But even the fantasy has an air of impossible unreality about it. “Who gave us the sponge,” Nietzsche writes, “to wipe away the whole horizon?” It would be easier to wipe away the entire horizon with a sponge than eliminate God from creation. God, however, can be removed in some sense from the lived psychological construct which we call, in the colloquial sense, our “world.” I stress the caveat “in some sense.” As Augustine says in his *Confessions*, “Even those who set themselves up against you do but copy you in a perverse way.” St. Augustine also said that the mind of man could find no rest until it found rest in God. So the mind is like the bridge, which will be in motion (which is to saying falling into the river) until it finds its rest (*i.e.* lack of motion) in

the bedrock which supports it, which is analogous to God, whom the Psalmist terms “my rock.” Once it finds that rest, the structure known as an individual’s “world” will grow in coherence, comprehensibility, and stability.

If the mind denies God, it will never find that rest. As a result, the structure that is built ultimately in God, the thing that is known as an individual’s world, will be in a constant state of motion toward disintegration without God, lacking coherence, comprehensibility and stability — in other words, in a constant state of motion toward death. On its way down, the mind will be frustrated because it cannot function properly. It will be constantly at odds with itself, frustrating the very purpose for which the mind was made in the very act of thinking. In Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, Satan described the mind as “its own place.”

Now let me return directly to the discussion and the issue of Aristotle. When I bring up Aristotle, I am accused of being a polytheist because he worshipped many gods. No, I say. Logos was part of the universe because the universe was created by God. Of course, this claim is predicated on a notion of the Trinity. Creation is the revelation of God the Father, a concept which is heretical in two ways according to Islam. First of all, because it is predicated on the Trinity and, secondly, because of the claims it makes about unaided human reason. Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, I claim, merely articulated what was already there. They were midwives for Logos and, like midwives, they brought the concept of God’s eternal pre-existent Logos into the world. When I make this point, the imam says that Aristotle is not necessary. I respond by asking, necessary for what? God’s death on the cross was necessary for the salvation of the human race, as is the Church he founded as the source of grace. In conceding that Aristotle is not necessary for salvation, I in effect concede the imam’s position, since he is only interested in what is necessary. Since Aristotle is not necessary can't he be dismissed along with philosophy in general?

There is, however, more to be said about Aristotle. One of them has already been hinted at and is expressed vigorously by James Higgins in his definitive study of Aquinas and Aristotle (“St. Thomas’s Pedagogy: Ignored, Rediscovered, and Applied,” *Heythrop Journal*, July 2009):

The reason for the devaluation and neglect of Aristotle’s argument may admittedly lie in the digression that immediately follows, where he turns, straight after his rational, metaphysical ‘break-through’, to fanciful cosmology and the question how many ‘prime movers’ to posit. From riding two horses at once, then, he comes a

cropper, so delighting the sceptics with his dotty speculation about whether we should say 47 or 55, and why.

Higgins goes on to make another powerful point:

Arguments usually consist of separate steps; and some of them, notably those at the end, may be less vital than the others and can for good reason be edited out. Despite Bertrand Russell's advice (in his *History of Western Philosophy*) that Aristotle's argument 'proves the existence' of so many prime movers (and therefore nothing at all), we need not doubt that Russell himself understood that editing principle just as well as the rest of us. Aristotle likewise.

Higgins draws attention to a further statement made later on by Aristotle restating the original argument:

Since this is a possible account of the subject and if it were untrue the world would have originated out of nothing, the difficulties are now resolved... There is an unmoved mover. It is eternal, a reality, actual ... a mind, nous. This prime mover, then, exists of necessity... On such a principle the heavens and the world depend.

As Higgins states, this is made more striking by its position, being placed "after the main point has been made, as *obiter dicta*: that is to say, as ways of viewing, or reviewing, the result — and not, ways of proving it." Aristotle can in truth be defended very effectively against the accusations made against him.

Finally, to return briefly to the discussion, the imam then brought up Hume and Marx. How does the believer deal with them? he wonders. By refuting them, I say, but that is only possible if they are measured against Logos. I claim that Hume and Marx can be refuted by showing where they deviate from Logos, but then Nasiri claims that since Logos is a Greek and therefore pagan concept, this means fighting the infidel on his own terms, something which is pointless at best and tantamount to idolatry at worst. This attitude leads to a wholesale rejection of the Enlightenment, which isn't necessarily bad, but with that rejection goes a rejection of all philosophy, including Plato, Aristotle, and the idea of Logos, which is crucial to the application of Gospel principles to future contingencies.

It should be obvious by now that the history of western philosophy is in many ways the reverse of the history of Islamic philosophy. After Aquinas integrated the good in Aristotle and the Greeks into a Scholasticism which came up with a synthesis of faith and reason that respected the claims of both, the West betrayed the hard won enculturation of Logos that Aquinas achieved and turned from reason to will. The nominalists of the Middle Ages had always posed a threat, but their latent threat became overt when Martin Luther demonized reason as a whore and

thereby opened the door for Nietzsche, who would complete Luther's train of thought at the end of the 19th century with his attack on Christ/Socrates and the promotion of Dionysian will as the alternative.

The parallels between the Ash'arite School of Islamic thought and modern philosophy which are so striking at first glance are ultimately predictable because of the limited number of available options when it comes to the relationship between thought and being. Like David Hume, al-Ghazali insisted that there is no "natural" sequence of cause and effect. According to al-Ghazali,

The connection between what is habitually believed to be a cause and what is habitually believed to be an effect is not necessary... Their connection is due to the prior decree of God, who creates them side by side, not in being necessary in itself, incapable of separation... The agent of burning is God... For fire is a dead body which has no action, and what is the proof that it is the agent? Indeed, the philosophers have no other proof than the observation of the occurrence of the burning, when there is contact with fire, but observation proves only simultaneity, not causation, and in reality there is no other cause ... but God.

Aquinas identifies this claim as "the error of the Law of the Moors," but it is also the error of David Hume and Jacques Derrida. Like the Deconstructionists, "Al-Ghazali taught that the intellect should only be used to destroy itself." David Hume is as vehement in his rejection of faith as al-Ghazali is in his rejection of reason, but both men find common ground in their mutually shared skepticism, which denies a Logos which includes faith and reason. In a universe which is purely a manifestation of God's will, God becomes a Nietzschean. All philosophers become sophists, and truth, as Thrasymachus predicted, becomes the opinion of the powerful. In a statement that had direct relevance, as we shall see, to the birth control discussion I had with the imams in Qom and the second thoughts the Ayatollah Khamenei was having over the government's support of population control, Sheikh Nabhani "taught that there was no such thing as morality in Islam; it was simply what God taught. If Allah allowed it, it was moral. If He forbade it, it was immoral."

CHAPTER SEVEN

The Logos of Sex

The result of the triumph of Ash'arism in the Islamic world is the curious duality of the third world, which accepts the technology which is the fruit of the West's acceptance of Logos, but not the philosophy which would allow its proper application. In this regard, Islam is no different than the post-Enlightenment West. In applying a fundamentalist *sola scriptura* understanding of the Koran to modern technology, certain issues have fallen through the cracks, and human sexuality is one of the most significant.

I then tried to deal with the Logos of sex. Humans were created by God, a fact which implies that there is a Logos to human sexuality; therefore, it would be wrong to interfere or deliberately disrupt that Logos by denying, for example, its procreative dimension by contraception. As I am waiting for the imam's response, someone brings up *coitus interruptus*, which the Imam defends, claiming that "just because you open a can of coke doesn't mean that you have to finish it." By now others present have joined in the discussion. In what amounts to a tacit rebuke of what Nasiri just said about coke and sex, one claims that *coitus interruptus* leads to prostate cancer. Someone else claims that sodomy between a husband and wife is permitted because it is not forbidden by the Koran. The imam does not dispute this, prompting me to contend that a *sola scriptura* approach to the Koran has hampered Islam's ability to deal with sexual issues, which I go on to claim are the most crucial issues facing the Islamic Republic of Iran at this moment in its history.

On February 7, 2013, Stratfor, the global intelligence agency, announced that the economic sanctions which the United States had imposed on the Islamic Republic of Iran were beginning to "unravel." On February 6, 2013, the European Union's Court of Justice removed Bank Saderat, one of Iran's largest foreign exchange banks, from the sanctions list. Bank Mellat, Iran's largest bank, had already been removed from the sanctions list a week before on January 30.

Following the announcement of the European Court of Justice, United States Vice-President Joseph Biden proposed high level talks to end

the nuclear impasse. The proposed talks were rejected by the Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khameni, but taken together with the Obama Administration's decision in the fall of 2012 not to attack Iran militarily, it looked as if a major change in policy were in the offing.

Unfortunately, looks can be deceiving, especially in diplomatic circles. What looked like a thaw in relations acted as a cover for covert psychological operations. Once the economic sanctions were beginning to unravel and the military option had been taken off the table, Iran was subjected to an even more intense version of sexual-oriented psychological warfare than the campaign that was unleashed on Palestine during the spring of 2002. During discussions with clergy and women's rights activists during my stay in Tehran in 2013, I heard repeated reports of covert dissemination of pornography. We are not talking simply about the sale of bootleg copies of R-rated Hollywood movies on the streets. We are talking about the covert distribution of pornographic DVDs *gratis* to the population at large. During the night, these DVDs were dropped off at people's houses like so many bottles of milk or newspapers. Oftentimes, the target of these psy ops could have his DVDs replaced by leaving them outside his house where the already viewed DVDs were picked up.

Pornography was only one aspect of this attempt to resexualize the culture as a prelude to returning sexuality to the status it enjoyed as a form of political control under the Shah. The dissemination of contraception propaganda and devices, begun under the Shah in collaboration with the Rockefeller Population Council, was an even more effective as well as pernicious form of using sexual liberation as political control.

Biden's overture was rejected by the Supreme Leader, but the fact that he made it at all indicates that the U.S. bargaining position had been weakened by the European Court of Justice's decision, and that it would continue to weaken over time as more and more countries jockeyed for favorable positions *vis a vis* resuming trade with Iran. "Some naive people like the idea of negotiating with America [but] negotiations will not solve the problems," Khameni said in remarks that were posted on his website. "If some people want American rule to be established again in Iran, the nation will rise up to face them."

President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, however, responded to Biden's overture in a way that was both cautious and positive. If we put the removal

of the military option together with the unraveling of the sanctions plus Biden's offer to negotiate together, it looked as if the U.S. was trying to negotiate with Iran from a position of strength that was only going to diminish with time. That meant increased psychological warfare, which would explain the fact that pornography was being delivered to the doors of Iranians like daily newspapers.

The Iranian leadership, however, was under its own form of pressure, one which was every bit as urgent as the pressure which the expiring sanctions had placed on the Obama Administration. The Islamic government's acceptance of contraception had created a demographic time bomb which was going to destroy the revolution from within. Widespread use of the birth control pill had created a feminist fifth column in Iran that was waiting to be manipulated by Western-funded covert operations. In this respect the Green Revolution demonstrations of June 2009 were a harbinger of things to come. Victoria Tahmasebi-Birgani claimed that women played a major role in the Green demonstrations of 2009, when "Iran's body politic was invaded by feminine power."

My contention that the *sola scriptura* approach to the Koran has hampered Islam in dealing with sexual issues finds independent corroboration in a speech which the Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khameni gave on October 10, 2012. In that speech Khameni claimed that it was a mistake not to abandon the population control policies which the Islamic revolution of 1979 had inherited from the Shah. Khameni claimed that:

we should have abandoned the population control policy in the mid-1370s [1990s]. I myself played a role in this mistake. Of course, it was a good policy at that time, but it should have been abandoned in the mid-1370s. We failed to do so, which was a mistake. As I said, our government officials and myself are responsible for this mistake. I hope Allah the Exalted and history forgives us. It is necessary to safeguard the young generation. As I said in a speech in the month of Ramadan, our country will grow old if we continue in this way. Our families and youth should have more children. The way it is practiced today, the policy — which limits the number of children that a family can have — is wrong. If we manage to keep our population young over the next ten, twenty years and far into the future, our youth will solve all the problems that our country is suffering from by relying on their characteristic preparedness, dynamism and talent.

The main internal threat to the ongoing existence of the Iranian Revolution of 1979 is birth control. After initially encouraging a high birth rate as the demographic basis for political and economic national power under the Ayatollah Khomeini, the revolutionary government after Khomeini's death in 1989 inexplicably reversed his position and instituted

what would turn out to be one of the most effective birth control campaigns in modern history. When Khomeini took power in 1979, Iran's birth rate was 6.5. By the time his successor Khamenei gave his speech in the fall of 2012 lamenting the population decline, the Iranian birthrate had plummeted to a European level of less than two children, which is to say below replacement rate. The *New York Times* was not slow in exposing the irony of the situation:

Under the grip of militant Islamic clerisy, Iran has seen its population of children implode. Accordingly, Iran's population is now aging at a rate nearly three times that of Western Europe. Maybe the middle aging of the Middle East will bring a mellower tone to the region, but middle age will pass swiftly to old age.

Accounts differ on why and how the change came about. Some claim that the changes were instituted by the Rafsanjani government after the death of the Ayatollah Khomeini; other reports claim that Khomeini himself was responsible for the change. One source claims that: "In the late 1980s, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, Iran's supreme leader, issued *fatwas* making birth control widely available and acceptable to conservative Muslims." (*LA Times*, July 29, 2012.) Either way, the birth rate plunged, but more importantly, as the *LA Times* put it, the promotion of contraception began "to usher in social changes, particularly in the role of women."

Crippled by a *sola scriptura* approach to morality, the religious leadership of the Islamic Republic of Iran inadvertently created a feminist fifth column which would rise up against the revolutionary government during the Green Demonstrations of 2009. Or as the *LA Times* put it:

"Without intending to, Iran's clerical leadership helped to foster the empowerment of Iranian women," said Djavad Salehi-Isfahani, an Iran expert at Virginia Tech. "The mullahs may be winning the battle on the streets, but women are winning the battle inside the family."

Now the Supreme Leader was faced with the unenviable task of putting the contraceptive genie back into the moral lamp from which he conjured it over twenty years ago. No wonder he was asking Allah the All-merciful for forgiveness. President Ahmadinejad joined in the anti-contraception campaign, as noted by the *LA Times*:

Doubling the country's population of 75 million would enable Iran to threaten the West, he [Ahmadinejad] said. He has denounced the contraceptive program as "a prescription for extinction," called on Iranian girls to marry no later than 16 or 17 and offered bonuses of more than \$950 for each child. So far, he has been widely ignored. "Iranian women are not going back," said Sussan Tahmasebi, an Iranian women's rights leader now living in the United States.

On July 25, 2012, Supreme Leader Khamenei stated that Iran's contraceptive policy made sense twenty years ago, "but its continuation in later years was wrong. Scientific and expert studies show that we will face population aging and reduction (in population) if the birth-control policy continues." Similarly, deputy health minister Ali Reza Mesdaghinia, was quoted in the semi-official Fars news agency on July 29 saying that population control programs "belonged to the past," and that "there is no plan to keep the number of children at one or two. Families should decide about it by themselves. In our culture, having a large number of children has been a tradition. In the past families had five or six children... The culture still exists in the rural areas. We should go back to our genuine culture."

At the end of the talk I gave in Iran in 2015 I said that the greatest threat facing Iran was its below replacement level birth rate, which went from 3.4 in the first decade after the Revolution of 1979 to 1.7, where it stands now. The majority of the Iranian people are now in their child-bearing years, largely because of the post-revolution baby boom. They could solve this problem overnight, but only if they acted now. In twenty years it would be too late. As a follow-up, I asked how many men were married, and about fifteen hands went up. I then went down the line of people with their hands up and asked how many children each man had. The answer was always the same. Zero, Zero, Zero. When I finally got to the last person in the room, it was clear to everyone that not one married man in that room had a child. Since the audience was made up of students, it would have been easy to dismiss my sample as unrepresentative and too young. On the other hand, it could just as easily be said, as the feminists said in Cairo in 1994 at the World Population Conference, that education is the best contraceptive. This is *a fortiori* true of women. I didn't ask them, but, in a sense, how could their situation be any worse? What number is lower than zero?

After I touched on the same topic in a lecture I gave at the Holy Shrine of the eighth imam in Mashad, someone brought up the idea that that night was "wish night," in the Shi'a religion, and so I said, "I have five children and fifteen grandchildren and my wish for you is that you have the same." That statement made it into the Farsi language newspaper report on my talk which appeared the following day.

CHAPTER EIGHT

“So Is America the Great Satan?”

After my talk in Mashad, the scholars at the Islamic Research Foundation gathered in private to ask me more questions. “So is America the Great Satan?” one scholar asked, as if I had been briefed by the Great Satan shortly before my flight left the United States. It was a portentous question and called for an equally portentous answer.

The Ayatollah Khomeini launched the term “Great Satan” in a speech following the revolution, some say on November 5, 1979. After the death of Ayatollah Teleghani in February 1979, Khomeini agreed to give a series of five lectures on *Surat al-Fatihah* (or *Surat al-Hamd*, as it is called in Iran), the opening chapter of the Qur’an. In a speech delivered on September 10, Khomeini referred to Satan and the fact that:

The prophets all came to make this world a divine world after it had been a satanic world, a world governed by Satan. It is Satan that is ruling us, too; we follow him, and our vain desires are a manifestation of him. As long as that great Satan that is our unredeemed soul exists within us, whatever we do will be done in egoism. We must destroy the government of Satan within us. When we migrate to the teachings of the prophets and the *awliya*, turn our backs on egoism, we will have begun to emerge from the pit. Some will even succeed, while still in this world, in reaching a stage that is now beyond our imagination — that of non-being, of being effaced in God. We must desire to make this migration from egoism, and be prepared to struggle in order to migrate.

In 1979 the Ayatollah Khomeini felt that Islam could provide a united front against the Great Satan. By 1980 it had become clear that America was using its leverage with the Saudis and the Egyptians to divide Islam, and lure the Wahhabis and their Pakistani allies into an alliance against the Soviet Union, which had just invaded Afghanistan. Khomeini saw what was happening, but was powerless to stop it. In a speech to pilgrims which he delivered on September 12, 1980, Khomeini claimed that at the very moment when Islam was about to unite:

the Great Satan has summoned its agents and instructed them to sow dissension among the Muslims by every imaginable means, giving rise to hostility and dispute among brothers in faith who share the belief in *tauhid* [unity], so that nothing will stand in the way of complete domination and plunder. Fearing that the Islamic Revolution of Iran will spread to other countries, Muslim and non-Muslim alike, and thus compel it to remove its foul hands from the lands it dominates, the Great Satan is resorting to another stratagem now, after the failure of both the economic boycott

and the military attack. It is attempting to distort the nature of our Islamic Revolution in the eyes of Muslims throughout the world in order set the Muslims at each others' throats while it continues its exploitation of Muslim countries. Thus it is that precisely at the time Iran is waging a determined struggle to ensure the unity of all Muslims in the world on the basis of *tauhid* and true Islam, the Great Satan gives its orders to one of its pawns in the region, one of the dead Shah's friends, to obtain decrees from Sunni *fuqaha* and *muftis* to the effect that the Iranians are unbelievers. These pawns of America say that the Islam the Iranians talk about is different from their Islam. Certainly the Islam of Iran is different from the Islam of those who support the pawns of America, like Sadat and Begin, who extend the hand of friendship to the enemies of Islam and flaunt the commands of God Almighty, and who leave no lie and calumny unuttered in their efforts to create disunity among the Muslims. The Muslims of the world must be aware of these people who are attempting to spread dissension, and must frustrate their foul conspiracy.

So, at the very moment he invoked Islamic unity, Khomeini was forced to concede that Islam was breaking up into two warring factions. The grand climactic battle of the anti-Communist crusade disguised this split for decades, but now, as intra-Islamic wars raged in Yemen and Iraq, Khomeini showed himself more of a prophet than a politician who could bring about Islamic unity. Either way, the Great Satan was exacerbating division as a means of achieving geo-political goals. Khomeini insisted that:

The most important and painful problem confronting the subjugated nations of the world, both Muslim and non-Muslim, is the problem of America. In order to swallow up the material resources of the countries it has succeeded in dominating, America, the most powerful country in the world, will spare no effort. America is the number-one enemy of the deprived and oppressed people of the world. There is no crime America will not commit in order to maintain its political, economic, cultural, and military domination of those parts of the world where it predominates. It exploits the oppressed people of the world by means of the large-scale propaganda campaigns that are coordinated for it by international Zionism. By means of its hidden and treacherous agents, it sucks the blood of the defenseless people as if it alone, together with its satellites, had the right to live in this world. Iran has tried to sever all its relations with this Great Satan and it is for this reason that it now finds wars imposed upon it.

Khomeini was here referring to Iraq, which had already launched a full-scale attack on Iran, as the proxy of America and Israel. Khomeini was hoping for Islamic unity, but he found neither sympathy nor allies in the Islamic world. Pakistan, which was a Saudi asset, had already been seduced by Saudi and American money and recruited into the final campaign of the anti-Communist crusade, when the ISI stepped forward as the exclusive arms broker for the Mujahedeen in Afghanistan. Thirty-four years later, in a speech he gave in Tehran in May 2014, Khomeini's successor, Ayatollah Khomeini had given up looking for Islamic unity. The new crisis was

defining Islam. Groups like ISIS in Iraq and Boko Haram in Nigeria, which Khomeini described as “American” Islam, had created an identity crisis, which was a function of the ongoing civil war between the Wahhabis and the Shi’a. In order to distinguish true Islam from its “American” counterfeit, Khomeini had to appeal to reason. In other words, the *Zeitgeist* had forced the hand of the Shi’a; they now had to return to the tradition of Islamic philosophy which had stalled when Ibn Rushd failed to reconcile Aristotle with the Koran. The *Zeitgeist*, in other words, had driven the Shi’a into the arms of Logos.

The Ayatollah Khomeini dealt with the issue obliquely when he issued his fatwa against Salman Rushdie’s book *The Satanic Verses*. Khomeini rightly understood Rushdie’s book as an attack on monotheism because it is an attack on “the unitary human subject” which has been created by “an ultimate transcendent unitary *logos*. The disintegration of that subject thus obscures, or demonstrates the obsolescence of, the *logos*.” Rushdie saw “the dispersed and plural subject of post-modernity” as “an opportunity for toleration and certainly preferable to the unified subject posited by monotheism,” but Khomeini was of a different opinion, and now his successor has been forced to embrace Logos, forced not so much by the Great Satan, which was Khomeini's term for America, but by the satanic nature of "American" Islam. The *Zeitgeist* was forcing everyone to take sides. It's either Logos or Satan.

CHAPTER NINE

The Faust Myth

In his book on the Faust myth, *The Faust Myth: Religion and the Rise of Representation*, Professor David Hawkes wrote that “St. Athanasius established the principle that being against Logos is synonymous with being Satanic.” Athanasius

established the fundamental role of the *logos* within Christianity, explicitly identifying the concept with the historical person of Jesus of Nazareth, and arguing that it was the only means of overcoming the alienation caused by sin. The incarnation of the *logos* was made necessary by the Fall, the seminal act of alienation, which rendered the human mind “carnal” and therefore mortal, as Athanasius explains in *On the Incarnation*: “It was our sinfulness that caused the Word to come down.” As a result of Athanasius’s identification of *logos* with the Messiah, anti-logocentrism becomes opposition to Christ, and by the early modern period, such opposition was deemed to involve an active allegiance to Satan.

Hawkes begins his book with a survey of the main stream of anti-logocentrism in our day, namely, the postmodern or deconstructive view of language proposed by theorists like Jacques Derrida, whose followers have taken over academe in the United States, and by extension the rest of the world.

Academe is satanic for precisely the reason Athanasius articulated almost two millennia ago: it is, as R. V. Young put it in his book on postmodernist literary theory, “at war with the word” (*At War with the Word: Literary Theory and Liberal Education* (1999)). The Long March which led to the establishment of Satanism as the official philosophy of academe in our day began with Friedrich Nietzsche. Jacques Derrida — like Michel Foucault, the other pillar of post-modernity — is a follower of Nietzsche, who proclaimed the Will to Power as the alternative to the West’s traditional docility to the truth. In a moment of uncanny clarity, Nietzsche hinted at the role that Capitalism would play in the promotion of his philosophy when he claimed that the complete dominance of money would be accompanied by a relativistic, pragmatic turn in philosophy. This prophecy has been fulfilled in the anti-logocentric, post-foundational modes of thought collectively known as “post-modernism.” “These ideas have had a long gestation, bursting forth into philosophy with Nietzsche, but before

that developing in subterranean fashion, as the doctrines and beliefs conventionally attributed to Satan.”

Post-modernism is Satanic because it is based on what John Searle and Derrida would call performative speech, which is another word for magic. As Hawkes points out, performative speech does not establish the relationship between the mind and the thing which the ancients called the truth; it creates the realities which the will conceives.

Michel Foucault, another pillar of post-modern thought, also inherited his Satanism from Nietzsche, but it had French progenitors as well. One was the Marquis de Sade. Another was Sade’s disciple, Georges Bataille. In his “Preface to Transgression,” a commemorative piece written in 1963, one year after Bataille’s death, Foucault thanked his mentor for murdering the transcendent God and thereby enabling everyone to share “an experience in which nothing may again announce the exteriority of Being and consequently ... an experience that is interior and sovereign.” Foucault was, of course, referring to conscience here and the witness which conscience inevitably bore to an objective moral order written on the heart of man by the Being we know as God but whom the post-modernists derisively referred to as the “Transcendental Signifier.”

Foucault, who was baptized and raised a Catholic, fought a losing battle with his own conscience for his entire life. It was a battle which only intensified as the West capitulated to his sexual demands and tacitly acceded to the creation of gay liberation as an internal front to divide the parties of the Left. Bataille, along with the Marquis de Sade, exerted a major influence over Foucault’s philosophy, which was in many ways nothing more than a rationalization of his sexual behavior of the sort I sketched out in my book *Degenerate Moderns* (1993). Foucault, even more than a sinister modern figure like E. M. Forster, was a degenerate post-modern, which meant that he took his homosexuality as the launching pad from which he would mount an attack, not just on social mores, as Forster had, but on Being itself. The post-modernist project is an exercise in ontological subversion, but its roots, as always in cases like this, are personal. Confronted with a conflict between his conscience and his behavior, or between the truth and his desires, Foucault spent his entire life trying to make the former conform to the latter, or as James Miller, Foucault’s Boswell, put it:

For Foucault in 1983, the key to appraising the values held dear by any philosopher was therefore “not to be sought in his ideas, as if it could be deduced from them, but rather in his philosophy-as-life, in his philosophical life, his ethos.”

CHAPTER TEN

Foucault in Tehran

In 1979 Foucault was in Tehran, misreading the Iranian Revolution as the continuation of Paris in May 1968, when in fact it was its violent refutation. Foucault arrived in Tehran in September 1978, hoping that, in the words of James Miller's book *The Passion of Michel Foucault* (1993), "perhaps a revolt against entrenched power was still possible," convinced that what was happening in Iran was "one of the greatest populist explosions in human history." The mullahs' rebellion against the Shah's attempts to modernize Iran had been simmering for years, but it entered its endgame phase on January 8, 1978, when police opened fire on seminarians demonstrating in the holy city of Qom. "The crowd had been calling for the return of the Shi'a religious leader, the Ayatollah Khomeini, a longtime critic of the government of the Shah of Iran. When the guns fell silent, some twenty seminarians were dead — martyrs to the cause of revolt." For the next fourteen months, the Shi'a faithful took part in ever greater numbers in demonstrations which provoked ever greater retaliation from the police, who in turn created more and more martyrs for the cause.

That Foucault, who was a disciple of Georges Bataille and the Marquis de Sade, would find himself enthralled by the revolutionary violence is not surprising, nor should it come as a surprise that this violence blinded him to the meaning of the revolution he purported to explain. In an article which appeared in the *Corriere della Sera* on October 8, Foucault recognized that there was a religious dimension to the revolution. Shi'ism had inspired the demonstrators with "an ardor that is simultaneously religious and political." Foucault, who never outgrew the Catholic faith in which he had been raised, found himself inspired by the ability of the mullahs to focus "the anger and aspirations of the community" into an energy that would create a new form of "Islamic government" which held out "the promise of a welcome new form of 'political spirituality,' unknown in the West 'since the Renaissance and the great crises of Christianity.'" Foucault viewed the Ayatollah Khomeini as a "saint." He felt that the Iranian Revolution might be "the first great insurrection against the planetary system, the most mad and most modern form of revolt," which

might bring about the end of America's "global hegemony" as well as a total "transfiguration of this world" because the Shi'ites were willing to die for their beliefs. They were united by "the craving, the taste, the capacity, the possibility of an absolute sacrifice."

In his book *The Ideology of Tyranny* (2007), Guido Preparata feels that Foucault "sided with the mullahs" in 1979 "in the name of blood reprisal" rather than any deep understanding of the religious motivation which united Khomeini's followers. As a result, Foucault misread the Iranian Revolution of 1979, failing to see that it was in reality a counterrevolution. The Revolution in Iran was in reality the *coup d'etat* which toppled Mossadegh in 1953 and installed the Shah as an American puppet who promoted modernity. When the Ayatollah came to power, "homosexuals were dispatched to firing squads." Preparata finds it odd that Foucault "stood by his enthusiasm for the revolution in Iran," when it is perhaps not so odd at all. Death was always part of the homosexual Faustian Pact. Deprived of society's censure, the homosexuals set out to punish each other in the bathhouses of San Francisco, where some received the same death sentence that Khomeini and the Revolutionary Guard were handing down in Tehran.

The conventional narrative sees 1979 as the triumph of Capitalism, when in fact, that year marked the beginning of its demise as the last philosophical justification for materialism. When it comes to 1979, markets had nothing to do with religion, and religion had nothing to do with markets. Khomeini's revolution in Iran inspired the Mujahedeen in Afghanistan, especially in the Farsi-speaking town of Heerat, where many of them gathered, in the wake of the Shah's downfall, "bearing a message of religious militancy that galvanized their compatriots." Religious ferment in Heerat led to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979. The subsequent ten-year long Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, in turn, made it impossible for the Russians to send troops into Poland to quell the Solidarity uprising which began in the wake of the Pope's visit to Warsaw in June 1979. The result of those two parallel religious uprisings was the fall of the Soviet Union. Markets had nothing to do with that story.

We know that the CIA supported the Mujahedeen in Afghanistan and Solidarity in Poland, but the fact that these political alliances existed does not eliminate the deep philosophical, political, and religious chasm separating those who took part in them. That unbridgeable gulf only

became apparent after the alliances vanquished the opponent and then fell apart, releasing its erstwhile allies, according to the dialectic of history, to wage war on each other.

Even if we concede the libertarian point and admit for the sake of argument that Capitalism did triumph in the decade following 1979, history is dialectic, which is to say in constant motion, and any historical synthesis is always on the way to decomposing into a civil war based on its component parts. So, according to the dialectical Logos of History, the triumph of religion and markets in 1979 would of necessity lead to the civil war between religion and free-market Capitalism that is going on as we speak. There is no ontological link between religion and markets. The link is a pure figment of the Neoconservative imagination.

Once religion and Capitalism united to destroy Communism, it was only a matter of time before religion and Capitalism would be at war with each other. This is precisely what happened in 2003 when the United States invaded Iraq and formally declared war on Islam. So, in the grand scheme of things, 1968 led to 1979, which led to 1989, which led to 2003 which led to the financial collapse of 2008, which led to the mess we are in today, but this trajectory also shows that World Spirit arrives at the truth by way of dialectic. Every successful revolution leads to a civil war. This means that there is no “End of History,” as Francis Fukuyama claimed at the end of the Cold War, but it also means that the dialectic always labors in the service of Logos, which is to say, in the service of God’s providence. No matter how messy their activity seems, the mills of history always grind out the truth. History is dialectical, but it is also teleological; it is always in some sense a manifestation of God’s will. To say that it isn’t is to affirm the materialism which ended up in the dustbin of history in 1979.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

“Daimonic Ordeals”

In *The Passion of Michel Foucault*, Miller claims that Foucault “had pursued a ‘critical ontology,’ trying to transform and transfigure his self by experimenting, sacrificing himself, putting his body and soul to the test directly, through an occult kind of ascesis, centered on the daimonic ordeals of S/M.” Whatever. Less than six years after his trip to Iran, Foucault was dead. Like most, Miller claimed that Foucault died of AIDS:

On June 27, 1984, *Le Monde* reprinted the medical bulletin issued by his doctors and cleared by his family: “Michel Foucault entered the clinic for diseases of the nervous system at the Hopital de la Salpetriere on June 9, 1984, in order to allow complementary investigation of neurological symptoms complicated by septicemia,” an infection of the blood. “These examinations revealed the existence of several areas of cerebral suppuration. Antibiotic treatment at first had a favorable effect...”

During the same year, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services announced that AIDS was caused by a virus, subsequently named Human Immunodeficiency Virus, or HIV, a diagnosis contested by Professor Peter Duesburg, also of the University of California at Berkeley. Miller attributes the cerebral suppuration to toxoplasmosis, which afflicts people with debilitated immune systems. Whatever the specific etiology of his death, it seems clear that Foucault died of homosexuality, as he knew he would.

Or did he and the other homosexuals who died in San Francisco during the '80s die of Capitalism and the libertarian ideology of choice which was its philosophical foundation? On March 17, 1983, the *Bay Area Reporter*, San Francisco's gay newspaper, ran an editorial claiming that: “each man owns his own body and the future he plots for it. And he retains ownership of the way he wants to die.” If this were true of the nobodies who gave up real lives and arrived in San Francisco in the '70s to die for their fantasies, it was certainly true of Michel Foucault, who, when he died at the age of fifty-seven, was “perhaps the single most famous intellectual in the world.” The real cause of Foucault's death was philosophical; it was, in Miller's words, Foucault's “uninhibited exploration of sado-masochistic eroticism.”

And so it was only fitting that Jacques Derrida attended Foucault's funeral. Foucault was a lapsed Catholic; Derrida was a Jew. What they shared was hatred of Logos, in all of its forms. Derrida gave the definitive explanation of "performative" speech in his *magnum opus* *Of Grammatology*, when he wrote:

The surrogate does not substitute itself for anything which has somehow preexisted it. From then on it was probably necessary to begin to think that there was no center, that the center could not be thought of in the form of a being-present, that the center had no natural locus, that it was not a fixed locus, but a function, a sort of non-locus in which an infinite number of sign-substitutions came into play. This moment was that in which language invaded the universal problematic: that in which, in the absence of a center or origin, everything became discourse — provided we can agree on this word — that is to say, when everything became a system where the central signified, the original or transcendental signified, is never absolutely present outside a system of differences. The absence of the transcendental signified extends the domain and interplay of signification *ad infinitum*.

If Foucault's attack on Logos is fundamentally sexual, Derrida's attack on the Logos is quintessentially Jewish. The opaque passage we just read is a veiled allegory of the destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D., the end of the Mosaic covenant, when God was present with his people, and its replacement by the synagogue, founded by Rabbi Jochanan ben Zacchai, as its surrogate. From that moment onward, which is to say, from the moment the Talmud replaced the Torah as the center of Jewish worship, "language invaded the universal discourse," *i.e.*, theology, and "everything became discourse," *i.e.*, pointless Talmudic quibbling. What Derrida and his followers refuse to see is that the covenant was fulfilled when the Logos became flesh. Foucault knew this much more intimately than Derrida, which is why his rebellion was much more terrible in its personal consequences and had to take place in the flesh as a demonic reversal of the transubstantiation that takes place at the moment of consecration in the Mass. Foucault's long and ultimately fatal odyssey through the labyrinth of sadomasochism bespoke his attempt to undo the Incarnation, because the Incarnation meant that the Logos had become an inescapable part of our lives. The Word had become flesh. By violating the flesh, Foucault could exorcize the Word, or so he thought.

Just as I was planning to leave Iran in 2015, I received an e-mail from Professor David Hawkes, whom I referred to earlier, who felt that there was a "remarkable convergence between our ideas," especially concerning usury, sexuality, and the Faust myth. The professor was right; the

correspondence between our writings is more than striking; it was uncanny. So we're talking about great minds running in the same circles or the *Zeitgeist* or a combination of both. Professor Hawkes comes from a background that is both Protestant and Marxist. That means that at various points during the course of the intellectual history of the West, we would have been shooting at each other over two different literary critical barricades. The course of history, however, has made us unwilling allies in the culture wars because now the main battle is between those who believe in Logos and those who don't, a group he denominates as Satanic. The alliance of those who don't — which sometimes goes by the name of post-modernism, and sometimes by the name of deconstruction, after its champion Jacques Derrida — now controls academe, turning Protestant Marxists into a slightly antiquated persecuted minority based on an obsolete revolutionary movement, like, say, Anabaptism or Freemasonry. The Ash'arites who run ISIS and are now involved in beheading Christians, and Shi'a Muslims believe in Nietzsche's Will to Power as fervently as the followers of Foucault and Derrida who now run Academe in America. Their nihilism is the driving force in history at the moment, and its politics have made strange bedfellows out of everyone who feels that Logos trumps will. All supporters of Logos — be they mullahs from Mashad, Catholic Hoosiers, or Marxist professors — have been turned into allies willy-nilly by their common enemy, which is to say, the Great Satan. This is the *Zeitgeist* in a nutshell. In case I had any lingering doubts, Professor Hawkes convinced me that America is the Great Satan.

CHAPTER TWELVE

The Mullahs in Mashad

So, to get back to the mullahs in Mashad, there was a pause after their question about America and the Great Satan, as everyone leaned forward in anticipation of my response. The pause was not without tension. Being an Iranian means being forever at the conjunction of two conflicting points of view. On the one hand, no nation on earth is more passionately attached to talking about the political implications of religious belief and the religious implications of politics, but by the same token, no nation on earth is more committed to the idea that foreigners are guests who need to be shown hospitality. As a result, the Iranians chant “Death to America” as they march through the streets and then invite Americans home to continue the discussion over pistachio nuts.

One of the few exceptions to that dichotomy is me saying that there is a tradition of Logos in the West that has been supplanted by the current regime which would complement the striving toward Logos which has been forced upon them by the flow of history. The Supreme Leader articulated this position a year ago when he said that groups like ISIS and Boko Haram were “American” Islam, which is to say, not true, and that the key to understanding true Islam was reason or Logos. By making this statement the Supreme Leader recapitulated the resurrection of Islamic philosophy which the Ayatollah Khomeini began by making the rule of the guardians, which he derived from reading Plato’s *Laws*, the norm for the Islamic Republic. We are talking about a change of millennial importance here. We are talking about correcting Ibn Rushd’s mistake and bringing an end to the millennium-long hegemony of the Ash’arite notion that God is pure will.

Confronted with the spectacle of fellow Muslims, like the thugs who populate ISIS, beheading people because they are Christians or, more pointedly, Shi’a heretics, the Iranians have been forced by the *Zeitgeist* into a recognition that Logos is another word for God and that God is the Lord of History. In many ways, their discovery is analogous to Kant’s discovery that practical reason in man is proof for the existence of God. The Iranian universities are overwhelmingly technological in their orientation. Technology is a form of Logos, but as Newtonian physics has shown, it is

inadequate as the basis for a cosmology and as such it is no substitute for metaphysics. When the Iranians hear that there is such a thing as metaphysics, or Logos, or that sex has a *telos* in procreation, or that there is a *telos* to anything, they rejoice and absorb the message like a dry sponge coming into contact with water. What happens afterward is anyone's guess. But the lesson of 1979, as viewed through the lens of Hegel, is that reason is self-sufficient and can bring about what it wants when it wants with no seeming preparation. Given the alternatives they have been presented, is it surprising then that the young people in Iran are not having children? Given on the one hand an Ash'arite God whose will is absolute, even to the absolute negation of its own Logos, and on the other hand the dead, mechanical universe which is the legacy of Newtonian physics and the English Ideology, what would you choose? Would you choose to have children? Would you choose to have a life in the face of two ideologies that denied that you could have one? Wouldn't you be happy if someone came up with an alternative that said that God was in control of history, and that he wanted you to have a life?

As Friedrich Romig has pointed out in his book *Der Sinn der Geschichte*, Positivism (which is another word for the English Ideology) means the end of history. The rise of science means the abolition of history. Everything is now just balls flying through space, and their trajectories are now entirely predictable. The end of history in this sense, as Hegel would point out a century and a half later, means the death of God, the real God of Christianity, and his replacement by the Unitarian, deist simulacrum, who is in reality nothing more than an exalted image of the usurper William of Orange.

After watching Napoleon ride out of Jena and defeat the Austrian army and eventually abolish the Holy Roman Empire, the 36-year-old Hegel felt compelled to formulate a philosophy of history. Given the humiliating circumstances of its birth, Hegel's history was remarkably optimistic. It was, in fact, a reworking of the traditional Christian doctrine of divine providence. History now had meaning again. God suddenly had power again. God was in control of history. Hegel's understanding of divine providence entails an understanding of predestination, but his understanding of predestination does not abrogate the notion of man's free will.

A re-articulation of the idea of divine providence in up-dated, Enlightenment-friendly terminology was necessary at this point in the history of philosophy because of the development of British empiricism over the century which began with Newton's *Principia Mathematica* and ended with David Hume's skepticism. Kant's articulation of the synthetic *a priori* put an end to Hume's skepticism and set the stage for the full flowering of German thought in Hegel, who reintroduced Logos to the post-Enlightenment West and simultaneously set the stage for the emergence of the German nation in 1871.

Because of its attachment to Newtonian physics and its global pre-eminence after the defeat of Napoleon, England had succeeded in creating a dead materialistic universe which was philosophically incoherent and which promoted an idea of motion which lacked *telos* (all motion had become what the Scholastics would call "violent motion"). As a result, life had become radically contingent. There was no plan, because, according to Positivism, there was no history. There were only atoms in motion, and those balls in motion had no history. In fact, as Laplace had told none other than Napoleon himself, once the laws of the universe were fully articulated, there would be no future either, just as the orbits of the planets had neither history nor future, just mathematically described trajectories that were eternally the same.

Hegel broke this intellectual logjam by doing the impossible. He came up with a philosophy of history, and he did this by eliminating contingency:

The sole aim of philosophy is to eliminate the contingent. Contingency is the same as external necessity, that is, a necessity which originates in causes which are themselves no more than external circumstances. In history we must look for a general design, the ultimate end of the world, and not a particular end of the subjective spirit or mind; and we must comprehend it by means of reason, which cannot concern itself with particular and finite ends but only with the absolute.

Reason is not contingent. Reason is necessary. Reason is self-sufficient. Reason brings itself into existence and carries itself into effect. Thought must become conscious of this end of reason. The history of the world is a rational process whose author is God. If creation is a manifestation of God's creative power in space, then history is a manifestation of God's creative power in time:

the divine wisdom is one and the same in great things and small. It is the same in plants and insects as in the destinies of entire nations and empires, and we must not imagine that God is not powerful enough to apply his wisdom to things of great

moment. To believe that God's wisdom is not active in everything is to show humility towards the material rather than towards the divine wisdom itself. Besides, nature is a theater of secondary importance compared with that of world history. Nature is a field in which the divine Idea operates in a non-conceptual medium.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

The Philosophy of Salafism: The Islamic Image of Neo-Conservatism

In his book *The Closing of the Muslim Mind*, Robert Reilly sees a connection between the voluntarism of the Ash'arite school of Islamic thought, the voluntarism of modern western philosophers like Marx and Nietzsche, and the voluntarism which underpins the philosophy of Salafism, which is the ideological driving force behind Islamic terrorism. According to Tony Corn: "In the past thirty years, one particular brand — pan-Islamic Salafism — has been allowed to fill the vacuum left by the failure of pan-Arab Socialism and, in the process, to marginalize the more enlightened forms of Islam to the point where Salafism now occupies a quasi-hegemonic position in the Muslim world."

The main proponent of Salafism is Sayyid Qutb (1906-1966), an Egyptian author, educator, Islamist theorist and poet, who was convicted of plotting the execution of Egyptian president Gamal Abdel Nasser and executed by hanging. Qutb's writings expressed what can be called without exaggeration, hatred of the United States as obsessed with materialism, violence and sexual pleasure, a hatred which Qutb's brother Muhammed conveyed to Osama bin Laden, who was his student at Abdul Aziz University in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia.

The Islamism that Qutb promoted is based, according to Reilly, "upon a deformed ideology that nonetheless shares in the classical ideological conflation of heaven and earth into one realm." The goal of Islamism is "to reestablish the Kingdom of God upon earth" or "to create a new world." In spite of his aversion to Marxism, Qutb was influenced by its teaching, something which caused the Islamists to mix the totalitarian program of the Communists with the Ash'arite interpretation of Islam. Reilly sees a "nearly complete ideological affinity" between the Nazi or Communist revolutionary points of view and the Islamism of Qutb. His logic in linking the three, however, is less than persuasive because the ideology of race, which is common to Nazism and Zionism, is absent from Islam and Communism.

In his analysis of the closing of the Muslim mind, Reilly fails to see that Sayyid Qutb is the uncanny ideological *Doppelgaenger* of Leo Strauss, and that Salafism is not only the Islamic world's mirror image of Neoconservatism, it is also a creation of Neoconservatism. If there had been no Neoconservatism, Qutb would have languished in the journals of Middle East Studies departments. Because of the Neoconservative takeover of American foreign policy during the Reagan Administration, and in particular because of Bill Casey's mobilization of the Mujahedeen in Afghanistan, Qutb's ideas became the marching orders for America's proxies in the war to topple the Soviet Union. After the successful conclusion of that war, Qutb's ideas, spread by American assets like Osama bin Laden and Ayman Zawahiri, would become the basis of Islamist terrorism campaigns throughout the Arab world. Whenever Qutb's Islamism was in danger of failing because of its penchant for murder, terror, and violent wretched excess against Muslims, the Neoconservatives would rehabilitate it to act as a tool of American foreign policy, as in Afghanistan, Libya, and then Syria, or as a foil that made their efforts seem necessary for America's survival.

After his stay in America, Qutb returned to Egypt, and after supporting the revolt of Gamal Abdul Nasser against the English, ended in prison where he was tortured by Egyptian secret police who were trained by the CIA. In a series of books written in prison, Qutb called upon a revolutionary vanguard to rise up and overthrow the leaders who had allowed their people to be infected with *Jahilya*, which is to say, *libido dominandi* — the use of sexual liberation as a form of political control. Qutb justified the murder of secular Islamic leaders by arguing that they had become so secular that they were no longer Muslim. In 1966 Qutb was put on trial for treason. The verdict was a foregone conclusion, and on August 29, 1966, Qutb was executed. But his ideas lived on because of Imam Zawahiri, who was to become the mentor of Osama bin Laden.

One year after Qutb's death, the social order collapsed in America in a series of riots in places like Detroit and Newark which called the entire liberal agenda, epitomized by Lyndon Johnson's Great Society programs and his Civil Rights Act into question. This collapse lent new power to Leo Strauss's ideas. In the early '70s Irving Kristol became the focus of a group of disaffected policy makers in Washington who were determined to find out why the liberal policies of the Great Society had failed. Paul Wolfowitz

and Francis Fukuyama had been taught Leo Strauss's ideas at the University of Chicago. Irving Kristol's son William had studied Strauss's theories at Harvard. This group became known as the Neoconservatives.

In the place of the liberal ideas which had failed, the Neoconservatives proposed "myths" about the threat of a common enemy which would stop the social disintegration they believed liberal freedom had unleashed. American foreign policy, they averred, needed to break with the pragmatism of Henry Kissinger, and return to the Manichean scenario of good vs. evil which had motivated America during the anti-Communist crusade of the 1950s. The Neoconservatives allied themselves with Donald Rumsfeld and Dick Cheney, President Ford's chief of staff, and hired Harvard historian Richard Pipes to concoct a scenario which would explain how the now moribund Soviet Union constituted a clear and present danger to America. The cadre which worked under Pipes came to be known as Team B, and their findings were published by a neocon front operation known as the Committee on the Present Danger.

At the same time that the Neoconservatives were beating the drum for the resumption of the anti-Communist crusade in America, Ayman al-Zawahiri, a medical doctor from a prosperous elite family in Cairo, was spreading Qutb's ideas *via* an underground Islamic cell he had created in Egypt. Qutb's ideas were spreading rapidly, especially among the student population, because they exposed the real corruption in Egyptian society, which the millionaire elite bankers tried to conceal behind the facade of westernization, at the hands of western banks and social engineering campaigns like birth control. Zawahiri, who had imbibed Marxist revolutionary ideas from his mentor Qutb, was convinced that a vanguard could rise up and overthrow the corrupt Sadat regime.

When the Ayatollah Khomeini overthrew the Shah, another Rockefeller puppet, in 1979, Zawahiri began to feel that his dream of establishing an Islamist state was possible. Khomeini put forward the idea of an Islamist state that was remarkably similar to Qutb's idea. He acknowledged this by putting Qutb's face on one of the postage stamps of the new Islamic republic. "Yes," Khomeini told the West, "we are reactionaries and you are Enlightenment intellectuals."

Anwar Sadat was appalled by Khomeini's revolution in Iran. "This is disgraceful," he told one reporter. "This is a crime against Islam." He then

went on to say that his airplane was ready to fly at a moment's notice to Tehran and bring the Shah to Egypt. Neither leader, however, survived the Islamist ferment that was destined to bring down every secular regime in Islam. The Shah died of cancer in exile in the United States in 1980, and Sadat fell dead one year later under a hail of bullets fired by soldiers who belonged to the secret organization Zawahiri had founded on Qutb's principles known as Islamic Jihad. The assassination was successful, but it failed to cause the revolution it was intended to create. That night Cairo remained calm; the masses failed to rise up. Zawahiri was arrested and put on trial, footage of which shows Zawahiri shouting from his cage in English: "Who are we? We are Muslims who believe in their religion."

Zawahiri was convicted and sentenced to three years in prison. Like Sayyid Qutb, Zawahiri was tortured, and under torture he began to interpret Qutb's theories in a far more radical way. Zawahiri concluded that the masses didn't rise up in the aftermath of Sadat's assassination because selfish individualism had corrupted them as completely as it had corrupted their leader. Like Lenin and Trotsky, Zawahiri concluded that only a revolutionary *avant garde* could do for the masses what the masses were incapable of doing for themselves.

The Neoconservatives had come to the same conclusion in America, and it was they who would play the role of *avant garde* in the newly elected Reagan Administration, which had come to power by exploiting Jimmy Carter's weakness in dealing with the Iranian hostage crisis.

The Neoconservatives got key appointments in the Reagan Administration. Paul Wolfowitz became head of the State Department policy staff, and his close friend Richard Perle became Assistant Secretary of Defense. Once their ally William Casey was appointed head of the CIA, the Neoconservatives believed that they had the power to implement their vision of America's revolutionary destiny. After reading *The Terror Network* (1981) by Claire Sterling, a piece of journalism confected from black propaganda which the CIA had invented to smear the Soviet Union, Casey persuaded Reagan in 1983 to sign a secret document that fundamentally changed American foreign policy. The country would now fight covert wars to push back the hidden Soviet threat around the world.

It was a triumph for the Neoconservatives. Their fictions had triumphed over reality. The CIA knew that the terror network Claire

Sterling described in her book didn't exist because they themselves had made it up. None of this mattered to the Neoconservatives, who now found themselves joining forces with the Islamists in Afghanistan, where together they would fight an epic battle against the Soviet Union. Both the Islamists and the Neoconservatives came out of Afghanistan believing that they had defeated the Soviet empire and were thus in possession of the power to transform the world. The Neoconservatives saw themselves as revolutionaries, not conservatives. As Richard Perle put it: "We're closer to being revolutionaries than conservatives because we want to change some deeply entrenched notions about the role of American power in the world."

After Casey concluded a pact with the Northern Alliance, American money and weapons began to pour across the Pakistani border into Afghanistan, and CIA agents began training the Afghans in the techniques of assassination and terror, including car bombing. In order to supply the manpower necessary to defeat the Soviet Union, governments throughout the Islamic world began emptying their prisons of their inmates and sending them off to the jihad in Afghanistan. One of those inmates was Ayman Zawahiri, the man behind the murder of Anwar Sadat. Zawahiri set up the headquarters of the newly revived Islamic Jihad in Peshwar, Pakistan, where he met a Saudi who shared his views by the name of Osama bin Laden. Zawahiri convinced bin Laden only violent revolution could succeed in purging western decadence from the Arab world. He also persuaded him to use the considerable financial resources at his disposal to create violent revolutions in Algeria and Egypt.

In the wake of the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan in 1989, Osama bin Laden became convinced that an armed vanguard could reproduce the Islamist victory in Afghanistan in every secular Islamic state in the world. At around the same time, the Neoconservatives came, *mutatis mutandis*, to the same conclusion. The same Neoconservatism which had driven the Soviets out of Afghanistan could now drive secular Islamic leaders like Saddam Hussein, who had been America's proxy during the 1980-87 war with Iran, from their thrones and establish a purer form of Islam in their place.

After the successful conclusion of the war to liberate Kuwait, Neoconservatives like Paul Wolfowitz wanted to press on to Baghdad to bring about a transformation of the Middle East. They were furious when George Bush senior and Council on Foreign Relation types like Brent

Scowcroft refused, and at this point they called down political fire upon their own position and worked for the defeat of George Bush, Sr.

The Islamist counterparts to the Neoconservatives would go into eclipse during the 1990s as well, but largely as a result of the negative effect their terrorist campaigns had on the masses in countries like Algeria and Egypt, which were subjected to a campaign of terrorist bombings which turned the masses against them. In the early '90s Algeria and other Islamic countries were being torn apart by a vicious wave of Islamist terror.

Jihadists who had returned from Afghanistan were trying to topple the regimes. The revolutionaries soon found that the masses did not rise up and follow them. The regimes stayed in power and the radical Islamists were hunted down. The refusal to rise up showed that the masses too had become corrupted. In Algeria this logic went completely out of control. The Islamists killed thousands of civilians because they believed all of these people had become corrupted. By 1997 the Islamist revolution was failing.

In Algeria they started to kill each other. By 1997 Bin Laden and Ayman Zawahiri had returned to Afghanistan. Now they were facing failure. All attempts to topple regimes in the Arab world had not succeeded. The people had turned against them because of the horrific violence, and Afghanistan was the only place they had left to go.

This is when they started this new strategy. In May 1998, bin Laden and Zawahiri announced a new Jihad, which focused on attacks against America itself.

In 1998 the Neoconservatives found themselves in the same situation as the Islamists. The attempt to mobilize the Christian right to gain power *via* a moral revolution in America had failed and they had become marginalized in both domestic and foreign policy. What saved both groups from political oblivion was the 9-11 attack on the World Trade Center in New York. In their response to the 9-11 attacks, the Neoconservatives would transform the failing Islamist movement into the revolutionary force that Zawahiri had always dreamed of. After the American invasion of Afghanistan in the wake of the 9-11 attacks, an invasion which wiped out the last remnants of the jihadists who had fought against the Soviet Union, the Neoconservatives reconstructed the failed Islamist movement as a phantom enemy which would consolidate the neocon hold on power during the administration of George W. Bush.

Osama bin Laden had no formal organization until the Americans invented one for him during the trial of the blind sheik who was responsible for the first attack on the World Trade Center in 1993. There is no evidence that bin Laden used the term *al Qaeda* to refer to the existence of a group until after September 11, when he realized this was the term that Americans had given it. The 9-11 attacks brought the Neoconservatives back to power in America because this proved that what they had been predicting throughout the 1990s was correct. Now they saw this new war on terror in the same epic terms as the anti-Communist crusade under Ronald Reagan. Or as Richard Perle put it: “it’s a war on terrorists who want to impose an intolerant tyranny on all mankind. An Islamic universe in which we are all compelled to accept their beliefs and live by their lights. And in that sense this is a battle between good and evil.” The Neoconservatives took a failing movement which had lost mass support and began to reconstruct it in the image of a powerful network of evil controlled from the center by bin Laden in his lair in Afghanistan.

As part of his attempt to explain the contemporary political situation in the world, Robert Reilly tries to associate Islamism, Communism, and Nazism, but the triad which really explains world politics in the wake of the jihad to drive the Soviet Union out of Afghanistan and bring about the collapse of the Soviet Union was Communism, Neoconservatism, and Islamism. The deep structure which underpins all three is the Jewish revolutionary spirit. Unlike David Horowitz, who has discussed this topic at length, Reilly fails to see that Communism’s attempt to destroy and re-build the social order is a manifestation of the Jewish penchant to create heaven on earth, as epitomized by the saying *tikkun olam*. As Horowitz wrote:

Marx was a rabbi after all. The revolutionary idea is a religious consolation for earthly defeat. For the Jews of our Sunnyside heritage, it is the consolation for internal exile; the comfort and support for marginal life. A passage home. Belief in the Idea is the deception of self that made people like my father and you and me feel real (David Horowitz, *The Politics of Bad Faith: The Radical Assault on America's Future* (1998)).

Marxism is revolutionary because it is Jewish. As Horowitz puts it:

For nearly two hundred years, Jews have played a disproportionate role as leaders of the modern revolutionary movements in Europe and the West... By carrying the revolution to its conclusion, socialists would usher in a millennium and fulfill the messianic prophecies of the pre-Enlightenment religions that modern ideas had discredited. Through this revolution, the lost unity of mankind would be restored, social harmony would be reestablished, paradise regained. It would be a *tikkun olam*, a repair of the world.

Blinded by his Neoconservatism, Reilly fails to see that Islamism is a manifestation of the Jewish revolutionary spirit, and that when Qutb calls Islam “to unite heaven and earth in a single system” he is really calling for the Islamist version of *tikkun olam*. This may help to explain some of the paradoxes of American foreign policy as well as the intellectual lacunae in Reilly’s otherwise informative book. Ironically, if there is ever a version of Islam that is incompatible with the Logos of the Catholic faith, it is the Islamism of Qutb and followers like Islamic cleric Sheikh Omar Abdel Rahman (the blind sheikh) who exhorted his followers to “Kill them [Americans] wherever you find them.”

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

Uncanny Fulfillment

The command to kill Americans wherever you find them found its uncanny fulfillment in the murder of Ambassador J. Christopher Stevens in Libya. Hilary Clinton and John McCain have sown dragons' teeth by supporting the Salafists, a point that Reilly fails to make in his book, which, it must be admitted, was written before the advent of the Arab Spring and the change in American foreign policy from support of secularist puppets like Mubarak to support for Salafist puppets like Morsi. Yet, in the wake of the Arab Spring revolts, it is precisely the Islamist followers of Qutb that Israel, Saudi Arabia, Qatar and the United States are backing in the current civil war in Syria.

Reilly criticizes the notion of perpetual war when it is endorsed by the Islamists but fails to see that that motto was articulated first by Trotsky, and that the most ardent followers of that principle are Jewish Neoconservatives like Irving Kristol, who was a Trotskyite during his days at the Community College of New York, and his son William. The Kristols, *pere et fils*, were the intellectual architects of the current war in the Middle East. The one irony that Reilly can't seem to grasp, much less articulate, is that the Neoconservatives, who are the ideological mirror image of the Islamists, put the Islamists in power in both Egypt and Libya, thereby jeopardizing both Israeli and American interests in the region. Nowhere do we find better substantiation of the old saw "politics makes strange bedfellows" than in the incoherent policy of the State Department in the Middle East.

Trying to make sense of the intellectual shift in the Islamic world away from secularist leaders like Saddam Hussein, Hosni Mubarak, and Muammar Khaddafi, Reilly claims that "Islamism within Islam may be roughly analogous to the development of liberation theology within Christianity. Especially in Latin America, Catholicism was infected with Marxist ideology by way of Christianity's preferential option for the poor," but the analogy limps in comparison to the connections between Neoconservatism and Salafism, which Reilly fails to see. Reilly has a difficult time separating his Neoconservative Americanism from his

Catholicism, as when he uses “Article 18 of the International Declaration of Human Rights” which “stipulates that every individual has freedom of thought, which includes the freedom to change one’s religion and beliefs” against the Muslims without understanding that no Catholic could subscribe to Article 18 if it meant a repudiation of Baptism. Indeed, the Church has a duty to use coercion to hold a Catholic to his baptismal promises, as she did during the Spanish Inquisition. We can disagree about the application but not the principle. Similarly, Reilly goes on to praise Muhammed Abdelmottaleb al-Houn, “who has the courage to say, ‘If we must choose between human rights and shari’a, then we must prefer human rights.’” The patent absurdity of a statement like this becomes apparent when we transpose it to the Catholicism which Reilly espouses. Does Reilly really believe that if we must choose between “human rights,” like abortion and gay marriage, and the Magisterium, that we must prefer human rights? If this does not apply to the Magisterium, why should it apply to shari’a?

Reilly goes on to ridicule Hasan Nasrallah’s claim that Hezbollah had “divinely guided missiles” which defeated the Israelis in their ill-fated incursion into Lebanon in 2006. Like Nasrallah, Mahmoud Chalhoub claimed that “Even the Israelis talk about a man all in white [the Mahdi] rid[ing] a white horse, who cut off the hand of one of their soldiers as he was about to launch a missile ... we have missiles guided by God.” Reilly, who is married to a Spaniard, should know that Cortez made similar claims about his conquest of Mexico. Cortez claimed that he saw St. James riding into battle on the side of the Spaniards, and if St. James, also astride a white horse, helped the Spaniards prevail over the Aztecs why shouldn’t the Mahdi guide Hezbollah’s missiles? In making his case against fellow believers, Reilly tries to out secularize the secularists. If it is absurd for a Muslim to say, “When you shot, it was not you who shot, but God,” then it is just absurd for a Catholic to say, “If the Lord does not build the house, then in vain do the workmen labor.” Reilly approves of secular prejudice in making his case against Islam, which would, if applied to Catholicism, completely undo his own position as well.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

MEMRI

Reilly gets in trouble when dealing with contemporary Islam because of his Neoconservative prejudices in general and in particular because of his reliance on the Middle East Media Research Institute (or MEMRI) as a source for his claims about the intellectual climate in the Islamic world. MEMRI purports to be a source of information on the Middle East, but it is nothing more than a front for Zionist propaganda, which scours Arabic newspapers for horror stories but never gets around to translating the racist diatribes of Israeli rabbis. MEMRI's main ploy involves citing any Arabic use of the word "Jew" as *ipso facto* proof of anti-Semitism, as in the quote, cited by Reilly: "If you study European history, you will see who was the main power in hoarding money and wealth in the 19th century. In most cases, it was the Jews." Reilly falls for this ploy completely, without any sense that one respected Catholic source after another made exactly the same claim. To give just two examples, both *Civiltà Cattolica*, the official organ of the Vatican, and Georg Ratzinger, Pope Benedict XVI's great uncle, criticized Jews for their business practices in ways that would land them on MEMRI's hate list.

Similarly, Reilly, again citing MEMRI as his source, attacks "Iranian Filmmaker Nader Talebzadeh," as someone who "denies the Holocaust and states: Al-Qaeda and the Mossad carried out 9/11 together," without any indication of just what Holocaust denial means in this particular instance and why a delict concocted by Debbie Lipstadt should be normative for Catholics, or of how many Americans contest the conventional 9/11 narrative as well. If it is our right as Americans to contest the government's narrative on, say, why Building #7 collapsed, why are we denying this right to Iranians, or ridiculing them when they make use of it? The answer to that question can be found in the Jewish control of discourse, as manifested in MEMRI's ability to colonize the minds of Neoconservative Catholics like Robert Reilly.

If Reilly had done his own research into the career of Nader Talebzadeh, he might have discovered that Talebzadeh directed a 20-part film on the life of Jesus Christ, which won praise from the Vatican for

attempting to give an Islamic understanding of Christ. But facts like that don't foster the demonization of Muslims that MEMRI exists to foster in the minds of the easily duped *goyim*. If there were a United States Media Research Institute in Iran, it would be able to come up with ideas far more absurd than MEMRI factoids like "Birth Control Increase [*sic*] STDs" or the claim that Jews were responsible for "82 percent of all attempts to corrupt humanity" because they "were responsible for 82 percent of the world's video clips" upon which Reilly bases his case against contemporary Islam. The Iranian equivalent of MEMRI could claim, without the faintest hint of exaggeration, that the president of the United States believes that two men have the right to marry each other, the topic of Reilly's subsequent book, *Making Gay OK* (2014).

Fortunately, Reilly ends his inquiry into the closing of the Muslim mind on an even-handed note that is a welcome relief from the MEMRI agit-prop that disfigures much of his book. Reilly sees an intellectual symmetry in the current geopolitical situation, in which the divorce of reason from faith which has led to the current crisis in the West finds its mirror image in the divorce of faith from reason which has led to the intellectual crisis of Islam. Both have led to catastrophe, but in an inspired moment both could just as easily lead to a mystical convergence, according to which the rejection of the Enlightenment on the part of the West would correspond exactly with the rejection of the Ash'arite anti-Enlightenment on the part of Islam. The main thing blocking this convergence is ideology — in particular, the ideology of Neoconservatism, which supports modernity, in the West and the ideology of Salafism in the Islamic world, which supports all of the voluntarism of western modernity as well. If there is a flaw in Reilly's book it lies in his inability to see the fundamentally revolutionary character of Neoconservatism and its incompatibility with the classical rationalism of the West and his failure to see that both Salafism and Neoconservatism are manifestations of the Jewish revolutionary spirit that has plagued the West since the chief priests, scribes, and elders mocked Christ on the cross. The answer lies, as Reilly rightly states, in "The recovery of reason, grounded in Logos," as "the only sentinel of sanity," a recovery that "is imperative for the East as well as the West."

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

The Nuclear Deal Goes Through

The successful conclusion of the P5+1 agreement limiting Iran's capability to produce nuclear weapons in July 2015 was met with one of the largest propaganda barrages ever orchestrated by the Israel Lobby in America. AIPAC announced that it was allocating anywhere between \$40 and \$150 million to sink the deal. In August New York Democrat Senator Chuck Schumer announced that he was breaking with the Obama Administration and joining the Senate's Republicans, who were unanimous in opposing the deal. As of August, the number of undecided Democrats was large enough to sink the deal. In a speech at American University, Obama countered by claiming that the choice was between the deal as it was or war. It turned out to be an effective move on Obama's part because by the time Congress returned from its summer break in September, the tide had turned and the momentum was on the side of the Obama Administration.

On September 1, the *New York Times* announced that three New York Democrats had defected to the Obama Camp. One day later, the final nail got hammered into the AIPAC coffin when Barbara Mikulski announced that she was siding with the Obama Administration. At this point the White House had enough votes to override any bill the Republican Congress presented, and opposition collapsed.

Newsweek claimed that, in taking on the Obama Administration, "AIPAC may have overestimated its influence." Over the course of its existence, AIPAC had effectively tamed Congress by showing a ruthless willingness to punish any member of Congress who opposed its agenda. In 1984, "All the Jews in America, from coast to coast, gathered to oust [the Republican Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Illinois Senator Charles] Percy," boasted Tom Dine, AIPAC's executive director at the time. "And the American politicians — those who hold public positions now, and those who aspire — got the message."

Charles Percy, Charles Finley, and Cynthia McKinney are just a few of the politicians whose careers ended abruptly when they fell afoul of the Israel Lobby. But the book of that name by Professors Walt and

Mearsheimer signaled a change in attitude among the elite members of America's foreign policy establishment. Israel was increasingly seen as a liability which crippled the State Department's ability to determine its own foreign policy goals. The intransigence of the Likud Party and Binyamin Netanyahu only made matters worse. Chutzpah is a Jewish virtue which makes effective diplomacy virtually impossible. This leads the Jews to hold onto policy positions long after they have become untenable. And this is precisely what the Jews did under Netanyahu's leadership. The first mistake was Netanyahu addressing Congress, without the invitation of the president. This turned support for Israel into a partisan issue, which was exactly what the Jews did not want to do. In its postmortem report on AIPAC's defeat, *Haaretz* claimed:

The more partisan the opposition to it becomes, the more Democrats rally behind Obama in response. This is a huge problem for AIPAC. For years, the organization has worked to ensure that both Democrats and Republicans provide the Israeli government unquestioning support. But Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, by embracing Mitt Romney in 2012, colluding with Republicans to organize a speech to Congress behind Obama's back this spring and making Ron Dermer, a former GOP operative, his top representative in Washington, has made AIPAC's work harder.

AIPAC had overplayed its hand. By throwing its lot in with the Neocon Republicans it had lost all leverage with the Democrats. Netanyahu showed up on Capitol Hill uninvited in a gesture that was breathtaking in its daring (or recklessness) by insulting a sitting president without the backing of the Jewish community in America. Even Abe Foxman warned Netanyahu not to go ahead. J Street, the new Israel Lobby, had thrown its support behind the Obama Administration. Todd Gitlin wrote an article showing that the majority of America's Jews, unlike the Jewish organizations which purported to represent them, supported the nuclear deal with Iran. According to J Street President Jeremy Ben-Ami, "The illusion that there's some form of wall-to-wall unity and unanimity on these issues in the Jewish political community has probably been put to rest by this fight."

The Obama Administration had broken the back of AIPAC, which no longer had a stranglehold on American foreign policy. *Haaretz* tried to explain why AIPAC, long considered the most powerful lobby in Washington, had failed. Mikulski implied that if the Congress torpedoed the deal, the Europeans who were cosigners of the deal would bolt and lift the sanctions against Iran unilaterally:

Some have suggested we reject this deal and impose unilateral sanctions to force Iran back to the table. But maintaining or stepping up sanctions will only work if the sanction coalition holds together. It's unclear if the European Union, Russia, China, India and others would continue sanctions if Congress rejects this deal. At best, sanctions would be porous, or limited to unilateral sanctions by the U.S.

What no one wanted to mention was the intellectual bankruptcy of those who opposed the deal. There was no Logos in the position which AIPAC took. It was simply a question of money talking, Jew money had spoken out in opposition to the agreement and it was up to the scribes who fed at the Jew money trough to come up with reasons why the rest of us should support them.

In its daily newsletter, the Heritage Foundation weighed in on the losing side of the debate in mid-August by claiming that the P5+1 deal would promote terrorism. Changing horses in midstream, Josh Siegel claimed that nuclear weapons weren't the real issue. After confecting a bogus narrative about Iran and nuclear weapons, the scribes in the pay of the Israel Lobby suddenly changed their story and claimed that the real threat was that Iran is now buying AK-47s. "It doesn't cost that much to buy a lot of RPGs and AK-47s and to pad the coffers of groups of 5,000 fighters here and 10,000 there," said Michael O'Hanlon, the director of research for the foreign policy program at the Brookings Institution. According to Max Abrahms, a Northeastern University professor and terrorism analyst, the United States is unlikely to be affected by Iran's aggression, but Israel faces a different reality. "A country such as Iran would never threaten the homeland even if it develops a nuclear weapon," Abrahms said. "But the threat matrix is a lot more complicated in Israel. Essentially Obama is saying, look, Iran isn't so dangerous, it helps us in the war on terror. Israel is banging its head and saying, don't forget Iran is the leading sponsor of terrorism." As an example of "terrorism," Siegel presents us with a picture of an August 14 rally celebrating the ninth anniversary of the end of Hezbollah's 2006 war with Israel. The fact that Hezbollah stopped Israeli tanks five hundred yards into Lebanon in 2006 was not something that was going to make people like Binyamin Netanyahu happy, but who in his right mind would call blowing up the tanks of an aggressor "terrorism," or an example of "Iran's aggression in the Middle East"? With arguments like this, it is not surprising that opposition to the P5+1 deal found no traction in Congress.

In their rush to get their front hooves into the Jew money trough, Catholic Neoconservatives revealed that they were every bit as intellectually bankrupt as the conservatives they emulated at places like the Heritage Foundation. *Crisis*, once known as *Catholicism in Crisis*, is a good case in point. It was created by Neoconservative foundations to undercut the pastoral on nuclear weapons which the American Catholic bishops had written in the early 1980s. *Crisis* claimed to be a Catholic magazine, when in fact it was an organ of the Republican Party, created to keep Catholics pulling the Republican lever faithfully in election after election. Editor Deal Hudson was fairly successful in turning out the Catholic vote until someone revealed that he had been dismissed from his professor's job at Fordham for seducing one of his students. Needless to say, lots of handwringing followed, all of which we could have been spared if Deal had been wearing the Catholic version of the NASCAR uniform. The fact that someone, probably from his own organization, outed Hudson as a seducer, pales in comparison to the dishonesty that the magazine itself had shown over the years by pretending to be Catholic.

On August 15, 2015, as part of the \$150 million propaganda deal which AIPAC launched to torpedo the P5+1 nuclear deal, *Crisis* published an article entitled "Faith-based Negotiations with Faith-based Fanatics," which attacked the Vatican for supporting the Iranian nuclear agreement:

After the global powers finally reached a deal, the Vatican wasted no time in praising it. Shortly after the announcement, Vatican spokesman Fr. Federico Lombardi said that the agreement "is viewed in a positive light by the Holy See." Bishop Oscar Cantu, the head of the U.S. bishops' Committee on International Justice and Peace, called on Congress to "support these efforts to build bridges that foster peace and greater understanding," and he warned Congress not to "undermine" the deal. For his part, Cardinal Theodore McCarrick, the former archbishop of Washington, D.C., applauded the deal in an essay for the *Washington Post*. He opined that we can trust the Iranians because Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei once issued a fatwa that "declared the possession and use of nuclear weapons as incompatible with Islam." But Iran is not like other societies, and its notion of what is rational differs substantially from what John Kerry supposes it to be.

In *Crisis*, Author William Kirk Kilpatrick (whose articles on psychology, I have to declaim, have appeared in *Fidelity*, the predecessor to *Culture Wars*) makes the odd argument (for a Catholic) that Iran cannot be trusted because it "is not a rational-secular society" like the United States. Kilpatrick views Iran with suspicion because "it is a faith-based society," which believes in "One God," "Divine Revelation and its fundamental role

in setting forth the laws” of the Islamic Republic, and “a return to God in the Hereafter.”

The perceptive reader will have noticed that the Catholic Church believes this too. Oblivious to that fact, Kilpatrick goes on to say that you can’t trust “people whose thoughts are fixed on the next life.” His authority in this matter is the neocon ideologue Bernard Lewis, who presumably would have similarly awful things to say about Catholics, since their thoughts are also “fixed on the next life,” or at least should be.

Not content to leave us with Bernard Lewis, Kilpatrick cites Denis MacEoin, “an expert on Iran,” who feels that Lewis “may have underestimated the extent of this preoccupation with the last days.” According to MacEoin, “The apocalyptic mindset is not something unique to Ahmadinejad and his followers. It has deep roots in Shiite belief.” This assertion is undeniably true. It also has deep roots in Christian beliefs. This may come as news to Messrs. Kilpatrick, Lewis, and MacEoin, but the term apocalyptic comes from Apocalypse, which is the title of the last book of the Bible, which predicts that all sorts of horrible things are going to happen at the end of the world. No one, as far as I know, has claimed that reading this book of the Bible would make Catholics more likely to use nuclear weapons.

No, wait, it turns out that Kilpatrick wants to make precisely that connection. The point of Kilpatrick’s essay is very simple: people with “religious motivations” cannot be trusted. This holds for the Ayatollah Khomeini, who issued a fatwa against the use of nuclear weapons, and Cardinal McCarrick, who “notes that the Ayatollah’s (supposed) fatwa against the use of nuclear arms is ‘a teaching not dissimilar to the Catholic position that the world must rid itself of these indiscriminate weapons.’”

“For a long time,” Kilpatrick continues:

Catholic leaders have contented themselves with the notion that Islam and Catholicism have much in common. Well, yes, on a superficial level they do. Like Catholics, Muslims believe in prayer, fasting, charity, and pilgrimage. In addition, they revere Jesus and await his second coming. If you don’t go any deeper than that then it’s plausible to think that Iran’s religious leaders are no more likely to use nukes than the pope.

Well, yes, that is plausible, and not just on a superficial level. In making claims like this, Kilpatrick has earned the distinction of writing one of the most incoherent, tortured, nonsensical articles ever to grace the pages of a Catholic periodical. He also goes on to prove that the more things

change, the more they remain the same. *Crisis* may have mutated into an online version after Hudson's demise, but it still calls itself Catholic, and it is still shilling for people behind the scenes.

I am no fan of NASCAR auto racing, but I like the uniforms. They must be tailor made because they fit so well, but best of all are the ads plastered all over the uniforms. They give a secure feeling; you know exactly where these guys stand because you know who pays for their ride. Would that this were the case in other areas of human endeavor! Pundits, for example, should be forced by law to wear NASCAR-style uniforms when they appear on the various Washington talk shows. That way we could be spared all the trouble of having to sort through their arguments. Once a pundit had, say, American Enterprise Institute plastered across his chest, we could spare ourselves the effort of trying to sort through his twisted arguments for, say, rejecting the Iran nuclear deal because there is no Logos in any of these arguments. What we're witnessing is money talking.

Just to show that great minds run in the same circles, Kilpatrick evidently agrees with my position on NASCAR uniforms for pundits because at the end of his bio he writes proudly that "his work is supported in part by the Shillman Foundation." It turns out that William Kirk Kilpatrick, the quondam Catholic journalist and contributor to *Fidelity* magazine, is now a shill for the appropriately named Shillman Foundation.

For those of you who don't know, the Shillman Foundation was created by Robert J. Shillman, who made his fortune by founding the Natick, Massachusetts-based Cognex corporation, "which makes machine vision products that help automate manufacturing." Mr. Shillman, *Reuters* notes, then used his money to fund

a number of conservative and pro-Israeli groups, including the Zionist Organization of America. The ZOA has targeted both academics it perceives have been teaching anti-Israel doctrine and Palestine student groups accused of intimidating Jewish students on U.S. campuses, including a campaign at Shillman's alma mater, Northeastern University in Boston.

Shillman is on the board of the David Horowitz Freedom Center, "whose Jihad Watch website helped organize the cartoon event in a Dallas suburb with activist Pamela Geller's American Freedom Defense Initiative." That "event" led to the deaths of two Muslims, in a way that was eerily similar to the attack on Charlie Hebdo, which left a number of French journalists dead after their satiric attack on the prophet. I mention all

of this as a public service, in the hope that it will spare the unwary reader the effort of trying to make sense out of Kilpatrick's tortured lucubrations on the American bishops and the nuclear deal with Iran. There is no Logos here. What we hear when we read these words is the sound of money talking — Jew money talking through the mouth of a Catholic puppet. That the majority of the American Congress did not succumb to the \$150 million which AIPAC appropriated to bribe and/or intimidate them is nothing less than a miracle, given the corrupt state of politics in America. It is a small sign of hope, as well as a sign of the depths to which their Catholic neocon lackeys have descended.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

Islam as the Scourge of God

The Iranian Revolution of 1979 was the counterrevolution against modernity which should have been launched by Vatican II. The desexualization of the culture which Cardinal Ottaviani proposed in the preliminary documents of Vatican II was derailed largely as a result of the efforts of people like Joseph Ratzinger, as he himself admitted, in collaboration with the German and American bishops.

From the Catholic perspective, Islam has always been the scourge of God, which is to say, a divinely ordained corrective punishment for the decadence of Christianity. As early as 1518, Dr. Martin Luther had identified the Islamic faith as the “scourge of God.” For the rest of his life Luther believed that the Muslims were God’s punishment upon a sinful Christendom that had, among other sins (ingratitude, toleration of wicked sects, worship of the god Mammon, drunkenness, greed, and the split of Christendom which had provoked His wrath), tolerated the papal abomination. Muslims would function as Germany’s schoolmaster who must correct and teach the German people to repent of their sins and to fear God. The Catholic antidote to decadent Jewish movies was the Philadelphia boycotts of 1933; the Islamic antidote was burning the movie theaters down in Tehran in 1979. What could have been accomplished by the Church ended up being accomplished by the scourge of God when the Iranians drove the Shah from the Peacock Throne in 1979 and created their own Islamic counterrevolution.

And so to answer the question proposed by our symposium, What is Islam?: Islam is the scourge of God. Islam always arrives on the scene when Christianity has failed. It burst into the world scene in the 7th century when Egypt and North Africa were riddled with Nestorianism and other heresies. It swept away the last remnants of the eastern Roman Empire in 1454 when Byzantium, riddled with Neoplatonist magic, rejected the unity achieved by the Council of Florence and fell to the Turks. Suleiman the Magnificent swept away the Hungarian army under Louis II at the Battle of Mohacs and would have taken Vienna in Luther’s day if Christendom hadn’t rediscovered its unity at the last moment.

It is now time to stop complaining about the “Council of the media” and to admit that the arrival of Islam in the deracinated public housing projects of Bradford and the suburbs of Marseilles is a function of the failure of Christianity — the Reformation first of all, which has now played itself out as support for Gay Marriage and the on-going extinction of England, but of the Catholic Church as well, which has been more interested in dialogue with the Jews than evangelization. The arrival of Islam on the scene is the sign that God has run out of patience with lukewarm Christians who do nothing to preserve the social and moral order from soul-destroying decadence of the sort found everywhere in Europe and, *mutatis mutandis*, America as well. Better Islam as the scourge of God than the decadence of once Presbyterian Glasgow depicted in the movie *Trainspotting*. But better still is the option proposed by Majid Majidi and Hojjatoleslam Hosayni, which is to say, ecumenical cultural jihad against Hollywood and the moral corruption which it spreads as the propaganda ministry for the American Imperium.

At the end of a short speech I gave in Iran in 2013 at the Hollywoodism conference, I pulled out my rosary and the prayer beads that Henna, a young Muslim lady, had given me. I said the fact they were tangled together was symbolic of the fate of both Catholics and Shi’as in the world today. No one objected to the sight of the cross dangling from the end of my rosary; no one objected when I mentioned the name of Jesus Christ as the antidote to Dracula, the hero of the American-Zionist Imperium and the City of Man. Instead of defeat at the hands of Hollywood, we are now being offered another option, the option of cultural jihad against the most sophisticated system of moral corruption that the world has never known. Whether we accept this challenge or let it turn into one more failure to stop the American-Jewish juggernaut depends largely on our faith, and our hope, and our charity. I concluded my little speech by waving my Islamo-Catholic beads before the crowd and claiming, “Fear is useless; what is needed is love.”

Or is there another alternative? Do we need another Jewish-led Revolution? In his encyclical *Spe Salvi*, Pope Benedict XVI indicates that revolution is not the Christian way:

Christianity did not bring a message of social revolution like that of the ill-fated Spartacus, whose struggle led to so much bloodshed. Jesus was not Spartacus; he was not engaged in a fight for political liberation like Barabbas or Bar-Kochba. Jesus himself, who died on the Cross, brought something totally different: an encounter

with a hope stronger than the suffering of slavery, a hope which therefore transformed life and the world from within.

It was Cyrus, King of Persia, who set captive Israel free. It was the three Persians whom we call the Magi who showed us that Logos, not revolution, is the source of our liberation. It is to these three Iranians that we should turn to find an alternative to the Jewish revolutionary spirit which has caused so much havoc in the world. Our model in this regard should be these three Persians, whom we call wise because they studied the Logos that God has made apparent in the sky. The three Magi from the East were different than the decadent philosophers from the West, who, St. Paul tells us, have been schooled to “keep truth imprisoned in their wickedness.” Like Michel Foucault, who was raised a Catholic and can stand as a symbol of the decadent state of philosophy in the West, “they knew God and yet refused to honor him as God or to thank him; instead they made nonsense out of logic and their empty minds were darkened. The more they called themselves philosophers,” St. Paul continues, “the more stupid they grew.” With the homosexual Foucault as their guide, the West has “turned from natural intercourse to unnatural practices ... their menfolk have given up natural intercourse to be consumed with passion for each other, men doing shameless things with men and getting an appropriate reward for their perversion.” Michel Foucault died of AIDS in 1984, after a decade of degrading himself in the bathhouses of San Francisco.

By succumbing to the increasingly insistent pull of his own homosexual compulsions, Foucault, according to his biographer, James Miller, made “a kind of Faustian pact with the death-instinct and the hecatombs of the fascist adventure.” Foucault is less oblique in describing his own personal deal with the devil:

The Faustian pact, whose temptation has been instilled in us by the deployment of sexuality, is now as follows: to exchange life in its entirety for sex itself, for the truth and sovereignty of sex. Sex is worth dying for. It is in this (strictly historical) sense that sex is indeed imbued with the death instinct.

Michel Foucault is the patron saint of the decadent West. That is why “The West,” as Denethor said in *The Lord of the Rings*, has failed. We have come to modern day Persia with different saints in mind. We take as our model the three Persians who followed a star. Why are they our model? First, because of their intellect. They were able to discern Logos in the sky by studying God’s creation. Second, because of their will. The Magi are worthy of imitation because when the star appeared in the sky they had the

courage to follow it wherever it led them. Do we have the same courage? If we don't, we will achieve nothing. And finally, because of their cunning. They were smart enough to understand that they could not accept political discourse and political categories. After being warned in a dream not to go back to Herod, they "returned to their own country by a different way" (Matt 2:12).

Like the Magi, we are being called to return to our own country by a different way. We are being called to avoid Herod and not become accomplices in his plans to slaughter the innocent. We are being called to abandon Herod's obsolete political categories, which have caused so much mayhem in the world. We are being called not only to eschew the Jewish revolutionary spirit but to oppose it openly and actively.

The alternative to becoming a wise man is now clear. As one of the bishops at the recent synod on the family in Rome made clear, it is the two beasts of the Apocalypse: the homosexual agenda of the Great Satan and the Takfiri in Syria and Iraq otherwise known as DAESH or ISIS. What do homosexual revolutionaries like Michel Foucault have in common with the liver-eating Takfiri? They believe that will is superior to reason. We are wise men because we believe in the opposite. We believe in subordinating our will to the Logos. We believe in following the Star which symbolizes the Logos which is God. As the Gospel of St. John reminds us: "*Verbum erat Deus.*" With the Magi as our role models, we ask for the courage to follow that star wherever it leads us.

POSTSCRIPT

The Magi and the Apartheid Wall: The Author Explores Iran

*“Why did you Americans do that terrible thing?” she cried out. “We always loved America. To us, America was the great country, the perfect country, the country that helped us while other countries were exploiting us. But after that moment, no one in Iran ever trusted the United States again. I can tell you for sure that if you had not done that thing, you would never have had that problem of hostages being taken in your embassy in Tehran. All your trouble started in 1953. Why did you do it?” (Stephen Kinzer, *All the Shah’s Men: An American Coup and the Roots of Middle East Terror* (2003)).*

Shiraz is roughly 200 miles west of the hottest place on earth, the Lut desert, where the temperature has been measured at 159 degrees F. Having me speak in Shiraz was Hamed’s idea. Hamed Ghashghavi is the flamboyant, 25-year-old son of an Iranian diplomat who grew up in Tunisia and was as a result fluent in French and Arabic. His language ability allows him to network, and his network now spreads throughout Iran and large parts of the West.

We arrived in Shiraz shortly after 8:00 in the morning. I am scheduled to speak at 11:00 a.m. in spite of the fact that I went to bed after midnight and had to get up at 3:00 a.m. to make the flight to Shiraz. Standing in the already blazing heat, I decide that I won’t make it through my talk unless I get a decent breakfast.

“I need to eat an omelet,” I say to Hamed.

“Sure, Mike,” Hamed says and relays the message to Shaheen and Mohammed, who picked us up at the airport.

Both are students at the Technological University of Shiraz. Both are even younger than Hamed. When Shaheen approached us in the heat of the airport parking lot, he looked a lot like Ben Affleck’s idea of a hostage-taking Iranian terrorist, complete with Republican Guard uniform tunic. Mohammad takes the wheel and we begin driving down the alleys of Shiraz, which are not much wider than our compact Fars car, a Peugeot

knock-off produced in Iranian factories. We end up at what looks like a café next to an auto body shop, both of which share the same hole in the ground as their rest room. The walls are decorated with Iranian body builders, who got that way by practicing the traditional Iranian bodybuilding known as House of Strength or Zurkhaneh by tossing larger and larger clubs into the air.

I look like an American businessman in my dark suit and yellow tie. Hamed, Mohammed, and Shaheen have all disappeared and the rest of the café's occupants view me with mild disinterest as they puff away on their hookahs. It is the first time that I have ever seen an Iranian smoke.

When my breakfast arrives, I try to discern which dish is the omelet by process of elimination. It isn't the flat bread, and it isn't the plate full of alfalfa-like salad on the next plate, so it must be the pile of reddish substance in the middle. I begin to eat. The reddish substance is warm, so I conclude that I will not contract dysentery from it. For the same reason, I refrain from eating the pile of greens, remembering what happened to the Westerners who ate salad in Cairo in 1994.

Hamed wonders why I am not eating the salad.

"A chacun sa gout," I say.

"What?" he asks.

I repeat the phrase about five times and then finally translate it into English.

"Oh," he says when the light bulb finally goes on, *"A chacun sa gout."*

"That's what I said."

"Your French is terrible."

He is, of course, right. My French is terrible, but even if it weren't I have no desire to argue with him. The red "omelet" has formed a knot in my stomach, and as we drive to the university I say a prayer that it doesn't get worse.

The political situation has changed dramatically since my first trip to Iran. President Ahmadinejad was voted out of office and replaced by Rouhani, who is determined to come to an agreement with the Americans which will end the economic sanctions which have been imposed on Iran. The Obama Administration seems determined to reciprocate, even if its

program seems to be two steps forward and one step back. The Obama Administration did not take the bait that the false flag gas attack in Syria offered in August of 2013. Instead Obama agreed to work with Vladimir Putin. The Israel Lobby was furious, but AIPAC's attempt to impose new sanctions failed in January 2014 largely because a new pro-Obama Jewish lobby, J Street, opposed them and gave wary congressmen a way out. It was AIPAC's first major defeat and signaled a decline in its power.

Not to be deterred, the Jews countered with Victoria Nuland's *coup d'etat* in the Ukraine, which made it impossible for Obama to work with Putin and blocked what was promising to be a convergence on gender issues between Poles and Russians. Nuland, wife of Neoconservative luminary Robert Kagan, failed in the act of succeeding, giving us a stunning recent example of what Hegel called "the cunning of reason." The democratically elected Yanukovich government was overthrown by a coalition of American supported Neo-Nazi thugs, but the Neocon holdovers from the Bush Administration overreached, causing a reaction, and the Crimea returned to Russia, putting an end to NATO's expansion eastward and signaling the beginning of the end of the American Empire and its century-long efforts to control the Eurasian landmass. In spite of everything, the Obama Administration continued its overtures to Iran, lifting the sanctions prohibiting sale of oil for six months around the time I was traveling through Iran with Hamed.

Over the course of our travels, Hamed told me he was willing to die for the Supreme Leader. The real issue now, however, is whether he and his generation are willing to live for the Supreme Leader. The situation has changed since the 1981 war with Iraq. The revolutionary fervor of 1979, followed closely by the war which took 300,000 lives, pictures of whom adorn virtually every building in Iran, has been replaced by a period of uncertainty. We know the Iranians know how to die; the current question is whether they know how to live, and what principles will guide their lives through this current period of uncertainty. Hamed is a supporter of former President Ahmadinejad and is worried about whether the Rouhani government is going to bargain away all of the gains of the revolution in order to broker a sanction-ending deal on the nuclear issue. He also talked about finding a wife. Willingness to die in battle and a desire to get married are two of the deepest aspirations a human being can have, but they require different intellectual infrastructures to find completion, and now the

conditions necessary to marry, have children and become one of the indispensable social cells which will carry Iran into the future have become opaque to large numbers of Iranians. The main issue is birth control.

Shortly after I returned from Iran, Thomas Erdbrink's article on Iran's troubled attitude toward children appeared in the *New York Times* (June 8, 2014). In a form that we have come to expect on issues and populations which the global elites have targeted for social engineering, Erdbrink tells the story of "Bita and Shirag," a young couple who "are really serious about not having kids." So serious, in fact, that Bita has procured two abortions, even though abortion is illegal in Iran. Erdbrink does his best to portray Ayatollah Ali Khamenei as a religious fanatic intent on imposing his views on Iran's helpless women *via*:

a 14-point program, announced late last month, that health officials hope will lead to a doubling of Iran's population, to 150 million, by 2050. Hospital delivery stays are now free, and women are allowed longer maternity leave. Reversing past policies to control population growth, the government has canceled subsidies for condoms and birth control pills and eliminated free vasectomies... Billboards in the capital show a laughing father with five children riding a single tandem bicycle up a hill, leaving far behind an unhappy looking father with only one child. Those parents who actually produce five children are now eligible for a \$1,500 bonus, not that many here are likely to be tempted.

As we have come to expect from aspirational articles of this sort, Erdbrink puts the last word into the mouth of an Iranian, a 25-year-old unemployed soccer player, who of course represents the position of the *New York Times*, when he opines: "Anybody with a lot of children is either very rich or very irresponsible," Mr. Najafi said. "There is no other way."

Like Hamed, Shaheen is also willing to die for the Supreme Leader. He is also interested in finding a wife. Shaheen asks me if I have any children. When I mention that I have three sons and two daughters, he asks if he can marry one of my daughters.

"How old are you?" I ask.

"Twenty-two," he says.

When I mention that he is closer in age to my oldest granddaughter, an internet search for her Facebook page ensues, but it is not successful because there are simply too many Joneses in this world.

Religious fervor and the sexual issue go hand in hand, there as over here. The differences involve the religions and the form of fervor. At this point, the global elites who control American policy have committed

America to a publicity campaign in favor of gay marriage that makes the Children's Crusade look wishy-washy by comparison. The cumulative effect of all past campaigns in favor of sexual liberation is having its effect in Iran. The revolutionary fervor of 1979 has diminished, as all revolutionary fervor must over time, and has been replaced by a sense of uncertainty. Was the West right after all? The unspoken question haunts Iran.

Since the end of the Iran-Iraq war, the Basij, or the Organization for the Mobilization of the Oppressed, a paramilitary volunteer militia which was established in 1979 by the Ayatollah Khomeini to fight in the Iran-Iraq war, has become a law enforcement auxiliary involved in "the providing of social service, organizing of public religious ceremonies, and policing of morals and the suppression of dissident gatherings" (*Wikipedia* on the Basij). The Basij still apprehends couples for holding hands in public, but the police release them with a lecture now, rather than putting them on trial. The same is true of dancing. Just before I arrived in Iran, a group of Iranian teenagers were arrested for posting a video to the tune "Happy," which showed Iranian girls dancing without wearing the hijab. The young people were taken to the police station but later let off after they claimed that the video had been done with the assurance that it would remain private. The young people were probably victims of a cultural agent provocateur, but the sense of uncertainty in the air remains.

The focal point of much of the cultural protest is the hijab or traditional headcovering which is mandatory for all women, including foreigners, in Iran. The women who attended my talk at Basij headquarters in Tehran all wore the chador, which is to say the black garment worn in public which covers body, head, and neck. The same was true of every other talk, including those in Shiraz and Fasa. But in the airports, the westernizers seemed to be in the majority. These women bleached their hair and wore the hijab as far back on the head as possible, exposing as much hair as possible. The effect is not particularly attractive because Iranian skin is not particularly compatible with blonde hair, certainly not bleached blonde hair. But the political statement is clear. In a world where the engineering of consent can now be projected globally *via* the internet, the hijab has become a symbol of the oppression of women. Women are urged to have themselves photographed in public *sans* hijab and to then post the photos on the internet. Doubtless some US-funded NGO is behind the

campaign. But the message is always the same. America frames no hypotheses. It simply promotes freedom, which is part of nature. Man is born free, but in Iran he (or, more importantly she) is in chains because some cleric wants to impose his morality on the population. Those with an ear for propaganda will remember that these same memes and tropes got used in the attack on the Catholic Church's position on birth control and later abortion during the 1960s and 1970s. The similarities between what happened to the Catholics then and what is now being foisted on the Iranians was the theme of my talks.

I ended my talk to the Basij by saying that birth control was the biggest issue facing Iran at that moment. The main internal threat to the ongoing existence of the Iranian Revolution of 1979 and, indeed, the existence of the Iranian people, is birth control. But to state the issue that way is to misstate it. No nation can maintain revolutionary fervor for any extended period of time. Even fervor for the sexual revolution of the 1960s began to wane by the mid-'70s, and in 1979 it was replaced by *Alien* and a whole new generation of horror movies that provided catharsis by articulating the psychic pain which the sexually liberated had been experiencing for over a decade. As a symbolic coda to what I was saying, H.R. Giger, the Swiss creator of the *Alien* monster, died when I was in Iran.

More often than not, the sexual counterrevolution often had nothing to do with the intentions of the counterrevolutionaries. The best example of this was the rise of Hollywood horror films. *Alien*, which opened in 1979 and won that year's Oscar for best visual effects, was in many ways the sequel to the 1973 porn classic *Deep Throat*, only by 1979 oral sex wasn't fun anymore. In the minds of the sexual revolutionaries, who had aborted their offspring, had their hearts broken, or contracted a venereal disease over the course of the decade following the other *annus mirabilis*, 1964, Year of the Pill, sex, in fact, had become an oftentimes disgusting, terrifying, and life-threatening experience. America's collective guilty conscience over abortion found psychic release by viewing H.R. Giger's face hugging monster, which inserted its penis into the mouth of John Hurt, causing his stomach to explode in a parody of human sexuality and gestation that was deeply cathartic for the walking wounded who were the survivors of sexual liberation (E. Michael Jones, *Monsters from the Id* (2013)). Horror films like *Alien* and *Halloween* (which came out one year earlier) gave the sexually liberated a cathartic release because they allowed

them to affirm simultaneously the contradictory assertions that sexual liberation is a good thing (thereby preserving their credentials as progressives) and it ruined my life.

The sexual revolution had created a world-wide wave of revulsion that would propel a number of world leaders into positions of political power. Ronald Reagan was one of these leaders; the Ayatollah Khomeini was another. In Iran, the sexual revolution of the '60s was replaced by another revolution. The Revolution of 1979 created the Islamic Republic which is still in existence today. After initially encouraging a high birth rate as the demographic basis for political and economic national power under the Ayatollah Khomeini, the revolutionary government after Khomeini's death in 1989 inexplicably reversed his position and instituted what would turn out to be one of the most effective birth control campaigns in modern history. In the 10-year period following the creation of the Islamic Republic in Iran in 1979, Iran's birth rate was 3.5. By the time his successor Khamenei gave his speech in the fall of 2012 lamenting the population decline, the Iranian birthrate had plummeted to a European level of less than two children, which is to say below replacement rate (*Wikipedia* on family planning in Iran). The *New York Times* was not slow in exposing the irony of the situation:

Under the grip of militant Islamic clerisy, Iran has seen its population of children implode. Accordingly, Iran's population is now aging at a rate nearly three times that of Western Europe. Maybe the middle aging of the Middle East will bring a mellower tone to the region, but middle age will pass swiftly to old age.

Accounts differ on why and how the change came about. Some claim that the changes were instituted by the Rafsanjani government after the death of the Ayatollah Khomeini; other reports claim that Khomeini himself was responsible for the change. One source claims that: "In the late 1980s, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, Iran's supreme leader, issued *fatwas* making birth control widely available and acceptable to conservative Muslims" (*LA Times*, July 29, 2012). Either way, the birth rate plunged, but more importantly, as the *LA Times* put it, the promotion of contraception began "to usher in social changes, particularly in the role of women." Crippled by a *sola scriptura* approach to morality, the religious leadership of the Islamic Republic of Iran inadvertently created a feminist fifth column which would rise up against the revolutionary government during the Green Demonstrations of 2009. Or as the *LA Times* put it:

Without intending to, Iran's clerical leadership helped to foster "the empowerment of Iranian women," said Djavad Salehi-Isfahani, an Iran expert at Virginia Tech. "The mullahs may be winning the battle on the streets, but women are winning the battle inside the family."

Now the Supreme Leader is faced with the unenviable task of putting the contraceptive genie back into the moral lamp from which he conjured it over twenty years ago. No wonder he is asking Allah the All-merciful for forgiveness. President Ahmadinejad joined in the anti-contraception campaign by claiming that:

Doubling the country's population of 75 million would enable Iran to threaten the West, he said. He has denounced the contraceptive program as "a prescription for extinction," called on Iranian girls to marry no later than 16 or 17 and offered bonuses of more than \$950 for each child.

Unfortunately for the pro-natalist faction, President Ahmadinejad is no longer in power. The question lurking behind every sexual/cultural issue at the moment is whether President Rouhani is going to throw the contraceptive baby out with the nuclear bathwater. On July 25, 2012, Supreme Leader Khamenei stated that Iran's contraceptive policy made sense twenty years ago, "but its continuation in later years was wrong. Scientific and experts' studies show that we will face population aging and reduction (in population) if the birth-control policy continues." Similarly:

Deputy health minister Ali Reza Mesdaghinia was quoted in the semiofficial Fars news agency on 29 July saying that population control programs "belonged to the past" and that "there is no plan to keep the number of children at one or two. Families should decide about it by themselves. In our culture, having a large number of children has been a tradition. In the past families had five or six children... The culture still exists in the rural areas. We should go back to our genuine culture" (*Wikipedia* on family planning in Iran).

My impromptu speech to the Basij on birth control was barely out of my mouth when fellow speaker Yvonne Ridley objected to what I had to say. Ridley is an English journalist who burst upon the scene on September 28, 2001 when she was captured by the Taliban in Afghanistan after she had crossed the border illegally wearing a burqa. Ridley was released on October 8, and as a result of her experience she converted to Islam. Now this 56-year-old chador clad Englishwoman was telling the Basij that Muslim women should have the right to choose. On our way back to the hotel in the car I asked Yvonne how she could claim to oppose American imperialism while at the same time supporting one of its main instruments, namely, population control, and in particular a program put in place in Iran at the behest of the Rockefellers in collaboration with the hated Shah. She

replied by saying that I wanted to keep women “barefoot and pregnant.” Needless to say, recourse to the feminist clichés of the 1970s was not conducive to intelligent discourse. The interpreter seemed intrigued by what I was saying about the Logos of sexual activity. “Sexual intercourse is like intercourse in general,” I said. “It’s not immoral to remain silent, but it is immoral to lie. Fertility is an integral part of human sexuality. Contradicting the Logos of sexuality is the sexual equivalent of a lie.” Ridley has been married five times. This would presumably make her an expert on marriage or, if not, then at least sadder but wiser, but Ridley’s mind, in spite of her conversion, seemed frozen in the feminist clichés of yesteryear and the conversation soon lapsed into silence.

In this she differed from the Iranian women, who seemed more pensive than truculent on the matter of birth control. You could tell by the expression on the faces of the women that birth control was a problem. You could tell that they were troubled, but also that they were grateful that someone was finally addressing the issue openly. This is not to say that there wasn’t some hostility. In Shiraz, a woman reacted in a hostile manner outside the hall where I had given my talk after the official Q&A had ended. When I mentioned the Polish bishops’ pastoral on gender ideology, she attacked the pope for not doing more to stop sexual decadence, sounding a lot like a conservative Catholic attending a meeting of her local CUF chapter in the 1980s.

“The pope should support the Polish bishops,” she said.

“I agree.”

“Why aren’t you a Muslim?” she asked.

“Why aren’t you a Catholic?” I answered in response to her question.

I then mentioned my encounter with a mullah in Qom, who told me that they weren’t interested in converting believers like me, but rather wanted to work together for justice until the twelfth imam returned from the state of occultation with Jesus at his side.

“So this way,” I continued, “instead of getting one convert, you get an alliance made up of two billion people.”

My interlocutor, who looked like an airline stewardess in her navy blue uniform and hijab, was unimpressed.

“You’re a very clever trader,” she said and walked off. She might have said “traitor,” but I suspect that what she meant to say was

“salesman.” I was more puzzled than offended by her outburst. What American, after all, could be offended by being called a clever salesman? Isn’t that our national ideal?

It was dark by the time we reached Fasa, the provincial capital of Fars province roughly 100 miles southeast of Shiraz. Shiraz is hotter than Tehran, which nestles at the foot of mountains to the north, but Fasa is hotter than Shiraz because it is farther south and east. Traveling to Fasa by car meant traveling through one hundred miles of desert, past a huge salt lake that first looked like a mirage, and sporadic plantations of what looked like olive trees but were in fact lemon groves. The deserts are red in Iran and full of mountains that glow with an intense light when the sun goes down. Mejid Mejidi used this light to spectacular effect in his forthcoming movie on the prophet, peace be upon him. The dying light is naturally conducive to meditation, which is probably why civilization began in deserts, or better, in arid climates on the edge of deserts where there was enough water to survive but not enough to create forests, which obscure the sky at night. The Greeks, the Hebrews, the Egyptians, and the Iranians, who sent Magi to present gifts and worship Christ at his birth, could contemplate the heavens at night and see visible evidence of God’s plan, the Logos that preceded everything else, including Christ’s arrival on earth. The Jews who rejected Christ need to be reintroduced to the order of the universe which the Hebrews who were waiting for the Messiah discovered before His birth.

Shakespeare understood this in the intuitive way that makes his writings such an unfathomable marvel. That is why he has Lorenzo instruct Jessica, his formerly Jewish wife, by explaining the order of the universe in the night sky:

Sit, Jessica, Look how the floor of heaven
Is thick inlaid with patines of bright gold:
There’s not the smallest orb which thou behold’st
But in his motion like an angel sings
Still quiring to the young-eyed cherubins.
Such harmony is in immortal souls,
But whilst this muddy vesture of decay
Doth grossly close it in, we cannot hear it.
(*Merchant of Venice*, Act V, scene 1)

Lorenzo explains here that Logos is apparent in God’s creation. As St. Paul says in his Epistle to the Romans, “Ever since God created the world his everlasting power and deity — however invisible — have been there for

the mind to see in the things he has made” (1:20). Taken together, all of the motions of God’s providence create harmony. Shylock the Jew rejected the harmony of the universe. He hath no music in him. He is therefore a representative of the Jewish revolutionary spirit:

The man that hath no music in himself,
Nor is moved with concord of sweet sounds,
Is fit for treasons, stratagems, and spoils.
The motions of his spirit are dull as night,
And his affections dark as Erebus.
Let no such man be trusted. Mark the music.

The Iranians never fell into this trap. They never rebelled against the Logos, as the Jews did when they rejected Christ. Nor did they turn against reason by turning Islam into an irrationalist vehicle for Arab nationalism, the fate it suffered under the Caliphate in Baghdad. When the Logos was made flesh, the Iranians were the first non-Hebraic people who came to worship him. “From Persia, whence the Magi are supposed to have come, to Jerusalem was a journey of between 1000 and 1200 miles” (*Catholic Encyclopedia*). The *Catholic Encyclopedia* tells us that:

The philosophy of the Magi, erroneous though it was, led them to the journey by which they were to find Christ. Magian astrology postulated a heavenly counterpart to complement man’s earthly self and make up the complete human personality. His “double” (the *fravashi* of the Parsi) developed together with every good man until death united the two. The sudden appearance of a new and brilliant star suggested to the Magi the birth of an important person. They came to adore him — *i.e.*, to acknowledge the Divinity of this newborn King (vv. 2, 8, 11).

The Messianic expectations of the Persian Magi weren’t simply a function of Magian astronomy. There was a significant Hebrew population in both Babylon and Persia at the time of Christ’s birth, and this community created a sense of “general unrest and expectation of the imminent arrival of a Golden Age ushered in by a great deliverer throughout the Roman Empire,” but St. Leo the Great insists that the Persian Magi were lead to Christ by “his star,” which is to say by their understanding of the Logos that was apparent in nature.

Wise men, we know from the bumper sticker, still seek him. The Iranians have never given up their quest for the Logos. Their culture was over a thousand years old when Islam arrived in Persia. Some bemoaned its arrival. When the Arab conquerors reached Ctesiphon, the luxurious capital of the Sassanian Persian Empire in 638, they discovered a 90 foot square silk carpet with rubies, pearls, and diamonds sown into it depicting a garden which symbolized Persia’s cultural patrimony and the empire’s wealth. The Arab looters cut that carpet into pieces and each commander took a fragment of it home with him. Three hundred years later, the Persians were

still complaining. “Curse this world, curse this time,” wrote the Persian poet Ferdowsi in the tenth century, “The uncivilized Arabs have come to force me to be a Muslim” (Kinzer).

What followed was an accommodation. The Persians became Muslims, but they became Muslims on their own terms. Over the course of centuries, the Iranians

fashioned an interpretation of Islam quite different from that of their Arab conquerors. This interpretation, called Shiism, is based on a particular reading of Islamic history, and it has the ingenious effect of using Islam to reinforce long-standing Iranian beliefs (Kinzer).

The intra-Islamic conflict between Arabs and Iranians continues to this day. It is currently being fought in Syria as an actual war between Hezbollah, the Shi’a defenders of Hafez Assad, the Syrian President, and the Takfiri, the liver-eating Saudi/American proxies whose solution to every theological dispute is a bullet in the back of the head. The issue is what it was when the Iranian magi brought gifts to the Christ, namely, Logos.

In some sense, the Iranians have never stopped following in the footsteps of the Magi. During my stay in Iran, the Iranian tradition of wise men seeking the Logos came out in a speech commemorating the death of Imam Khomeini by the Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, Iran’s current Supreme Leader. Hamed and I attended that talk on the fourth day of my stay in Iran, along with an audience which included current President Rouhani and former President Rafsanjani as well as ambassadors from around the world, including Saudi Arabia, their foes in the current Islamic civil war. In a speech that was part funeral oration and part state of the union address, Khamenei urged Iranians to reject violence and extremism and use their “God-given reasoning ability” (*al-’aql*) to solve the problems facing the Middle East and the world today. Khamenei identified the true Islam (as opposed to what the Ayatollah Khomeini referred to as American Islam) with the Logos, as the mean between two extremes. On the one hand, Khamenei rejected the Islam of the Takfiri (the rejecters or excommunicators) and Boko Haram in Nigeria, who practice “violence in the name of Islam,” but on the other hand, he also rejected the opposite extreme, namely, the American Zionist Imperium which seeks to undermine Logos through the systematic “propagation of public sexuality in the mass media.” The crucial issue is not the correct position of the hijab on the head of Iran’s women, nor is it the give and take of nuclear negotiation; the crucial issue is birth control, because in order to negotiate the change in

policy he envisions the Supreme Leader will have to mobilize the entire country, something that is only possible if he uses Logos to distinguish between the custom, which is negotiable, and the moral law, which is not.

The already mentioned *New York Times* article came on the heels of Khamenei's speech. As some indication that life issues are intertwined with every other issue, economics has become the subtext for the birth control question. The critical factor, according to Mohammad Jalal Abbasi-Shavazi, head of the demographics department at Tehran University, is the economy. Missing from the *New York Times* account was any mention of the fact that the main thing crippling the Iranian economy is American sanctions. Deprived of oil revenue, the Iranian government decided to maintain an economy at pre-sanction levels by printing more money. The result has been inflation. A bank in Iran will pay you 40 percent interest, but to make a deposit, you have to convert your dollars to rials which are losing value at the rate of 30 percent per month. Mr. Erdbrink of the *New York Times* is now using that U.S. inflicted hardship as an excuse for the practice of birth control.

The real issue is not whether the Iranians are smart enough to see through what is happening to them. The Iranians are nothing if not intelligent. One issue is whether they have the cultural weapons to fight this battle in a campaign of covert warfare which stretches back to 1953, when the CIA overthrew Mossadegh. The other issue is whether they have the will to engage in one more battle. Compromise is in the air. After twenty five years of government sanctioned birth control, many Iranian women identify birth control with freedom, when in fact the main psychological result of ingesting birth control pills is fear on the part of the ingester. Acceptance of birth control means acceptance of the Malthusian ideology, which sees endemic famine as the result of a universe without God. In that universe, where Divine Providence has no role to play in the lives of people who have children, the food supply, which increases arithmetically, is condemned to lag behind populations, which always increase geometrically. Acceptance of the birth control pill means acceptance of a universe in which God's providence has been replaced by the self-regulating mechanism of English Capitalism, a system created by the alchemist Newton and perfected by his intellectual offspring, Adam Smith, Parson Malthus, and Charles Darwin. In this system, "science," which is a cover for Capitalism, always trumps religion. Science is part of Nature; Religion,

banned from the universe by Newton and Locke, is a figment of the mind of clerics like the Supreme Leader. Erdbrink poses the alternatives in his article. On the one hand, we have Dr. Ahmadi's birth control clinic. On the other, we have the mullah, Mojtaba Takhitpour, on the "quest for a perfect society." According to the schema Erdbrink proposes in his article, Iran now must choose between the Scottish Enlightenment, as manifested in Rockefeller-inspired birth control campaigns, or religious darkness, of the sort proposed by Mr. Takhitpour, who tells Erdbrink: "We do believe that ultimately God will provide our daily bread. So go out and have kids and have faith, is what I always say" (*New York Times*, June 8, 2014).

The ultimate question is whether Divine Providence is reasonable or not. Father Garrigou-Lagrange says that Providence flows from motion, properly understood, *Providence* (1932), which is another way of saying that it does not flow from the Newtonian idea of "violent motion" which became the philosophical underpinning of English Capitalism and the Anglo-American Empire which sought to impose that system on the world *via*, among other things, population control. Mullahs like Mr. Takhitpour understand Garrigou-Lagrange's point, at least intuitively. The real question is whether the mullahs will be able to understand it explicitly enough to convince the Iranian people before demographic winter sets in and it's too late. The issue is purely an issue of consciousness. The overwhelming majority of Iranians are now in their childbearing years. If they changed their minds, the demographic crisis would be over in a minute — at least for the Iranians — but it would only be the beginning for the world elites who worry about the fertility of inferior races, hence Mr. Erdbrink's article in the *New York Times*.

That, in fact, is precisely what I said in my talks in Tehran, Shiraz, and Fasa. It is also the main thrust of the talk I was supposed to give, which appeared as the article on "Riba vs. Mercy in The Merchant of Venice" in the June 2014 issue of *Culture Wars*. After one such talk, my translator says that she has never heard a white man say such things. Actually she said Christian. But the novelty of hearing an American telling Iranians to have more children never wore off. I'm not sure of the propriety of telling young Iranian mothers to go home and conceive another child, but I did it, and no one complained to the Basij.

At times like this, I felt like a latter day version of Howard Baskerville, an earnest young American school teacher who is revered as

“the American Lafayette” because he “was killed in 1909 while fighting alongside his Iranian friends in the Constitutional Revolution” (Kinzer). Unlike the English during that period, “Americans were regarded with nearly universal admiration and affection” because “Without attempting to force their way of life on people or convert us to their religion, they had learned Persian and started schools, hospitals, and medical dispensaries all over Iran.” By the mid-1920s an American envoy in Tehran was able to report that “Persians of all classes still have unbounded confidence in America.”

Until the outbreak of World War II, the United States had no active policy toward Iran. After the war, everything changed. The Soviet Union, which had been the ally of the United States, became its main foe in 1946, the same year that Winston Churchill gave his Iron Curtain speech. In January 1950 the National Security Council prepared a seminal document, known as NSC-68, which asserted the need for the United States to confront communist movements not only in regions of vital security interest but wherever they appeared (Kinzer).

Confronted with what it termed a “world-wide ... assault on free institutions,” the United States needed the support of Great Britain, which, as of 1951, was engaged in an ugly dispute with Iran. The main bone of contention between England and Iran was the Anglo-Iranian oil Company. The British had concluded an incredibly lucrative deal to exploit Iran’s oil deposits, and exploit them they did in just about every sense of the word. In return for those rights, the Iranian government got next to nothing, and the Iranian workers were paid 50 cents a day, with “no vacation pay, no sick leave, no disability compensation.” The workers lived in a shanty town called Kaghazabad, or Paper City, “without running water or electricity” (Kinzer). England had bankrupted itself by fighting two world wars in the 20th century, and now with unrest spreading throughout the British Empire, the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company seemed the only bulwark against total ruin. Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin claimed that without oil from Iran, there would be “no hope of our being able to achieve the standard of living at which we were aiming in Great Britain” (Kinzer).

On May 1, 1951, Mohammed Reza Shah, at the urging of Iran’s charismatic president Mohammed Mossadegh and the Iranian parliament, nationalized the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company and created the National Iranian Oil to take its place. The English government under Winston

Churchill took this as an act of war and immediately set about to overthrow the new government. Great Britain's ambassador to Iran blamed the vote to nationalize Anglo-Iranian on the Americans:

specifically on Aramco, the Arabian-American Oil Company. Aramco's announcement that it would begin splitting its profits with the Saudi Arabian government on a 50-50 basis, Shepherd complained, had "thrown a wrench" into Britain's negotiating position. But the English found no sympathy for a coup from either President Truman or his secretary of state Dean Acheson (Kinzer).

That situation changed dramatically when Dwight D. Eisenhower was elected president in November of 1952. After taking office in 1953, Eisenhower installed his campaign manager C. D. Jackson as head of staff in the White House, John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State, and Allen Dulles as head of the newly created Central Intelligence Agency:

Mossadegh's challenge to the British was unfolding at a time of unusual turbulence in the world. The Soviet Union has just conducted its second atomic bomb test, making clear that the threat of annihilation would shape history for generations to come. War was raging in Korea (Kinzer).

The Dulles brothers were obsessed with the Communist threat and felt that Iran was in imminent danger of becoming "a second China" (Kinzer). Soon after President Eisenhower took office on January 20, 1953, John Foster Dulles and Allen Dulles told their British counterparts that they were ready to move against Mossadegh. The CIA plan to remove Mossadegh was known as Operation Ajax, and Kermit Roosevelt, grandson of President Theodore Roosevelt, was sent to Tehran to carry it out. Operation Ajax involved "an intense psychological campaign against Prime Minister Mossadegh, which the CIA had already launched, followed by an announcement that the Shah had dismissed him from office" (Kinzer). It was in fact America's first foray into the realm of covert, psychological warfare, and the outcome of the playbook established in Tehran in 1953 would have far-reaching consequences, the *coup d'etat* in Ukraine in 2014 being the most recent and therefore most significant. What happened in the Ukraine in 2014 was the result of what happened in Tehran in 1953.

In 1953 the Soviet Union had just conducted its second atomic bomb test. The bomb had created a stalemate in conventional warfare that led the Dulles brothers to turn to covert warfare as the means of spreading the American Empire. The CIA began waging what it called "doctrinal warfare" against the Catholics in 1953 after Eisenhower won the presidential election. The Catholics were unaware of what was going on because "doctrinal warfare" was also covert warfare. The Catholics thought

they were part of the anti-communist crusade when in fact the CIA had targeted them as much as it had targeted the Soviet Union. It all began in Iran.

When we finally arrived in Fasa, I noticed a vaguely familiar face on a billboard, namely, my own. My mug towered over the parking lot of the hotel where we are staying. As I enter the lobby, I am greeted by another delegation of strangers.

“*Salam*,” I say, covering my heart with my right hand. The original plan was for me to lie down for an hour nap, but we are already an hour late for the talk, so all I have time to do is shower and change into my white suit. Kevin Barrett thinks that my white suit makes me look like a CIA agent. Winston Churchill also wore a white suit when visiting Tehran. Looking in the mirror as I tie my tie, I wonder if wearing a white suit will help me expiate their sins. The image in the mirror gives no answer to this question.

When we climb into the car, the cute young woman in the tan airline stewardess version of the chador who greeted me when we arrived is introduced as my translator. Her name is Habibe.

“I’ve heard that you’re an anti-Semite and a racist,” Habibe says by way of introducing herself.

Hamed and I burst out laughing.

“Where did you hear that?” I asked.

“On the web,” she said, confirming my conviction that the main function of the internet, aside from bringing pornography into everyone’s home, is slander, in particular slander of people that Jews don’t like, the current definition of an anti-Semite. Being accused of anti-Semitism by an Iranian is like showing up at an AA meeting and being called a drunk.

As my picture on billboards throughout Fasa indicated, the sponsors of my talk decided to advertise, and as a result five hundred people were waiting when I arrived at the hall. I confess to feeling overwhelmed. The cumulative effects of the heat and lack of sleep combined with the effect of walking into a hall where five hundred pairs of eyes were focused on someone who, for all they knew, could have been the revenant of Kermit Roosevelt, left me momentarily unhinged. And so I walked out of the hall back into the hot night and, ignoring what seemed like an equally large crowd outside the hall and the children who were pestering me for an

autograph, I said a prayer, and the Lord answered by saying, “You were made for this moment. Go back into the hall.”

So I went back in and began my talk, pausing after every sentence so that Habibe could translate what I said into Farsi. The Iranians saw me as the representative of America, so the first thing I had to make clear is that there was no such thing as an American. According to the sociological theory known as the triple melting pot, America is made up of three ethnic groups based on three religions: Protestant, Catholic, and Jew. Those three groups have been in a state of constant cultural conflict since before America launched its covert warfare attack on Iran in 1953. In fact, what happened to Catholics then is happening to Iranians now, especially in the area of birth control and gender ideology.

The Iranian crisis of 1953 began as the Catholic Crisis in 1933 when Cardinal Dougherty called for a boycott of the Warner Brothers theaters in Philadelphia. After a few weeks, Warner Brothers began to feel the pinch. Joe Breen attended a meeting, after which he reported that Harry Warner was “crying tears as big as horse turds because he was losing \$100,000 a week in Philadelphia alone.” The refusal of Mr. Giannini, founder of the Bank of America, to lend Hollywood more money, combined with the debts that Hollywood had incurred in 1929 to retool to make talking pictures, convinced the studio bosses to back down on the obscenity issue.

What followed was the Hollywood Production Code, which for the next thirty one years insured that people like Joe Breen kept nudity, blasphemy, obscenity, and foul language out of Hollywood films. No theater would show unapproved films, and no film got approved without the tacit approval of Catholics like Joe Breen.

On February 29, 1936, shortly after the American bishops imposed the Production Code on Hollywood, Augustin Cardinal Hlond, the primate of Poland, issued a pastoral letter on morals, in which he claimed that the Jews were having a similarly corrupting influence on Poland.

In 1965 the Catholics in America lost their nerve. When the Catholics lost their nerve in the war on Hollywood, they lost the culture wars. Before long there was no opposition to Jewish control of the media. This led to Jewish control over American foreign policy and the decriminalization of usury.

The thirty year battle over the sexualization of the culture ended in 1965 when the Legion of Decency ran up the white flag and Hollywood broke the Code. Once the Catholics lost their nerve in the war over the sexualization of culture, once they backed away from holding Hollywood Jews to the basic rudiments of sexual decency, it was inevitable that the instruments of culture they failed to control would get used against them in all out cultural warfare. The sexualization of the Catholic clergy dates from this period.

There are no truces in cultural warfare. The law of cultural life is either occupy your own cultural territory or have it occupied by alien forces. "The truth of the matter was that I did not like the Catholic Church," Leo Pfeffer admitted in his memoirs. The truth of the matter goes beyond that as well. Leo Pfeffer was not just talking about personal animus; he was talking about an animus which was shared by his employer, the American Jewish Committee, as well as by Hollywood's motion picture and television industries. The latter group was described by Stephen Steinlight as "the Jewish industry, par excellence." Even toward the end of his life, after proclaiming the triumph of secular humanism over the Catholic Church in 1976, Pfeffer was concerned about Catholic activism on the abortion issue because "the partial success which it has so far achieved may encourage further Catholic intervention in the political arena and bring back the days when the Roman Catholic Church was a powerful force in the American political system."

The destruction of Catholic political power meant the rise of Jewish power. In a Protestant culture, there was no one else to keep the Jews in check. What happened to American Catholics in the 1960s was a prelude to what happened in Poland after the fall of Communism, and to what is happening to the Islamic world today. When American Catholics lost the culture wars of the 1960s, the rest of the world was subjected to the same regime of control through the manipulation of appetite that was erected in America after their defeat. The results were the same. Democracy led to tyranny. Extreme "freedom" led to equally extreme forms of slavery. Hollywood is now putting those Trotskyite globalist ideals into practice by promoting the widespread dissemination of things like pornography and MTV. Stephen Steinlight indicates that "MTV, for better or for worse, will prove more powerful with young Muslim immigrants than the mullahs."

Once I exposed the ethnic subtext to the culture wars in America, it became clear that what happened to the Catholics in the 1930s was happening to the Iranians now. The same WASP/Jewish alliance was responsible for both incidents of covert warfare. A year after the coup in Tehran, the CIA staged another coup in Guatemala for United Fruit. Eddy Bernays, Freud's nephew, supplied the PR. An awareness is growing that the same thing happened in Paris in 1968:

More and more young Frenchmen are looking back at the history of France since 1945 and they are gradually coming to the realization that the country has been ruled by an arrogant cabal of plutocrats who overthrew de Gaulle in 1968 and who replaced this remarkable national leader with a protégé of the Rothschild family, Georges Pompidou, who began his career as a director of the Banque Rothschild and who was later [chosen] by the French elites to replace de Gaulle. The French plutocracy which, together with the CIA, had covertly orchestrated the "May 68" riots to achieve "regime change" in France, now had free rein to radically change the "sovereignist" political course chartered by de Gaulle. Can you guess when the policy of mindless import of cheap foreign labor into France began? Under Pompidou, of course! Now ... both native and immigrant French people are re-discovering their common history and are beginning to understand that they both were victims of the same politicians (frenchdissidents.wordpress.com, November 14, 2013).

The Soral-Dieudonne coalition that is trying to circumvent the dialectical relationship between the policies of the left and right, each of which generates the need for the other as its corrective, are beginning to see that it is counterproductive to demonize all Muslims, as nationalist parties like the BNP in England was paid to do, as Martin Webster has pointed out. A more nuanced view recognizes that Iran "fosters a far more refined and sophisticated look at the flaws of modern society than either the pro-regime mosques in France and abroad or the Wahabbis" (*ibid*).

The 1979 revolution in Iran was an important milestone in the history of resistance to post-World War II CIA covert warfare. Both the negative consequences and the unintended consequences of the Hostage Crisis of 1979 are traceable to the CIA's 1953 coup to overthrow Mossadegh. The revolution and hostage crisis inspired the Shi'a in Heerat to imitate the Iranians' example. It also inspired Osama bin Laden who declared war on the Soviet Union after its invasion of Afghanistan and on America shortly after the Soviet defeat. All of that was traceable to Operation Ajax. More importantly:

The success of Operation Ajax had an immediate and far-reaching effect in Washington. Overnight, the CIA became a central part of the American foreign

policy apparatus, and covert action came to be regarded as a cheap and effective way to shape the course of world events (Kinzer).

The chain of American involvement in CIA sponsored covert warfare which began with the *coup d'état* in Iran found its culmination in the late winter of 2013 in Victoria Nuland's *coup d'état* in the Ukraine. The results of the Ukrainian *coup d'état* were disastrous for the United States. The return of the Crimea to Russia signaled the beginning of the end of the American Empire as well as the end of the one hundred year-long campaign based on the Mackinder thesis to dominate the Eurasian landmass and the pivot of civilization, but the playbook was the same one put into action in 1953 in Iran. The results were the same as under the Shah. After the *coup d'état*, the Ukrainian Nazis had to pass sexual nondiscrimination laws. Once they did, they qualified for IMF loans and the system of complete control based on sodomy and usury was in place.

“Operation Ajax has,” in Kinzer’s words, “left a haunting and terrible legacy.” It “turned whole regions of the world bitterly against the United States.” Kinzer tells us that: “The violent anti-Americanism that emerged from Iran after 1979 shocked most people in the United States. Americans had no idea of what might have set off such bitter hatred in a country where they had always imagined themselves as more or less well-liked.”

I had the mirror image of that feeling during the more than an hour of Q&A which followed my talk. These were passionate people looking for honest answers in troubled times. They could have stormed the stage and taken me hostage if they wanted to. I had no protection, no security guards, no secret back entrance, no helicopter waiting to fly me away. The only thing that protected everyone in that hall, especially me, from the chaos of passion fueled by historical grievance was the Logos, the same Logos the Magi discerned in the sky when the star led them to The Logos Incarnate.

When the Iranians chanted “Death to America,” I was told not to take it personally, and I didn’t. “I love America,” I told my audience in Fasa. “I love the St. Joseph River and my home in Indiana under the trees.”

“But I hate the American Empire,” I continued. I hate what it did to the Catholic Church in America under the guise of “doctrinal warfare,” and I hate what it did in Iran in 1953 after C.D. Jackson and the Dulles brothers hijacked American foreign policy under the guise of the anti-Communist crusade.

The first successful insurrection against that American Empire took place in Iran in 1979 when Imam Khomeini came to power. That revolution is in danger now. The revolution needs to become conscious of itself. Revolutionary action needs Logos to complete its trajectory into a new, but lasting social order. The first item on the agenda is birth control.

“Throw away your birth control pills,” I told the audience in Fasa. “Support the Supreme Leader.”

Back at the hotel I shared a cup of tea with Habibe after the talk.

“God,” I said, still wound up from the talk and almost two-hour Q&A which followed, “created heaven and earth. God created space and time. We perceive time as history. God is the Lord of History. God cannot create something evil. This means that history cannot have an evil end. History must result in something good in spite of the machinations of evil men. God uses these evil men to bring about good. It’s like the story of Joseph in the Bible. Joseph’s brothers did evil, but God brought good out of it. When the brothers came to Joseph for grain after the famine struck Egypt, Joseph told them, ‘the evil that you intended to me has been turned by God’s power into good.’ The same thing applies to all of human history. The intentions of evil men don’t have the final word. God does.”

“You sound like a Muslim,” Habibe told me after I paused to take a breath. “You’re not at all like your description on the internet.”

“That’s good,” I said.

“You’re much better looking in person than in your pictures,” she continued.

“Thank you,” I said, warming to my attractive young interlocutor.

“Your suit goes well with your gray hair.”

Gray hair?

I don’t perceive myself as a grandfather, but I suspect that that is the way 20-year-old Iranians perceive me. During the long Farsi language introduction in Fasa, a cheer went up from the crowd. When I asked what they were cheering about, I was told it was the announcement that I had five children and thirteen grandchildren. Every time Shaheen insisted that he wanted me to be his father-in-law, Hamed would correct him by saying “grandfather-in-law.”

We are on the verge of a new new world order symbolized by the picture of Pope Francis at the Apartheid Wall. Kevin Barrett summed it up when he wrote:

The Pope's historic prayer at the apartheid wall illustrates the rise of religion as a force for social justice. Prior to 1979, social justice struggles were associated with "the left," meaning socialism or communism. Both movements were dominated by atheists and secularists. They saw religion as a tool of oppression, an "opiate of the people." In 1979, two epochal events signaled a sea change in modern history. In Iran, the Islamic Revolution overthrew a corrupt and brutal secularist dictatorship and established a new social model — one that sought social justice through a religiously-based society. And in Poland, the Catholic Solidarity labor movement arose to challenge atheistic Communism. Soon religious Afghans were challenging the atheist Soviet occupation of their country. In 1989, the Berlin Wall came tumbling down ... and with it the "Godless Communism" of the Soviet Empire. Since then, the Islamic awakening has been challenging secular capitalism in many parts of the world (veteranstoday.com, June 1, 2014).

Kevin then mentioned my first trip to Tehran:

Catholic historian E. Michael Jones foresees such an eventuality. In February 2013, Jones and I were returning to Tehran from a meeting with religious scholars in Qom. Jones, who admires Iran's God-centered society, expressed the fervent hope that the Pope would come to Iran to make common cause with the Islamic Republic — and turn decisively against Zionism. "But could this Pope [Benedict] ever do such a thing?" we asked. "He won't be Pope forever!" Jones announced. An hour or so later, regular programming was interrupted by a special bulletin: "Pope Resigns!" It was the first time in 600 years that a Pope had decided to step down. If E. Michael Jones is ever nominated for sainthood, I will happily testify to his miraculous powers of premonition. The new Pope, Francis, seems blessed with a heartfelt concern for ordinary people. He appears genuinely pained by the suffering of the Palestinians under Israeli oppression. And he seems instinctively opposed to the heartless power of New World Order bankster capitalism. Will Pope Francis soon be "Going to Tehran"? Will he announce that Netanyahu needs an exorcism, and Zionism needs a funeral? Will he stand with Putin against NATO's nuclear encirclement of Russia? Will he join the world's Muslim scholars calling for an end to usury and the destruction of the current international banking system in favor of something more humane and equitable? Will he demand that the US radically scale back its obscene military spending and lead the planet towards demilitarization ... and the transfer of trillions of wasted military dollars into schools, hospitals, mass transit, and sustainable energy? Might he call for an end to biological technologies that threaten human dignity and even human existence — such as bio-weapons, designer genes, and trans-humanism? None of these things are possible today. But could they be possible tomorrow? If the new religious movements for social justice unite — and make common cause with everyone who supports justice, including those who consider themselves secularists — who knows what the future might bring.

On the day that I arrived in Tehran, Pastor Joel Hunter, a man the press billed as "Obama's spiritual adviser," was winding up a week-long visit to discuss "religious tolerance." Needless to say, there was no small amount of condescension in the report. One can imagine the reaction in the

press if the Supreme Leader were to come to America to discuss religious tolerance for Americans who objected to gay marriage. But Pastor Hunter didn't seem bent on making political points. "Those of us" who want to make progress, "know we're going to be blamed by some of the hardliners, for even having these conversations," but "we believe it's worth the risk because we're not going to make progress as countries or even as religious communities for not talking to one another."

"We believe," Hunter continued, "that we have something in common, and out of the commonality of our religious communities, we can build the kind of relationship and trust that politics simply can't," he said. "Only through religious leadership or the exchange of religious leaders, we believe peace is going to be successfully built between our two countries." Hunter said he believes religious leaders can play a role in decreasing tensions between the United States and Iran.

Hunter planned to report on his trip to President Obama. As another indication that the world is changing, the U.S. State Department praised Hunter's efforts. "We commend such efforts to promote interfaith tolerance and religious freedom," said one State Department official, who considered this sort of dialogue "a foreign policy priority for the Department." The same official added that "a small delegation of U.S. Catholics visited Iran in March, entirely independent of the U.S. government."

So, for once, I seem to be in good company. The interrogation by the Customs official seemed perfunctory this time around. She seemed interested in what I had to say to the Iranians, but the parameters of her job prevented further questioning. The hold of the Israel Lobby, while not broken (certainly not in Congress), seems weaker than before. The main force weakening that grip is the Logos, which manifests itself as historical consciousness of the crimes which the WASP/Jewish alliance has carried out under the guise of covert warfare at the hands of groups like the CIA.

As of the end of my trip, the only thing between the Americans in Baghdad's Green Zone and death at the hands of the liver-eating Takfiri who have been armed with American and Saudi money is the Iranian Army and Iraq's Shi'a irregulars. The U.S. desperately wants to forge an alliance with Iran, much to the chagrin of the Neoconservatives and the Israelis. It's what Hegel would have called "the cunning of reason."

About the Author

E. Michael Jones, Ph.d., is the editor of *Culture Wars* magazine and the author of numerous books and e-books. You may contact him at jones@culturewars.com.