

Islam's Link to Terror—A Psychology of Denial

Mark Malmin^{1*}

¹ San Jose, USA

* Mark Malmin, E-mail: mbmalmin@comcast.net

Abstract

This positional paper examines mental health issues associated with terrorism, the psychological social and interpersonal dynamics of self-deception, delusion, and denial; and it offers analytical argument, sociological perspective, and comparative theologic analysis and commentary on the epistemology of Islam and radical Islamic terrorism. The disputatious assertion that terrorism has nothing to do with Islam is examined from an evidentiary criminal prima facie perspective. Islam is conceptually linked to various affiliate terrorist groups by its mutual sociology, derivative core ideology, and by its endogenous religious operational authority derived from the Koran. Islamic violence is not limited to terrorism. The feasibility of Islam embracing spiritual reformation is examined. Global terrorism needs to be fought both on the ground and with multifaceted societal strategies that challenge and defeat the ideologic presuppositional arguments that fuel terrorism.

Keywords

terrorism, Islamic terrorism, Islam, political correctness, religious violence, ISIS

1. Introduction

Human wellness and vitality are systemic. Mental health, cognition, emotional wellness and human spirituality are subsets of the whole, an amalgamation of body, soul and spirit, requiring a symbiotic balance of these interactive anthropological dimensions of mankind. A requisite balance of these interactive systems is arguably missing in many jihadi warriors who are being recruited into terrorist groups like ISIS. Radical Islamic ideology fulfills a religious, political, emotional, cultural, and mental health vacuum that defies sagacious conventional wisdom associated with the sociology of peaceful coexistence. The cultural, sociological, psychological, systemic components of governance are immensely important environmental influences of geopolitical stability which impact peace and conflict. There are controversial disputatious doctrinal presuppositions of epistemology and other contributing factors of theocratic ideology surrounding Islam, which require a closer examination into the nature and validity of Islam, which provide an ideologic linkage to radical terrorist groups like ISIS. Existentially disillusioned and conflicted young people looking for a cause and meaning in life, are known to be prime targets for terrorist recruitment and radicalization. This phenomenon is supported by scientific literature.

2. Psychological Stability Factors

Some human behaviors such as irrational fear, delusional thinking, misplaced anger, aggression, and other forms of emotional anxiety are common behavioral angsts people experience from time to time, at a conscious or unconscious level, according to the National Institute of Mental Health (2015). Good mental health, critical thinking, maturity and wisdom that incorporates conflict resolution skills, life experience, and sound counsel, usually enables people to overcome, mitigate, or functionally cope with life's behavioral ailments. Failure or inability to accurately process perceptual stimulus, and distinguish factual data accurately, impacts human decision making and quality of life. In cases of mental illness, where people lose touch with reality, distorted human perceptions, phobias, aggression, and other anxiety disorders can become diagnostically severe and pathological (Smith & Segal, 2016).

These psychological behavioral anomalies and disorders, by virtue of deduction, may manifest themselves in varying degrees of mild imbalance to severe pathology in the population of radical terrorist groups like ISIS. Terrorists tend to embrace the existential cause or ideology of these organizations, or they would never join these groups; however, motivational causes alone don't make mental illness a prerequisite. Putting disclaimers aside, certain terrorist ideologies are bound to attract behavioral pathologies which fit well thematically with group cause alignment. In sharp contrast, notably healthy, well-balanced people who have a love and appreciation for life, get along well with others, have future aspirations, hopes, and dreams, probably would not do well working for ISIS. Good mental health that promotes efficacious living and convivial social compatibility is metaphorically like a tree that produces good fruit. A healthy righteous tree, by definition, should not simultaneously be conflicted and polemic, producing poisonous fruit from the same branch, yet this very aberration becomes a deleterious issue in the House of Islam. This paper explores the analytics of this phenomenon.

There are other relevant variables and cognition dynamics that impact how people process stimuli. The battle over ideology requires critical thinking in order to weigh the evidence carefully under the bright light of scrutiny, and guard against undue influence born by emotional hysteria, fear, or bias. The effort that people put into analytical thinking is a choice. Perhaps more than anything, each analogous juror, researcher, academic, peacemaker, or concerned citizen who weighs in on terrorism and conflict resolution, must be open to, and desirous of, the truth [however subjective that may be]; and this includes not only the antiterrorist peacemaker and government defense minister, but also the jihadi recruit who must decide if the cause for which he/she embraces is just. Reality and truth must be measured by common sense standards of consensus and by what the evidence supports, where results are based on tangible facts and conclusions that are anchored in logic, credible argument, scientific reason, and compelling circumstantial evidence.

3. Acknowledging the Ideologic Threat of Terrorism

Global security and cultural differences which promote peaceful coexistence will never be realized if radical Islamic terrorism is tolerated or ideologically excused at various pseudo-religious geopolitical social threshold levels. Radical Islamic terrorism can never be defeated if its ideology is permitted or defended with subterfuge, guile, or by “pie in the sky” religious arguments devoid of substance and credibility. Dr. John Grohol, Psy.D., author, researcher, and expert in mental health, points out (2016) that denial is a powerful psychological defense mechanism that can be used to avoid the truth, deny reality, or impede mental health treatment and wellness. One might argue that if denial is a refusal to accept reality or facts, self-delusion may represent a corroborating false narrative or misrepresentation of a given set of facts, based upon perception or self-deception. Perceptions are not always factual or correct, and skewed perception can lead to self-deception and false assumptions, which thereafter may be firmly embraced or augmented by denial. If there is no interest in truth, reality, critical thinking, or best evidence standards, denial becomes quite accommodating. Doctors Penny Tompkins and James Lawley, supervising neurolinguistic psychotherapists, registered with the United Kingdom Council for Psychotherapy since 1993, describe a human behavioral conditional of deception, delusion, and denial, which they describe as: clinging to misleading beliefs when deep down one knows them to be untrue; this is what we call self-deception, self-delusion and self-denial (self-DDD for short). What is self-DDD? “When we deceive, delude or deny to *our self*, we mislead our self, we misrepresent or disown what we know to be true, we lie to our self, we refuse to acknowledge that which we know” (Tompkins & Lawley, 2004, p. 2) In expressing a further analysis of this point, Tompkins and Lawley refer to Stanley Cohen’s exposition that highlights *States of Denial* are equally as evident with nations as with individuals: *people, organizations, governments or whole societies are presented with information that is too disturbing, threatening or anomalous to be fully absorbed or openly acknowledged. The information is therefore somehow repressed, disavowed, pushed aside or reinterpreted. Or else the information “registers” well enough, but its implications—cognitive, emotional or moral—are evaded, neutralized or rationalized away* (p. 2). Tompkins and Lawley explain that in less dramatic ways, the condition of self-DDD features itself ubiquitously in daily life because most people are proficiently able to deceive and delude themselves in various common social ways. The following examples of commonly used metaphors and expressions illustrate this universal pattern of self-DDD human behavior.

I don't want to know.

I couldn't take in the news.

It's got nothing to do with me.

Don't make waves.

I looked the other way.

There's nothing I can do about it.

I can't believe this is happening to me.

Ignorance is bliss.

Let sleeping dogs lie.

Brush it under the carpet.

I'm just hoping it isn't going to happen.

I'll just pop in for a quick pint.

Why didn't I listen to my intuition, again (p. 3)?

Tompkins and Lawley (2004) argue that in a typical conflict or dilemma, people acknowledge *both* sides *and* that they don't know how to resolve it; [but] they do not deny there is a conflict. People see conflict, but they may choose to avoid it, embracing a position that gives them a way out, from having to deal with it. This involves choice. This involves cognition. This psychological phenomenon is arguably occurring with the radical ideology of Islamic inspired terrorism. Refusal to question philosophical religious theology issues that defy logic, sound reason, or social mores of peaceful coexistence, in some ways, exemplifies how the ideology of terrorism is able to manifest itself without jihadi warriors collapsing from the stress of their own unconscionable sadistic, self-destructive behavior. The destructive nature of such barbaric terrorism supplants anthropological community survival efforts with nihilism. Behavioral denial, in all its forms, is practiced by necessity, to some extent, in terrorist warrior groups like ISIS who perpetrate their violent ideology with the delusion that their cause is just, divine, and that it serves a greater good, wherein the means [however horrific and barbaric] is justified by the perceived end results. As a suppositional argument, if these jihadi warriors did not protect themselves emotionally and psychologically with a mind-set of denial, they would all most likely be completely dysfunctional for combat or battle by virtue of severe PTSD symptoms, and other mental health disorders. Delusion and denial independently serve as a survival mechanism. For illustration purposes, imagine hypothetically that Jihadi "John" comes home to his wife and she affectionately asks him, how many people to did you behead today? Any crucifixions today? The life and stress management of a jihadi warrior and that of his spouse must surely be dysfunctional in profound and absurd ways by any reasonable standard of emotional and mental health wellness. In reality, few of these jihadi warriors are known to have marital relationships, as most people might imagine conventional marriage. There are many ISIS allegations of rape being reported against ISIS jihadis in the Mideast, and probably many more that go unreported. The profound victimology of this violent ideology on the general public can also result in social denial, as Doctors Tompkins and Lawley previously outlined. Once again, institutional governments and societies are also capable of manifesting the same phenomenological denial behaviors.

4. Faith and Spirituality

What furthermore complicates radical Islamic extremism is the subjective components of faith and spirituality. Faith makes all things possible from a spirituality point of view, but faith, or anything else, can be conceptually manipulated, misunderstood, and perverted by human motivation and by limitations of wisdom, and by fanatical thinking that lacks a foundational basis which is soundly grounded in philosophical truth and reason. People who deceive and delude themselves do so all the time in matters of religiosity. This is not uncommon. Anyone who holds enough clout, power and control, charismatic command presence, and public following, can persuade people of almost anything, by simply offering them increased prosperity, peace, or fulfilment of some other need that the group seeks. The person who solicits the group's following and commitment may claim a divine leadership role by asserting: "God showed *me*" or revealed to *me* alone, some special truth; but unfortunately, in most of these scenarios, only that enlightened individual receives the *truth*, and no one else gets the memo. People who entertain delusions are often disinclined to critically weigh the evidence, and history shows they are known to blindly follow charismatic leaders like lost sheep, because they want someone else to navigate life for them and make the difficult decisions. People oftentimes want someone to be lead them through life, a life that will lead to the promise land, a future heavenly life of milk and honey, but people are not always discriminating in who they choose as their leader. In 33 A.D. the people chose Barabbas over Jesus (Matthew, 27: 20-26). In one instance found in the Bible, God characterized the helplessness and blindness of the people of Nineveh as being incapable of discerning their right hand from their left hand (Jonah, 4: 11). In another example, Jesus allegorically referred to the same typology of people as "lost sheep" (Matthew, 9: 36). Even today, in present day Western culture, the idiomatic phrase "helpless sheep" is commonly used. People oftentimes hear what they want to hear when they choose to follow a leader, without weighing the evidence of the person's character. Historically, people have always been known to be allegorically like sheep because they will follow a leader even if he is not a good shepherd. Hitler comes to mind. As it relates to the spirituality of prophetic leaders, a positive assertion may be difficult to prove, or disprove, where there is insufficient evidence but the same holds true for proving a negative assertion. In the absence of credible evidence, how do truth seekers prove or disprove someone is a prophetic spiritual leader possessing special knowledge? If it cannot be proven to the group that a charismatic leader is *not* a prophet, then the given group mentality may take a position that the leader is a prophet. There is a lack of logic to this argument, of course, but this may be what the group chooses to believe, especially if there is an assumed, perceived, or known quid pro quo, symbiotic attraction, or covenant between the group and the leader. This arrangement may become more political in nature than religious in substance, where there is inherent bias on either side, or something to gain in the relationship. Suffice to say that in the judgment of such matters, there usually is not a disinterested arbitrator who is conducting a blind peer review of the conflict issues. People historically believe what they choose to believe and it may not have anything to do with evidence, or righteousness. In the sociology of group behavior and

deviance, anyone who contradicts the wisdom or teaching of one who acquires the self-appointed role of prophet, or who is selected or accepted as such by the group, automatically becomes a dissenter, an offender, a threat to the leader and the group followers. Such an offender may be viewed or ostracized as an infidel by the group. This very phenomenon may be presently manifesting itself with ISIS and its self-appointed leader, Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi. Many of his followers may [or may have] viewed him as a prophet. There are unverified, conflicting reports he may have been killed in coalition air strikes in Syria recently, although most officials seem to think he is still alive (Mosendz, 2015). In these deviant groups, dissent and argument is not invited. Simply challenging the leader or questioning Islam, its tenets, the Koran, or the group's ideology can make one an offender, or, as the case may be, an infidel. This holds true in all of Islam, and it could cost someone their life for saying the wrong thing, or just asking questions. There are many examples of this to choose from but, under intriguing circumstances, Dr. Mark Gabriel is an example. He was a devote Muslim, raised from early childhood in Islamic tradition. Gabriel attended Egypt's most prestigious university, earning high respect from all his Islamic peers and mentors, and he later lectured there at the same university after earning his doctoral degree. At a crossroads point in his life Gabriel began to ask some soul searching critical questions of his own spirituality and his Islamic faith. Was there compelling evidence to support the beliefs he had been taught to embrace? These were honest questions, and there was never any intention to defame Islam. When he asked his own mother if there was any way to truly know if a Muslim would go to heaven, she got mad at him, and told him to stop asking such questions; but when that failed, she finally opined to Gabriel that no one knows; we only hope we will find favor with Allah. Doctor Gabriel ruminated over this, but wanted to know more from a purely scholarly point of view, and for his own moral belief system. When he asked respected Imams this questions they also told him to stop asking questions. Eventually, over a period of months, Gabriel was labeled an infidel and he literally had to flee Egypt because a death Fatwa had been put upon his life (Gabriel, 2002). The sociology of this reveals the dynamics of social governing behavioral pressure being exerted within the membership to compel compliance with the group's goals and agenda [This author had the opportunity to meet Dr. Gabriel at a conference in 2005 in which he was the keynote speaker at an FBI Training Seminar. Dr. Gabriel has a fascinating personal story of his own spiritual journey, and his love for Muslims was very evident].

In Islam, the prophet Mohammad is greatly venerated. Unfortunately, if someone questions his spiritual gifts, leadership, or prophetic powers, this is considered an invidious form of acrimony, perhaps even blasphemy. If someone were to sincerely ask or wonder, how is it that people can be assured he was, indeed, a prophet of God; these questions are never entertained, even in most cases from a purely academic point of view. Censorship is sure to follow. The act of anyone who impugns, dishonors or challenges the prophet, is grounds, in itself, for death by execution. People who seek truth and want to be honest, especially with themselves, may want to ask tough questions of their own faith. There are honest people who understand the human weakness and propensity to engage in deception, delusion,

and denial, and they make honest efforts to ask and obtain answers to hard questions of themselves and of God. The existential quest for knowledge and meaning compels humanity to ask, seek, and knock on doors, in the pursuit of truth. This principle is well recognized in theology (Matthew, 7: 7-8). In Christianity, the veracity, godliness, and reliability of a prophet is quite simple. The proof is in the pudding. If the prophet's words or future predictions of God's will do not come to pass, precisely as the prophet predicts, or his prognostications are not fulfilled in tangible ways with specificity, the self-described or appointed prophet is considered a *false* prophet. In Christianity teachings, Jesus warned that in the last days many false prophets would rise, and deceive many (Matthew, 24: 11, 24). Embracing such thematic analytical questions, observations, or argument that challenge Islamic apologetics are generally not permitted in Islam. There are, of course, exceptions to most things in life, so there probably are Muslims who do not object to hard questions being posed of Islam. Suffice to say, elite clerks and Imams generally do not allow this. Dr. Gabriel's questioning of Islam, as previously outlined, is an example of how dissent is controlled in Islam. The real answer to the potential uncertainty of ascribing prophet status to someone lies in the availability, quality, and credibility of whatever existing evidence there may be, but the sociology of group behavior oftentimes influences who the group wishes to believe, follow, and embrace, irrespective of evidence. This cultural religious anthropology has historically been documented in both Islam and Christianity. Both the Bible and the Koran warn of deception as it pertains to spiritual leaders or false prophets. One might wonder, then, why this subject matter does not allow for tough questions and greater analytical argument. Does not the truth consistently stand up under bright light and cross examination? In a world filled with deceit, virtue needs to be examined for its veracity under the scrutiny of blight light.

Regarding self-appointed false prophets, there are numerous historical typologies of religious individuals who rose in group accepted leadership stature to the status of what one might characterize as an infallible prophet, or spiritual leader. The infamous Reverend Jim Jones, of People's Temple, in 1978 persuaded hundreds of people in Jonestown, Guyana, to drink cyanide laced cool-aid in a suicidal ritual that would allow these people to go to heaven. A pending US Congressional investigation into the Jonestown theocratic organization of Jim Jones, where cult members alleged they were being held as captives against their will, was a primary motivational factor for the mass suicides at the leadership direction and commands of Jim Jones. In his pathological state of mental illness, Jim Jones persuaded his followers they would go to heaven by committing suicide. In their delusional acceptance of this man as an anointed prophet of God, over a period of many years, his disciples followed him to death. The group accepted Jones' message that suicide was the escape mechanism to reach heaven. Deception, delusion, denial, and mental illness were all present in this mass human tragedy [This author knew Jim Jones personally and had numerous contacts with him over a period of several years; my sister was nearly killed in Jonestown when this event transpired. I acquired intimate knowledge of Jim Jones' theocratic ideology and his operational tactics].

Sound pedagogical theology and apologetics advocate an opposing oppositional argument that truth is confirmatory and reliable in the hands of several witnesses. Science follows this best evidence standard. One promising study in medicine does not reinvent the wheel. Confirmation of truth and reliability require replicating studies. There is inherent safety in numbers. This reflects a universal principle of creation, wisdom, science, and governance. It offers almost unlimited application. People who follow sound principles of living, don't jump of the bridge and commit suicide just because their church pastor told them this was a good idea. Sound truth withstands the bright light of scrutiny and cross examination. This principle is not limited to ecclesiastical issues; it applies to just about everything one might consider, but certainly the fields of science. The American jury system is built upon such truth, where evidence is carefully weighed in the hands of more than one person. To do otherwise opens invitation for extremism that might suggest a group of believers like ISIS need to murder, rape and pillage people so their jihadis can all go to heaven. Heaven is presumably the ultimate end goal of ISIS jihadi warriors. Everybody wants to go to heaven. That people will get to heaven in this unholy delinquent way defies reason, logic, common sense, philosophy, sociology, political science, all standards of morality and justice, and the remaining theology of all global religions. Even if, for the sake of abstract thinking and debate, honest people were to seriously entertain the epistemology of this, then critical thinking people would need to question what kind of deity would subscribe to such a set of rules. Could there be a deity that possesses less virtue than flawed human beings who treat others more judiciously? The pursuit of truth necessitates hard questions.

Perspicacious faith, by any reasonable standard of excellence, does not ignore science, humanity, reality, common sense, or anthropological survivability. The Golden Rule rocks! It has been the paragon of all humanity and religious faiths. The entire world, including completely non-religious people, acknowledge and embrace this moral law and pay assent to its value, and it is so simple even children can grasp its profundity! The aberration and perversion of human goodness and divine inspiration would seem to be the salient distinguishing compositional identifying difference in Islamic radical extremism: its theology defies all common core shared human values and religious morality when it advocates the execution of people who don't embrace its subjective views of theology.

A methodology for truth analysis needs to be examined and put into perspective where people excuse, deny, or otherwise attempt to mitigate provisions of Islam that promote violent global theocratic political subjugation of others. When students learn to read and write, they must learn how to break a sentence down into its component parts. If a sentence, for example, which poses a true or false question, reads in such a way that part of the sentence is true, but part of the sentence is false, then the entire sentence is deemed to be false by academic rules. The entire sentence must be true or it's false. No other answer applies unless the question is rephrased in some more qualifying way. A similar analogous doctrinal theological argument of this principle of truth is found in the Koran; one that cannot be both true and untrue at the same time. Its bipolar extremes represent a house divided against itself.

It would be difficult to argue parts of the Koran are not advocating violent subjugation without distorting the concept of truth. It also does not serve the credibility of the Koran to argue that this is not what the scripture *means*, when that is precisely how it is written. There exists no authoritative reliability to the Koran if no one can agree on what it says or means. Denying the promotion of violence in the Koran would then become analogous to arguing that educated intelligent people cannot rely on the meaning of words found in collegiate dictionaries. Like the example of a sentence which cannot be both true and untrue at the same time, there exists this conflict in the Koran and with Islam. It is not convivial to both love your neighbor and murder your neighbor in the same gospel of love. No true religion should offer that mendacity, deceit, and guile be permissible if it is used as a tactical strategy where the ultimate goal is subjugation. This Islamic tactic, found in the Koran, is known as *Taqiyya*, and it is well recognized by scholars who have studied Islam, and it is taught by Muslims. The Koran permits this as a war tactic strategy (Davis, 2016; Ibrahim, 2010). Organized global ecclesiastical institutions are seemingly not making much effort to challenge Islamic terrorism ideology with oppositional argument. If there were such collaborative efforts, religious inspired terrorism could have been eliminated by now. Even where the cultural relativity of truth may be subjective in geographical scope and nature, the seeming lack of societal desire to resolve violent pseudo-religious positional complexities, such as Islamic influenced terrorism, at times, defies common sense. Global religious church leadership efforts have failed in this regard, to put social pressure on radical extremists, Islamic countries, or upon Islam as an institutional faith, to force compliance to social religious norms and mores that promote symbiotic peaceful sociology. This failure is not endemically limited to the global church. There is an absence of salient, vociferous, universal societal condemnation that is necessary to collaboratively enforce social mores with efficacy. People look the other way, and many deny the seriousness of this threat. A preponderance of the evidence would suggest the “self-DDDs” previously depicted by doctors Tompkins and Lawley are fully operational across much of the world, and even where global governmental leaders perceive the problem, they are not in accord as to what to do about it. Terrorist recruitment strategies incorporate all of these aforementioned pejorative variables: distorted religious epistemology views, anhedonic views of deprivation and martyrdom for a so-called greater social good, the absence of critical thinking, emotional insecurity, and mental health pathology that promotes suicide as a means of earning divine approval and eternal life. If the global war on terrorism and its ideology is to be won, social and institutional efforts must be made to win the hearts and minds of young people succumbing to radicalization. Radical Islamic ideology must be acknowledged as a metastasizing security threat which is becoming globally more pervasive. Its flawed ideology needs to be challenged on its merits. Good Muslims, and there are many of them, need to boldly speak up and denounce theocratic evil ideology in all its forms. This effort does not fall upon Muslims alone, for it is societal in nature.

5. The Current State of Radical Islamic Violence

The world is being assaulted with gruesome barbaric terrorism that is so horrific, it is difficult to digest, process, or even comprehend. In fact, individuals may not even want to acknowledge it. It is simply too unconscionable, ugly, and threatening to ponder. Some people probably put it out of their mind, using denial to protect their psyche by concluding it is occurring somewhere else, on the other side of the world, where they don't have to see it, or face it. Who wants to think about such mayhem and horror? Many Americans probably would not know [or want to know] that children have been beheaded by radical Islamic terrorists in Iraq and Syria (Schultz, 2014). Fox News reports revealed women and children being crucified, beheaded, and buried alive, and The United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child, released a report in February, documenting the many horrors ISIS has imposed on children being tortured, crucified, buried alive, used as suicide bombers, and sold as sex slaves (Zimmerman, 2015). A Jordanian military pilot was burned alive in a cage and the graphic video was streamed for the world to see (CBS/Associated Press, 2015). The scene was so horrific, barbaric and repulsive, most global networks did not show the film footage to its viewers because it was simply too graphically disturbing and malevolent. Most people didn't see that atrocity, neither the horror of people being beheaded, crucified, or buried alive. In Raqqa, Syria, ISIS took the severed heads of men they had executed and mounted the heads on city fence poles for public display (Basil & Levs, 2014). Global media sources from all around the world reported this gruesome radical Islamic violence. The issue of denial is a multifaceted, psychological, geopolitical, social, and governmental problem. If more people had seen these horrific abhorrent detestations against humanity, there might be more global anger. The emotional response of anger can be beneficial if its properly channeled. Righteous anger can become a powerful motivational tool that is used for the interdiction of such anathemas.

Americans are not expressing more outrage over these atrocities right now because most of these terroristic attacks are occurring on the other side of the world where most Americans do not see the graphic violence, and also because this violence has been sporadic in America. Another full assault and mass killing of civilians on US soil such as those seen in NYC on 9-11, and in Paris and Brussels, will radically change public perception.

6. Geopolitical Social Deniability Factors

There may be an international geopolitical psychology of denial with present day terrorism, similar to what occurred when Hitler was committing genocide with the Jews. To put the Holocaust into context, it can be perspectively argued that Hitler, alone, did not commit the historical atrocities against the Jewish people; Hitler's Nazi Germany and its political machine allowed this dark part of human history to unfold and societal acquiescence subsequently allow it to continue. Research by Bailey (1999), *Understanding the German People's Participation in the Third Reich*, demonstrates this, as does the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (2016), and the exegetical work of Ezard (2001) entitled *Germans knew of Holocaust horror about death camps*. The social psychology and cognition of what is

occurring with present day terrorism is similarly so intense and searing to the human psyche, that cultures, institutions, and governments now look the other way, rather than confront it, and seriously deal with it. Delusion and denial kick the can down the road until governments are forced to acknowledge it, because it has reached their own backyard. In a societal context of governance, denial may serve as a deflection for social permissiveness, political guilt, and contributing moral responsibility for the indefensible toleration of nefarious antisocial behaviors. Such a phenomenological mind-set of denial exists at times with criminal sexual assaults cases involving children, which this author has empirical knowledge of through specialized training, investigative field experience, and criminal trial experience. One parent acquires knowledge that the other spouse is sexually assaulting one of the family children, but the horror, shame, denial, and the unwillingness to acknowledge the event pushes the truth out of their mind, and the crime goes unreported, until some other event brings the matter to light. The original failure of the first parent to report the crime occurs largely because of emotional denial. The parent looks the other way and ignores evidence, refusing to acknowledge the attack occurring in their own home, even denying the possibility that such a terrible thing could happen with their spouse and child. Sometimes a parent will formulate a delusional explanation for the matter, or presuppose the child is imagining the molestation. Make it go away. This didn't really happen. The delusion can be powerful; it offers a creative mental escape mechanism of avoidance which denial supports and corroborates. Such denial is a matter of cognition and choice.

A similar social element of denial is occurring with Islamic inspired terrorism. Rather than honestly acknowledge the unspeakable evil that is occurring, much of the world's first response is a mitigating deflection of reality which offers the disquietingly uncomfortable argument of rebuttal that "most Muslims" don't support this kind of violence. The victimology of this hardly offers a consolation of empathy or sympathy. What should the world tell the parents of those children who were beheaded: just remember, most Muslims would never do this? Such a response deflects the real issue of criminality and terrorism. The next denial further exacerbates the reality of such victimizations by asserting the irrefutable atrocities, known to be occurring, have nothing to do with Islam, in spite of compelling evidence to the contrary. In examining the contextual issue of denial, as it relates to terrorism, the assertion that radical Islamic terrorism has nothing to do with Islam represents a vacuous, flawed argument on its evidentiary merits. This specious argument, lacking in veracity, is disingenuously asserted to deflect criticism and moral responsibility from Islamic leadership. Islam has no manifest organizational mechanism to police malfeasance in its own house. Islamic affiliate terrorist organizations, like ISIS, are all directly linked by their core ideology to Islam through the Koran. Since the Koran prescribes the execution of infidels, the suggestion that such violence has nothing to do with Islam would seem to be, by reason and logic alone, a patently false assertion. The argument that Islam has nothing to do with Islamic teachings of violence is as disingenuous and nonsensical as arguing the teachings of Jesus have nothing to do with Christianity. Defending Islam of any culpability for what the Koran teaches or permits is intrinsically delusional and hypocritical. The problem of radical ideology is

not limited to ISIS. Its foundational doctrine is found in the teaching of the Koran, and what the Koran teaches and permits is intrinsically problematic and divisive by virtue of its polemic, contradictory doctrine. ISIS simply embraces all portions of the Koran's extreme ideologic doctrine.

It does not matter that there are Muslims who ignore or disavow portions of the Koran. This does not mean there is nothing, therefore, to worry about; it doesn't eliminate other credible threats which are presently being made. When the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor in 1942, American citizens [and their global friends] were not comforted by the fact that some Japanese people were against the devastating attack. The fact that there were good Japanese people who didn't support the attack on Pear Harbor didn't change or undo the reality of what happened. The fact that all Muslims don't support jihad against America does not eliminate the history of what occurred on 9-11, nor does it eliminate current threats of the thousands who do support global jihad. The mitigating fact that not all Muslims follow everything in the Koran does not address the extreme ideology explicitly promulgated in the Koran; nor does it eliminate the threat this poses, nor does it address the issue that there are many Muslims who *do* silently and openly embrace this ideology. The indisputable fact that the Koran explicitly commands the execution of infidels and its political ideology promotes global subjugation makes Islam deleteriously problematic. Islam has no control or authority over rogue ISIS agents who follow the Koran's doctrine to the letter of the law. In fact, Islam has no control over its own teachings. Islamic leaders and Imams can pick and choose what they wish to follow from the Koran, and what laws and commandments of Islam they wish to enforce. This is precisely what allows ISIS to exist. Islam has no governing authority. Global leaders are not sufficiently interdicting this violence.

Imagine a malevolent child who is murdering people but a global investigation deliberately ignores, vis-à-vis indecorous political correctness, the inculcating role of the parents in raising the child. Don't blame the parents, the family attorney argues! The court then discovers the parents are teaching criminality and contumacious behavior to the child. Such teaching behaviors actually occur. Children are being trained to become jihadi warriors. The media has reported this for years all across the Mideast. A documented example of this very issue of parental teaching has manifested itself in Syria where the son of a jihadi terrorist is pictured on social media holding the severed head of a soldier who was beheaded in Raqqa. The proud father brags about his boy in the beheaded image that was posted on Twitter (Fraser, 2014). Without legal intervention, unattenuated parental influence makes Islamic reformation virtually impossible. Islam plays such an invisible parental role, which not only allows such behaviors to exist, but in some cases Imams and parents actually promote it. The Children's Rights Institute (2016) documents how children are being trained and used in warfare by ISIS, Hamas, Al Qaeda and other affiliate organizations. Tens of thousands of children are now being trained for Islamic jihad (Reynolds, 2015; Akbar, 2015). Suggesting this jihadi training of children has nothing to do with Islam defies reality, and the express codified doctrinal pedagogy of Islam. In a world of goodness, Islamic training of children for global warfare and subjugation of other communities would not have anything to do with Islam or its ideology, but unfortunately it does; moreover, the world is not

filled with goodness. The ideology that ISIS employs comes directly from the Koran. The Royal Islamic Strategic Studies Centre (2011) puts out an annual list of the *500 Most Influential Muslims* (Imams and clerics) annually recognized for their individual erudition and community stature, however, their leadership is limited and localized, and like state governors, they hold no power or control over other jurisdictional territories or cultures. Islam has no formalized management system of governance which sets organizational standards of uniformity, policy, accountability, or central authority. This lack of organizational leadership, control, unity, and accountability thus allows Imams and clerics to nefariously encourage, look the other way, or surreptitiously promote radicalism. Each country and geographical subkingdom does what it wants with impunity. Who is ruling the House of Islam and permitting disorder?

7. Organizational Governing Factors of Islam

In a PBS KQED Interview (2002), respected scholar Imam Feisal Abdul Rauf was asked: *who decides the rules of Islamic jurisprudence?* Rauf replied, “The thing about the Islamic situation is we don’t have a church. We don’t have an ordained priesthood, which makes it a little complicated. But we do have a tradition of scholarship, and rules of scholarship”. Rauf describes the decision making leadership process of Islam as “a kind of a growing consensus of opinion on how one should think correctly to arrive at what would be deemed a right, a correct decision ... a tradition of theological interpretation” (p. 3).

Islamic differences of opinion in doctrinal rules and governance vary by culture, community, state, and country all around the world on a local consensual basis. Such a permissible belief system, involving bipolar doctrinal extremes, inherently allows for disputatious positional views of radical theological doctrine and ideology. This is intrinsic to Islam. Dr. Akbar Muhammad, who studied Arabic and Islamic jurisprudence at Al Azhar University in Cairo and is fluent in Arabic, received his Ph.D. at Edinburgh University in Scotland, and now serves as an Associate Professor of history and Africana studies at Binghamton University in New York. When interviewed by PBS KQED (2002) he was asked: *Is there anyone to say who’s right?* Dr. Muhammad offered this statement: *Islam is a very flexible system, and it has been very flexible for centuries. One community may differ from another community, even in the same country. We interpret the Sharia in the South, let’s say, in Alabama, in this particular area of marriage and divorce or whatever, in this way. You people in New York, in New Jersey, and elsewhere, you interpret it differently. We are all correct. And we have agreed on that* (p. 3). It becomes readily apparent how this Islamic philosophy of diversity and “flexibility” creates a two-edged sword that permits theological division, especially since there is no Supreme Court or designated governing body to resolve doctrinal disputes or malfeasance. Rational thinking, regardless of theological conceptuality or subject matter, reminds the trier of fact, “we” can’t all be *correct*, neither can light and darkness be the same, for light shines through the darkness and dispels darkness. Conversely, if the ideology of ISIS is correct, then the rest of Islam is all incorrect. This duplicity

completely contradicts reason and logic. The pursuit of truth requires independent analysis of what the facts and evidence support, including circumstantial testimonial evidence and expert second opinions offered as alternative positional arguments. Contrasting spiritual opinion and argument is worthwhile in this regard, otherwise the jury is left with only a single narrative. Another renowned prophet who was recognized for his great accomplishments on earth, who changed the course of ecclesiastical history said this: *you will know them by their fruits. A righteous tree cannot produce corrupt fruit, neither can a corrupt tree produce righteous fruit (Matthew, 7: 16, 18)*. One does not have to be religious to embrace such truth. It stands independently on its own, in much the same way as if the scientific community declared that people universally need clean air to breathe. Foundational, axiomatic principles of truth require no institutional attribution to authenticate its endogenous veracity or profundity. This manifestation of universal principles of peace are missing in Islam when its doctrinal ideology promotes or permits unambiguous violent subjugation of other cultures. The fact that Islam has no governing church board organization or official governing body that elects or appoints a global ruler inherently creates an environment where geopolitical power allows charismatic geographical leaders to emerge. The most wanted man in the world, Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi, without a single vote being cast by any recognized earthly moral authority, simply declared himself to be the supreme leader of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria-aka: ISIS (Joshi, 2014). All of Islam should be united and mobilized to destroy ISIS but instead there is internal division that tolerates or embraces some of this radical ideology. Moreover, Islamic leaders repudiate all responsibility and culpability for what is being done in the name of Islam. No one takes responsibility. Most Muslims are, or should be, displeased with what is happening at the hands of ISIS, but there is no strong, unified leadership or strategy sufficiently committed to stop this evil. National Review correspondent Daniel Pipes (2015) points out that Muslim President Abdel Fattah Al-Sisi of Egypt has acknowledged the organizational leadership failure of Islam and he has advocated for reformation, but the rest of the Islamic world, including the *500 Most Influential Muslims*, have done nothing to intervene and stop the mayhem and carnage of ISIS, or forbid its violent ideology. The problem reflects the absence of accountability and organizational control, and a collective Muslim issue of disinterest for any reformation or ideological intervention that puts a stop to radical Islamic violence. As unpleasant as the truth may be, Islam permits violence, and not just toward *infidels*, but even within its own family. The geopolitical sociology of this divisive Islamic epistemology seems to embrace a collective mind-set of denial rather than a cultural acknowledgement of organizational failure, which then implements a decisive pursuit strategy of reformation.

8. In-House Violence in the Name of Islam

Islamic violence is not limited to *terrorist* organizations. Muslims Sunnis and Shiites both practice beheading executions to enforce Islam and punish dissent. Dissent includes freedom of association, religion, and freedom of speech that disagrees with Islam or its government. Saudi Arabia and Iran are paradigms of dictatorial governments run by violent Islamic religious authority. In just one day, on January 2, 2016, Saudi Arabia executed 47 people in the name of Islam. There were 158 executions in 2015 (Whitson, 2016). One of the 47 beheaded in January included a Shia cleric from Iran, Sheik Nimr Baqr al-Nimr. Shiites around the world expressed outrage according to news reports from Reuters (2016), and officials in Iran warned there would be repercussions. The theocracy of Islam permits government sanctioned abusive situational violence. Theocratic countries, including Iran and Saudi Arabia, execute hundreds of their own Muslim people every year, but similar Islamic governmental efforts are not being deployed against ISIS. When it serves the interest of Islam, as defined by local Islamic leaders, executions are carried out quite regularly. How ironic it does not apparently serve the interests of Islam to put a stop to Islamic radical terrorism. From an organizational perspective, Islam is not just a theoretical belief system. Islam, like other faith-based religious belief systems, is not simplistically defined as a brick and mortar mosque. Islam, like any other belief systems, is defined by its people, its leaders, its ideologic doctrine, its moral values, and its reputation. The absence of consistency, accountability, and moral leadership is a pejorative identifying factor that justifies criticism of Islam, and this, once again, elucidates the need for spiritual reformation. Global societies and national governments don't hold brick and mortar buildings accountable for malfeasant terrorism; they hold people and leaders responsible for their actions or negligent inactions. Even when Islamic leaders publicly disavow radical Islamic terrorism, many tolerate it, and collectively, the global Muslim leadership does nothing meaningful to eliminate terrorism from its own faith. Islamic leadership looks the other way, tolerates terroristic crimes against humanity, while Muslim leaders are quick to declare Islamic terrorism has nothing to do with Islam. This disingenuous denial and organizational nonfeasance defies situational prima facie evidence, and ground reality. Islamic violence is deadly in all its varietal forms and it is not limited to ISIS. Directed and inspired attacks are global in scope and growing, and further attacks around the world are a virtual certainty.

9. The Political Correctness Conundrum

A further complication to this social political morass of theocratic violence and denial is that the nexus between Islam and terrorism is guilefully obfuscated by political correctness. This is a difficult conversation for Americans [and others] because Americans are acutely, and at times irrationally, phobic of being labeled intolerant, or bigoted. Americans want to be fair and inclusive. They don't want to denigrate another culture's religion so they conceptually try to consider all religions as being roughly equal in terms of putative respectability and virtue. This reflects a polite gesture of *étiquette* and political correctness seen at formal State Department dining events with foreign dignitaries, but it

is sadly inconsistent with ground warfare, urban field conditions, and victimology reality. Americans tend to embrace a politically correct culture that tries to avoid offending people at all cost. In cases where social and national mores are not firmly embraced, Americans may want to be all things to all people, but this is not possible without the culture abdicating its own national identity and values. At times, Americans seem less concerned with reason, as they are with offending others, being unjustifiably fearful they might be called intolerant or xenophobic. Americans overcompensate for their Islamic insecurity by trying to be inclusive to all things, as though this will make the average US citizen more respectable, gracious, loving, and magnanimous in the eyes of Muslims, and the rest of the world. Conceptually speaking, it is neither possible nor desirable to be completely inclusive. Complete inclusivity would eliminate all social restrictions and personal boundaries, and it would vitiate democracy. This strategy of being all-inclusive represents a sophistry which mistakenly confers respect, virtue, and equality to various pseudo-religious issues people don't necessarily believe in. Duplicity and political correctness allow well-meaning people to perceive themselves as being tolerant and inclusive, even when it may violate their own social, political, religious values, and mores. Political correctness is inherently obsequious and deferential, but when examined more closely, political correctness may turn out to be deceitful, especially if it disavows the reality of what people actually feel and believe on a personal heart felt level.

Religions are not all equal. Islamic core pedagogy uniquely permits violent territorial subjugation which is unacceptable. Any pretense of political correctness that would suggest that this theology to be potentially acceptable under negotiated moderate management terms is delusional. Islamic ideology is unacceptable on its merits, even where Muslims are not intending to actually follow the Koran and subjugate other neighboring communities. If countries or communities only see ISIS as being the real threat, they are missing the subjugation ideology and perverse teaching of this doctrine to children who are becoming warriors. Islam's core ideology defies Western civilization values, common sense, the Golden Rule, democratic due process, gender equality, and religious freedom. America needs to keep and maintain its own values. Democracy is incompatible with theocracy.

Islam's polemic theology puts Americans in an awkward contentious position of ideological opposition. Love your neighbor. No, kill your neighbor! What part of the Koran should Muslims embrace, or throw out the window? Dr. Mark Gabriel, who holds a doctoral degree in Islamic history, addresses this important question. Gabriel explains this disputatious theological question regarding the contradictory teaching of the Koran was put to top Muslim Imams. The Islamic leadership's aphoristic collective consensus and authoritative answer took the position that the most recent writings in the Koran should prevail over the earlier ones. According to Dr. Gabriel (2002) this translates into jihad. Kill the infidels. If Americans [or other Western cultures] posit they are not at war with Islam, there is rebuttal argument. The assertion is partly true, and partly untrue. Americans are not at war with peace-loving *people* who support America, but they are in a type of spiritual warfare, which opposes the *political ideology* of Islam, because its core values mandate a global caliphate theocracy and Sharia Law that is violent, and

inherently unjust and discriminatory. Islam permits women to be treated like chattel; it denies basic human rights, civil rights, and democratic freedoms. Women who cherish democratic freedoms should be screaming about this, rejecting this ideology, gender victimization and human subjugation. Americans should not be blind, politically correct, or naive to this global spiritual warfare. Radical terrorist attacks like 9-11, Paris, and Brussels, are deeply grounded in Islam, not Southern Baptist Christianity.

10. Presuppositional Epistemology Issues of Islam

A closer examination and exegesis into the epistemological nature and indoctrination of Islam should raise theological questions of validity and credibility. Islam offers a suppositional machination that promotes a spurious, indefensible, logic-defying recruitment theology that jihadi men killed in battle will be rewarded in heaven with sex, being provided 72 virgins, for having murdered innocent men, women, and children [which Islam considers infidels]. What noumenon supports such a flawed lascivious preferential gender assertion, susceptible to human error, delusion and wishful base carnal thinking? What perspicacious majestic God offers virtuous women as sexual property to unvirtuous evil men who are rapists, murderers, and thugs, as manifested with barbaric ISIS fighters? This ad hominem recruitment marketing argument lacks religious logic, gravitas, august spirituality, and moral credibility. If Islam took this lubricious retirement benefit off the table during recruitment hiring interviews, there might be fewer randy males joining ISIS who are willing to commit suicide in the name of Islam.

Religious pedagogic leaders, theologians, academicians, and professional therapists who specialize in reality therapy and therapeutic mind control intervention, who want to fight this perverse radicalization ideology with impressionistic jihadi recruits, could argue that it might be philosophically more possible for warriors to be served ice water in hell than it will be for evil men to be rewarded in heaven with exceeding great sexual pleasure for their evil acts on earth. This flawed theology of sexual gratification exemplifies psychological moral delusion that caters to man's base carnal desires rather than his existential higher spiritual being. Consider the gender duplicity inherent in this flawed theology involving virginity: women are required to be virtuous and faithful, but men are not? Who deserves attribution for this hypocrisy? Who wrote the Koran and did they get it right? Dennis Giron examines authorship issues of the Koran (2016). Even faithful devote Muslims disagree over the authorship of the Koran, according to *Mission Islam* (2016). Positive spirituality should promote and offer a greater *constructive* sense of meaning and purpose in life. A good tree produces good fruit. Spirituality should promote life, not help to destroy it, especially when it comes to the subjective preference of cultural sociology, religion, and free participatory governance. The absence of free thought, speech, and choice, promotes bondage. Convivial love and wholesome spirituality embraces diversity, and does not attempt to control others.

Mankind's view of God arguably needs to be recalibrated if humanity comes to the fallacious assumption that a just and righteous God will one day reward and bless evil behavior with sexual

gratuities, and that humankind will, for some magical reason, not reap what it sows. Societal survival depends, in part, on a collective consensus of universal moral values and laws grounded in the concept and practice of accountability. For this reason, stealing is not permitted. From an anthropological point of view, accountability is what sustains the human race from mankind's evil side. Here again, mankind manifests the plebeian capability of conceptually putting God into a small fitting box that accommodates an ignoble narrow vision of his holy divinity, presupposing God will some how theologially suspend the concept of accountability. This would be counter intuitive to creation as well as humanity's current on-going sustainability and future existence. A theological argument could also be made that God's divine magnificent nature, power, and wisdom, makes it completely unnecessary for him to be needful of lowering his kingdom dignity and rulership to the vile quid pro quo business of earthly marketing and bargaining for mankind's frail efforts to serve others by offering sexual favors. Jihadi candidates need to be challenged to altruistically serve others, not destroy others. If peaceful coexistence is to be sought, and cultural differences are to be tolerated on a global level, the radicalization of Islamic ideology through theocratic subjugation needs to be tenaciously opposed on all government levels, and by planned socialized inculcation.

Notwithstanding global organizational differences of doctrine that exist in faith based spirituality belief systems, no other religion in the world, except Islam, casts aspersions by calling people of other faiths infidels. No other so-called religion in the world advocates the beheading or crucifixion of infidels, or promulgates violent jihadi subjugation of those who refuse to convert to Islam. In this regard, Islam, by its own self-proclaimed goals, is characteristically a pseudo-religious geopolitical entity that ascribes global political dictatorial domination, rather than a religion that innocuously incorporates religiosity that merely promotes spirituality values consistence with peaceful coexistence. Islam, in this context, is in need of syncretic spiritual reformation. Yet, there can be no surgical fix for radical Islamic ideology, unless the Koran is rewritten.

11. Threat Conclusions

Anyone who is not a Muslim, or who does not convert to Islam, is an infidel. Infidels are to be put to death! This hatred is especially intense toward Jews and Christians. Why are Imams not putting an end to Islamic violence? This question, once again, illuminates the core problem, Islam, the elephant in the room everyone is terrified to talk about. The problem is not limited to ISIS. Islam permits violence, and Muslim followers who have no authority to effectuate change are willing to accept, tolerate, and even embrace this ideology. Make no mistake about this: the world is full of good Muslims but unfortunately it makes no difference some Muslims reject this radical ideology and bigotry because elite Imams control Islam's ideology, and many Muslims hold sympathetic views to Sharia Law and radical Islamic ideology. Some Muslims tolerate Islamic *honor killings* of their own family members for violating Islamic Sharia Law. The political tilt of imbalance in this conflict becomes apparent if the allegorical scales of justice were reversed, and juxtapositional comparisons that include fair and balanced

counter-arguments were considered. Imagine then the pedantic recriminations if the metaphorical shoe were to be reversed, and Muslims were threatened with execution by Christians, Jews, or some other religious group, if Muslims did not convert to *that* faith. The Golden Rule would seem to be a *sui generis* solution if peace was desired. In the absence of comity, the hypocrisy of defending Islam serves no one, least of all Muslims who are being executed for dissent, not fasting at Ramadan, and other egregious sins of free speech and thought. If radical Islamic terrorist groups like ISIS were suddenly eliminated tomorrow by popular demand, the world would still be faced with human rights violations that Islam perpetrates upon its own Muslim people. Islamic beheadings, as seen in Saudi Arabia, Iran, and elsewhere have not changed. Since the status quo of Islam remains firmly in tact, violence would still continue under the present reign of Islam. The concept of negotiated peace with radical Islam is delusional, because its core ideology allows and promotes lying to gain an upper hand in jihad. Negotiated truce or peace agreements are never supposed to be more than 10 years, and they can be broken at any time under the Islam ideology of war permitted in the Koran. Islamic jurisprudence allows deceit and deception during war. Islam considers war (jihad) to be an on-going struggle until all nations and people submit to the dominion and rule of Islam. Under Islam, war against infidels will go on in perpetuity until all religions belong to Allah (Koran, 8: 39). Simply put, jihad will exist as long as universal domination of Islam has not been attained (Kopf, 2015).

Islam has historically practiced theocratic territorial conquering and research shows present day goals *continue* to embrace global domination (Wood, 2015). This is not an imaginary social problem. The threat is real. According to the Counter Jihad Report (2016) Defense Intelligence Agency Director Lt. General Vincent Stewart told the Senate Armed Services Committee on February 9, 2016, that ISIS will “attempt to direct attacks on the U.S. homeland in 2016”, and that the caliphate is infiltrating the refugees fleeing the ISIS mayhem in Iraq and Syria (p. 1). United States Director of National Intelligence, James R. Clapper, speaking before Congress, said that ISIS has become the *preeminent* terrorist threat, and its membership has grown to over 35,000 fighters. Clapper said ISIS can make and has used weapons of mass destruction, and that ISIS is hiding among refugees, using fake passports to cross borders. Director Clapper (2016) reported that Homegrown Violent Extremist (HVE) attacks will continue to pose the most significant threat in 2016 to the U.S. homeland (pp. 4-5).

Hundreds of Sharia *no-go-zones* exist in Paris, Great Britain, Germany, and elsewhere around the world, posing a clear and present danger to neighboring communities. To effectuate change and stop terrorism, Islam itself must change, and denounce core ideologies that support radicalism, Sharia Law, and global domination. Such pedagogical change is simply illusory. Most Sunnis and Shiites Imams have no vested interest in reformation, and many Muslims, like former Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, pervasively embrace an apocalyptic ideology. This apocalyptic view embraces the ideology that Islamic jihad will hasten a global caliphate of Islamic rule (Gerstenfeld, 2004).

12. Recommendations

The war on terrorism necessarily requires community support from its citizenry, local and national defense efforts, and global governmental collaborative forces that coordinate surgical strikes against terrorist groups; but a global effort also needs to include well organized multifaceted societal strategies that challenge and defeat the fallacious ideologic presuppositional arguments that support terrorism. The hearts and minds of young people being recruited into radical Islamic terrorist groups need to be won in this global war against terrorism. As more radical Islamic attacks occur on US soil, citizen anger and security concerns will become increasingly more relevant and potentially divisive. America must protect its homeland, but also be just and fair to Muslims. Homeland Security should elicit Muslim community collaboration with national intelligence to improve and implement reasonable screening procedures and better visa management enforcement strategies for foreigners entering the United States. This might necessitate political ideology waivers, country of origin background investigations, employment records, and other security clearance documentation. In the same way in which the absence of documented good credit history and references might preclude someone from making a major purchase, the absence of documented personal history and references might necessitate entry restrictions into the United States. America needs Muslims, and Americans who love justice and equality want the Muslim community to be their strong partner in this fight against terrorism.

References

- Akbar, J. (2015). Muslim children—Trained to kill. *The Muslim Issue*. Retrieved June 16, 2015, from <https://www.themuslimissue.wordpress.com/2015/06/16/muslim-children-trained-to-kill/>
- Bailey, T. (1999). Understanding the German People's Participation in the Third Reich. *Florida Gulf Coast University* (Last Modified April, 1999). Retrieved from <http://www.itech.fgcu.edu/&/issues/vol2/issue1/german.htm>
- Basil, Y., & Levs, J. (2014). Militants in Syria put victims' heads on poles; hundreds killed daily. *CNN News* (Last modified July 28, 2014). Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2014/07/28/world/meast/syria-crisis/>
- Children's Rights Institute*. (2015). Retrieved February 5, 2016, from <http://www.childrensrightsinitiative.org/news-videos.php>
- Clapper, J. R. (2016). Statement for the Record Worldwide Threat Assessment of the US Intelligence Community. *Senate Armed Forces Committee*. Retrieved February 9, 2016, from http://www.armed-services.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Clapper_02-09-16.pdf
- Counter Jihad Report. (2016). *An ISIS 9/11 Attack On America With WMDs In 2016*. Retrieved February 12, 2016, from <http://www.counterjihadreport.com/2016/02/12/an-isis-911-attack-on-america-with-wmds-in-2016/>
- Davis, G. M. (2016). *Islam 101*, *Jihad Watch.org*. Retrieved February 17, 2016, from <http://www.jihadwatch.org/islam-101>

- Ezard, J. (2001). *Germans knew of Holocaust horror about death camps*, *The Guardian*. Retrieved February 16, 2001, from <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2001/feb/17/johnevard>
- Fraser, K. (2014). *The photo that will shock the world: Jihadist Khaled Sharrouf's son, 7, holds severed head*, *The Daily Telegraph*. Retrieved August 11, 2014, from <http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/news/nsw/the-photo-that-will-shock-the-world-jihadist-khaled-sharroufs-son-7-holds-severed-head/news-story/ea5201d8e7f6fac960022548f51e3b4f>
- Gabriel, M. A. (2002). *Islam And Terrorism: What the Quran really teaches about Christianity, violence and the goals of the Islamic jihad*. Lake Mary, FL: Frontline Charisma Media/Charisma House Book Group.
- Gerstenfeld, M. (2004). Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism, Jihad, Apocalypse, and Anti-Semitism: An Interview with Richard Landes. *Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, Israeli Security, Regional Diplomacy, and International Law*. Retrieved September 1, 2004, from <http://www.jcpa.org/phas/phas-24.htm>
- Giron, D. (2016). Qur'an: A Work of Multiple Hands? *The Secular Web, Internet Infidels*. Retrieved March 29, 2016, from http://www.infidels.org/library/modern/denis_giron/multiple.html
- Grohol, J. (2016). *Denial is a Powerful Impediment to Treatment*. Retrieved February 8, 2016, from <http://www.psychcentral.com/lib/denial-is-a-powerful-impediment-to-treatment/>
- Ibrahim, R. (2010). How Taqiyya Alters Islam's Rules of War-Defeating Jihadist Terrorism. *The Middle East Quarterly*, 17(1), pp. 1-6. Retrieved from <http://www.meforum.org/2538/taqiyya-islam-rules-of-war>
- Jordanian pilot's "obscene" burning death by ISIS sparks outrage in Mideast*. (February 4, 2015). CBS News/Associated Press. Retrieved from <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/jordanian-pilots-obscene-burning-death-by-isis-sparks-outrage-in-mideast/>
- Joshi, S. (2014). Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi: The world's most wanted man. *The Telegraph*. Retrieved July 1, 2014, from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/10935790/Abu-Bakr-al-Baghdadi-The-worlds-most-wanted-man.html>
- Kopf, K. (2015). Obama's Naïve Iran "Deal" Cloaked in Islamic Deception? *CNS News*. Retrieved March 26, 2015, from <http://www.cnsnews.com/commentary/kenneth-kopf/obama-s-na-ve-iran-deal-cloaked-islamic-deception>
- Lawley, J., & Tompkins, P. (2004). *Self-Deception, Self-Delusion, Self-Denial* (The Clean Collection). Retrieved February 7, 2004, from <http://www.cleanlanguage.co.uk/articles/articles/27/1/Self-Deception-Delusion-and-Denial/Page1.html>
- Mission Islam. (2016). Who Wrote the Holy Qur'an? Retrieved March 29, 2016, from <http://www.missionislam.com/quran/whowrote.htm>
- Mosendz, P. (2015). Officials: ISIS Leader Al-Baghdadi Alive; Likely Not Hit in Iraq Airstrikes. *News Week*. Retrieved October 12, 2015, from <http://www.newsweek.com/officials-isis-leader-al-baghdadi-alive-likely-not-hit-iraq-airstrikes-382162>

- National Institute of Mental Health. (2015). *Anxiety Disorders*. Retrieved from <http://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/topics/anxiety-disorders/index.shtml>
- PBS KQED Frontline: Interviews With Muslim Scholars, Akbar Mohammad Interview: Islamic Belief, Law, and Practice. (March 3, 2002). *Is there anyone to say who's right?* Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/muslims/interviews/akbar.html>
- PBS KQED Frontline: Interviews With Muslim Scholars, Imam Feisal Rauf Interview: Islamic Belief, Law, and Practice. (March 3, 2002). *Who decides the rules of Islamic jurisprudence?* Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/muslims/interviews/feisal.html>
- Pipes, D. (2015). Sisi and the Reform of Islam. *National Review*. Retrieved January 19, 2015, from <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/396642/sisi-and-reform-islam-daniel-pipes>
- Reuters/The Guardian. (2016). *Saudi Arabia executes 47 people in one day including Shia cleric*. Retrieved January 2, 2016, from <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/jan/02/saudi-arabia-executes-47-people-in-one-day-including-iranian-cleric>
- Reynolds, E. (2015). *Cubs of the caliphate: Islamic State's child recruits*. Retrieved November 5, 2015, from <http://www.news.com.au/world/middle-east/cubs-of-the-caliphate-islamic-states-child-recruits/news-story/64e4579e39e221312853bf10f28e8ad2>
- Royal Islamic Strategic Studies Center. (2011). *The Muslim 500: The 500 Most Influential Muslims*. Retrieved February 7, 2016, from https://www.gwu.edu/~ieresgwu/assets/docs/Kavakci_500.pdf
- Schultz, M. (2014). ISIS savages behead four children: Christian leader. *New York Post*. Retrieved December 12, 2014, from <http://www.nypost.com/2014/12/12/christian-leader-isis-savages-behead-four-children/>
- Smith, M., Segal, R., & Segal, J. (2016). *Phobias and Fears Symptoms, Treatment, and Self-Help for Phobias and Fears*. Retrieved February 2016, from <http://www.helpguide.org/articles/anxiety/phobias-and-fears.htm>
- United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (2016). *The Holocaust: A Learning Site for Students: The Final Solution*. Retrieved January 24, 2016, from <http://www.ushmm.org/outreach/en/article.php?ModuleId=10007704>
- Whitson, S. L. (2016). Saudi Arabia: Mass Execution Largest Since 1980. *Human Rights Watch.org*. Retrieved January 4, 2016, from <http://www.hrw.org/news/2016/01/04/saudi-arabia-mass-execution-largest-1980>
- Wood, G. (2015). What ISIS Really Wants. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved March 2015, from <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/03/what-isis-really-wants/384980/>
- Zimmerman, M. (2015). 74 children executed by ISIS for "crimes" that include refusal to fast, report says. *Fox News*. Retrieved July 2, 2015, from <http://www.foxnews.com/world/2015/07/02/isis-executioners-spare-no-one-killing-74-children-for-crimes-including-not.html>