



Personal Journeys to Difficult Truths
Citizen Warrior

Personal Journeys to Difficult Truths

Elsa: Can you say a bit about yourself?

CW: Citizen Warrior is a woman and a man. Our profile picture is meant to be androgynous to represent us both.



Elsa: Is there anything in your personality, family, etc, that got each of you to see what so many block at seeing — for example, the dangers of Islamic encroachments on freedom of speech?

CW1: My grandfather was in the military, my uncle was in the military, and my father was in the military. I know what it costs to defend our freedom. And I needed to know I did what I could.

CW2: I'm a curious person and I like to learn. I get even more intensely interested when something doesn't make sense, and I just have to keep learning until it makes sense to me.

Elsa: You're two. That's unusual. Bill Warner, Pam Geller — they're each one person, even if they have support. What does it give you, being two?

CW: It's definitely an advantage. We each have different

strengths. It's a case of "one plus one equals more than two." One of us is a thinker and is good at seeing through complication to fundamental principles. The other is good at articulating ideas in a way that is easy to read and understand. We work together very well, and our different interests and skills compliment each other.

Elsa: And then, why be anonymous? I'm sure people will be curious.

CW: Our voices would be recognized. This way we can speak out freely.

Elsa: What you say is so important. Over and over, in your blog, [CitizenWarrior](#), you explore ways of reaching people about Islam. What got you to try, so persistently, to figure out how to reach people?

CW: We realized that this was the only way most people will find out. Certainly the mainstream media is failing miserably at informing the public about even the most basic facts about Islam. And politicians are certainly not going to speak straight about it. We didn't see any other way to create a "public awareness campaign" that would work without either a lot of money (which we don't have) or individual one-on-one conversations.

Once we realized others were having as much trouble as we were (trying getting through to people) our personal conversations took on a larger purpose. We could use our own conversations for the good of others, to experiment and discover what helps and what doesn't, and share what we learned with others trying to do the same thing. Often our articles then ask the readers to add their experiences, so we've got a team effort going on. We're accumulating important practical know-how about how this "ideological war" can be won.

Elsa: By the way, how did you come to your interest in Islam, and your facing what was happening in the West (the general silence, and so on)?

CW: September 11th came out of nowhere for us. And at first, we didn't really understand that it had much to do with Islam. We thought like everyone else that "all religions have their extremists."

But we were pretty shaken by the events of 9/11. We wanted to do something about what happened. But what? Then we came up with the idea of creating a blog to try to explore that very question. People with national security jobs can obviously do something. Politicians can do something. What can an ordinary citizen do besides vote?

At first we didn't have much to say, because we didn't know much about it. So we started reading whatever we could get our hands on. The first book that made world events make sense to us was Serge Trifkovic's "The Sword of the Prophet." But we had a hard time believing it. I mean, who ever heard of a warlord and plunderer starting a religion? Especially a religion with so many followers. Although the book clarified a lot of world events in a wholly intelligent way, we thought this can't possibly be true.

So we tried to prove it to ourselves that it was false. Trifkovic's book had to be the propaganda of a believer of a different religion just trying to put down rival religions or something. We were hoping what he wrote was not true.

So we checked out a bunch of pro-Islam books from the library and read them. And we noticed a strange thing. They didn't mention anything about any intolerance, violence, or political intent within the Islamic ideology.

They could have said, "Yes, there are those things in our doctrine, but we don't believe in it." But they didn't mention it at all, like it didn't exist.

We had already read many quotes from the Koran that included those things, and clearly many Muslims took those to heart. But according to these pro-Islam books, no such thing even existed in Islam. It was all goodness and light.

That made us suspicious. Now we were really curious, and it seemed the only answer would be to go to the source. What does it actually say in the Koran? So we bought a book at the local Barnes and Noble — a big, beautiful, very expensive classic Koran. And one of us (the more scholarly type) tried to read it. It didn't make much sense. It was written in clumsy language. We know now that most of the Koran can't be understood without knowing the events in Muhammad's life, but that information is not in the Koran. And the chapters are not in chronological order. So the whole thing seemed like an exercise in futility.

We kept looking around for a better version and found Bill Warner's "A Simple Koran" which has every verse of the Koran in it, but with the necessary information about Muhammad's life added where necessary to understand it, and he put the chapters (suras) into chronological order.

But we were getting suspicious of everyone now, so our question was "What if Bill's Koran was biased?"

How could we know? Well, by then we had two classic versions of the Koran, and each chapter and verse in the Koran is numbered, so it was easy to check. We just looked up random verses in Bill's book and then looked up the same verses in the other two Korans. They matched perfectly, although the verses in "A Simple Koran" were easier to read because they are written in plain English (as opposed to the King James Bible-style English some Korans are written in).

Elsa: What has your evolution been? — within yourself and in speaking out (writing, speaking, being visible)?

CW: We became satisfied that Bill's Koran was the real thing, and began at the beginning to read it. But even though it was clear writing, it was still very hard to read, just because it was so boring and repetitious. And stupid. Of course, that's a rough thing to say, but some of the stuff in the Koran is really childish and seems obviously self-serving (that is, serving Muhammad).

But after getting through about three fourths of it, the book suddenly became interesting. Once Muhammad became a leader of a small army, the nature of the "revelations" began to change. He stopped trying to gain favor with the Jews and the Christians and began to express intolerance toward them. Then came demands on non-Muslims to conform to Islam's rules, and threats of violence if they didn't conform.

We started writing about what we were learning, and slowly gained subscribers to our blog as our readers shared articles with others.

And we were, of course, sharing what we were learning with our personal friends and family.

And that's when a second wave of fear and frustration hit us.

The first was the attack on 9/11. Who was attacking us? Why were they attacking us? How can it be stopped?

The second wave was discovering how difficult it was to share simple information with people we knew.

After learning the disturbing truth about Islamic doctrine, we realized that this kind of violence toward non-Muslims has been going on since Muhammad became the leader of a violent gang, and we couldn't see any reason why it would ever stop.

It seemed to us that at least some Muslims would always be around who believed in Islamic doctrine, who took it to heart and tried to follow Muhammad's example. Especially since it says in Islam's most "holy" book, the Koran, that Muslims should follow Muhammad's example. (It says this 91 times in the Koran.)

We didn't know what ordinary citizens could do about this other than help our fellow citizens learn about it. The first place to start in solving this problem, we reasoned, would be to learn the facts as they are.

The truth is, it is not crazy misinterpreters who are reading things into the Koran and trying to use the Koran's peaceful teachings to justify their political actions and violence. No. Those commands to be politically active and violent are in the Koran as plain as day (and demonstrated unequivocally by Muhammad).

Here it is eleven years after 9/11 and it is amazing to us how many people don't yet even know this simple fact.

And when we started trying to tell people about it, we were really taken aback at the reaction we got from almost everybody. People who didn't know anything about Islam would argue with us. One of us had just finished reading the Koran. And people who didn't even know the most basic things about Islam (like who founded it and when) — these people were arguing with us. We didn't understand why they argued like that. We hadn't expected it.

We are avid learners. All our lives we have enjoyed learning things and sharing what we've learned with others. And all our lives, the reaction has been overwhelmingly positive.

Until we started sharing what we were learning about Islam.

And we were hearing back from our subscribers the same thing. They were also having a very difficult time sharing simple

information with their family and friends, and they were also baffled by it. And frustrated.

We were all very frustrated.

Here we want to do something about this horrible situation we're in — that a whole host of people want to destroy us simply for being non-Muslims, and want to take control of our free governments and dismantle our hard-won freedoms, and they are moving forward with it and in many ways succeeding — and we come up with what seems like an obvious first step (just simply knowing a few facts about Islam) and we get stopped right off the bat.

We were thinking that the educational part was only the preliminary step, and then we could go on to the harder things like figuring out what to do about it.

But we couldn't even get that first easy step done. That was very scary for us.

I mean how are we going to effectively stop orthodox (believing, fundamentalist) Muslims from gaining concessions to Islam if so many of us refuse to know anything about what the orthodox Muslims are doing and why?

So we started experimenting in our personal lives with different ways to share what we knew about Islam with the people we knew. Some things worked well, and some things didn't work at all. Several rifts in our family and friends came about because of our failures.

But when we found things that worked well, we shared them on the blog. And others started writing in with their own experiences. We've been learning together. And we recently published a book on what we've learned about it, entitled ["Getting Through: How to Talk to Non-Muslims About the Disturbing Nature of Islam."](#)

We're hoping it helps us complete the first step, which is getting a sufficient number of us to acknowledge that Islam is not really a religion of peace, and that political action in the service of Islam is a religious duty for orthodox Muslims, and that Islamic doctrine lays out a clear goal: To eventually create a world that follows the laws of Allah rather than any other laws. In other words, to create a world that follows Islamic law. Or, another way to put that, is to make every person on earth subject to Islamic law, by peaceful coercion if possible, but by force if necessary. That's the goal.

Of course, not all Muslims are committed to this. It may be what it says in Islamic doctrine, but many Muslims either don't know about it or wish to live a modern life and be happy.

But enough Muslims DO actually buy into it and are committed to it, and thus we non-Muslims cannot sensibly ignore it and go on about our business.

Elsa: Have there been stages along the way, in what you realized, in how you responded, both re Islam and the West?

CW: There are two other issues that we have come to see as important. One is women's rights. Wherever women gain more rights, Islamic orthodoxy has less power. The subjugation of women is a fundamental element in Islamic orthodoxy, so it cannot coexist with women's rights and equality under the law. When one rises, the other falls by necessity.

Even if it doesn't solve the whole problem, promoting women's rights is worth doing for its own sake.

Some people have found out about Islam's prime directive (the political goal of Islam) and want to do something to stop it, but whenever they try to tell people about Islam, they are shunned, they are argued with, and people refuse to talk to them any

more.

It is upsetting, and people are alienating family members and friends.

So here is another, equally valid way to fight in the counterjihad — devote your time to promoting women's rights, especially, of course, in the Muslim world.

Another good thing about working towards women's rights is that you can talk about it with anyone. You don't have to mention Islam. People are not going to be against you. Almost everyone is in favor of women's rights here in the free world, so people will not argue with you.

So this is something people can do if they just cannot talk to people about Islam.

Elsa: You say that encouraging the advancement of women helps erode Islam. That isn't what I've seen. In fact, I see rather that Islam has worked against women's rights. Ok, you can do something for women. But it's precarious — Islam, until dealt with, can resurge, as long as the pull of those texts hasn't been taken care of. Just think of *Lord of the Ring* — as long as the ring exists, it's dangerous.

CW: Women's rights won't solve the whole problem. But it would help. Some people cannot and will not talk to their friends and family about Islam because it causes so much friction with people they love, but they want to do SOMETHING. Women's rights is something, and it helps with the overall effort.

During WWII we had conscientious objectors who were absolutely against killing people but still wanted to do something to help. That's what women's rights can be for us in the counterjihad. Something else people can do that will help with the overall effort.

As Islam works against women's rights, people who get involved in women's rights will come face to face with what is stopping women's rights: Islam. It is a different way to awaken people to the tenets of Islam without having to argue with them about Islam. Let them discover it for themselves. Working for women's rights wouldn't work as the ONLY approach, but it isn't the only approach. But it is perfect for some people.

Elsa: I've just read of a 14-year-old Pakistani girl shot in the head and critically injured by the Taliban because she was speaking out. I see that as one of the problems of educating girls — what if they speak out, like this one did? In the end, my guess is that it's the Qu'ran that needs to be taken on. With the shooting of this girl, Pakistani politicians are saying they are against the terrorism. They're visiting her in the hospital, where she's just now in critical condition, in intensive care. But that's not going to the root. The people who shot her quoted several passages from the Qu'ran (and of course they also draw on "bully power").

CW: I'm completely with you on this. And it is also true that her shooting exposed more people to Islamic doctrine. The fact that she spoke up helped reveal a human-rights issue embedded in Islam to the rest of the world. Her shooting is an outrage to non-Muslims. And the Taliban directly tell us, "This is what our religion dictates."

I also agree with you that the MOST important thing we need to do is educate our fellow non-Muslims about Islamic doctrine, because I'm sure in this shooting, many non-Muslims completely missed the fact that it is part of the religion to repress women. I'm sure many people who read that story will think, "They must be taking the quotes out of context."

The second issue we feel is important is money. Militant Islam had already been in remission once. Its power was diminished.

Its influence in the world was minimal. The Islamic empire had been essentially divided and conquered by colonial powers. But then oil was discovered in the Middle East and orthodox Muslims have used this money to launch a new wave of Islamic expansion. Wahhabis from Saudi Arabia have been building madrassas and mosques all over the world, pouring their oil billions into them and promoting fundamental, orthodox Islam. Iran has poured its oil billions into politically expanding Islam's domain throughout the Middle East.

Since the creation of OPEC, Iran, Saudi Arabia and the other member nations of OPEC control a large enough percentage of the world oil supply that they can dictate the world price of oil. They have kept the price high and going higher, leaching the wealth from the free world and pouring it into the hands of men (in orthodox Islam, the money does not go to women) who are helping to create the next generation of orthodox Muslims hell-bent on Islam's prime directive.

But how can this be stopped? We need oil. Almost all transportation in the free world is fueled by oil. Ships, planes, trucks, cars. It's almost all running on oil. We can't just stop using oil. The world economy would completely collapse, and that is not an exaggeration.

And we can't do anything against OPEC or they would do what they have done before — they would cut off their oil production, creating another oil crisis, and that would also bring the world's economy to ruin.

The solution is to bring competition to the fuel market. A bill in Congress right now would do it quickly, called the Open Fuel Standard Act.

But individuals can do it immediately for themselves too. Just stop burning oil, and convince everyone you know to follow your example. Right now, we have ethanol as an alternative fuel.

But that's not the only possibility. It's a place we can start, though. The more people on the road with cars that burn ethanol, the more ethanol stations will be available, and the more ethanol stations that are available, the more willing people will be to convert their cars to flex fuel.

As soon as enough cars are flex fuel, the monopoly will be broken and OPEC will have lost its ability to harm us. And the West will no longer be in a vulnerable position in relation to the OPEC nations. If they try another oil embargo, people will just burn ethanol in their cars because it will be a lot cheaper than gasoline.

And with the Open Fuel Standard Act, methanol and other alcohol fuels would also be an option. The fuels could compete, making OPEC lose its ability to bleed the world of its wealth.

And more importantly for our purposes here, it would cut off the powerful flow of money that is currently expanding the reach of orthodox Islam because we would no longer have to import foreign oil and the price of gas would drop to its actual (not its inflated) value.

Elsa: A big issue for almost every one is opposition — something which you have in fact already talked about. Do you have anything more to say? Who has given the strongest opposition? And what has it been? Denial of what you are seeing? Name calling? Danger?

CW: We haven't gotten much opposition, except in our personal lives, as we shared this information.

As a matter of fact, one of the sites we created has actually been praised by some Muslims. They thought it was a pro-Islam site.

We created that site (inquiryintoislam.com) so that Citizen Warrior readers could share it with their friends. We made the

site as neutral as possible. That is, it is “just the facts” without any judgment as to whether it is good or bad.

And because of this, many Muslims have written to us praising this great web site! Especially with one of the articles called “What Makes Islam So Successful,” we list different features of Islam and how they all work together in such a way as to cause the spread of Islam, the subjugation of non-Muslims, and a high level of commitment in its followers.

When non-Muslims read it, they are of course alarmed.

When believing Muslims read it they are pleased to see how clever Allah is, and what a great example Muhammad was.

But we’ve never gotten any death threats, or even much hostility. Every once in awhile we’ll get Muslims trying to argue with us that what we’re writing about isn’t the “real Islam.” But that’s about it.

Elsa: What have been the greatest positive factors?

CW: There have been several. First, we’ve met some wonderful people. These modern freedom fighters are the highest quality people we’ve ever known. They are compassionate, intelligent, strong people with a purpose.

And the purposefulness of this work has also been a positive factor. 9/11 gave us a purpose recognized by ourselves “as a mighty one,” as George Bernard Shaw put it. And the work has given us a relief from the torment of 9/11, and eased the feeling of helplessness it gave us.

Elsa: Have you ever felt like quitting? — why am I bothering, etc?

CW: Yes, several times we've wanted to quit, because this work can be very negative and sad and angering and frustrating, and it is so difficult to get through to people sometimes, we've wanted to just say, "forget it!"

But something always pulls us back in. We'll get a call, or some world event will occur, or subscribers will write to us. Or the disillusionment passes and we get back on the horse.

Elsa: What's your current perspective on Islam and the West? What are your current interests, explorations, writings, projects?

CW: Our next book will be based on WhatYouCanDoAboutIslam.com, which is a list of things we've collected over the years that ordinary citizens can do to make a difference.

More people are coming to an understanding about basic Islamic principles. The number is growing all the time.

And of course, the next question is, then what?

This is a brand new field.

In the 1400 year history of Islamic expansion, a population has never had the wealth of information available to them that we do now, so this issue has never been worked out.

What can you do about the existence of such a dominating, repressive and relentlessly aggressive ideology? What about the heterodox Muslims? What kind of policies should be created? What about immigration policies? What about selection criteria for security and military and government positions? Can a Muslim's commitment to Islamic doctrine be tested for? How should we deal with this without taking away freedoms guaranteed by law to all citizens? Can mosques be investigated for sedition?

And we're still at the beginning stages of even working out how to TALK about Islam.

How do you distinguish between the people who are essentially Muslim in name only and people who are believers in the fundamental doctrine? Should that distinction be made? Or should it be the responsibility of heterodox (meaning non-orthodox) Muslims to let the rest of us know they are partial believers or non-believers?

Would it be best to just assume if someone says he's a Muslim that he believes in Islamic doctrine?

Other language issues need to be addressed and worked out. For example, when we talk to people about Islam, the first thing we discovered is it engulfs the conversation in mire if we talk about Muslims. But it doesn't do that so much if we talk about Islamic doctrine or Sharia law.

With all the books and lectures and articles, it seems we in the counterjihad movement are collectively figuring out how to speak about this issue, among each other and with those who don't yet know. Certain phrases are catching on and some are falling into disuse. Certain ways of speaking about it are proving effective and other ways not so much. It's kind of a global conversation and it's great to be a part of it.

Elsa: Why do you think there is so much resistance to the truths you have faced and are sharing, the truths re Islam and the truths re the West?

CW: That is an immensely good question. That is a question we have spent a lot of time on because we've discovered we are better at sharing with others about Islam if we understand why they don't want to know it.

We have discovered several points of view that help us stay in the right frame of mind for getting through to people — instead of the natural reaction to someone's unwillingness to listen, which is, "What is wrong with you?" or "Why do you have to be such a moron?" which doesn't really help the communication process.

Besides just not wanting to talk about it because it is an unpleasant topic, we believe the main source of the resistance is guilt. This is the West's Achilles' heel.

Achilles was invincible, so the story goes. But when he was shot with an arrow through the back of his heel, he was momentarily disabled, and that gave his enemies enough time to finish him off.

The West seems invincible too. We have superior technology and war-making know-how. We seem undefeatable.

But we have a weakness. It is known in North America as "white guilt." In Europe it's called "post-colonial guilt."

But this guilt is founded on a mistake we should all easily see. The mistake is a simple overgeneralization. If we looked at it from another angle, most of us could clearly recognize the error.

If someone said, "All Muslims should die because of what they did to us on 9/11," almost everyone could see something wrong with the statement. Not all Muslims were involved in bringing down the Twin Towers. Some Muslims hadn't even been born yet. So it would be a moral wrong to punish all Muslims for what some Muslims did.

Let's look at it from another angle. Let's say an African-American kills a European-American in a robbery. Should all African-Americans be punished for this? Should all African-Americans even feel guilty about it? No, absolutely not.

Just because someone is a member of your race or religion does not mean you are responsible for what they do. They are

individual human beings, and they choose their own destiny. All African-Americans should not be held responsible for what any individual African-American does.

We can easily see this.

And yet what is white guilt? For a "white" person, it says "because some people in the past had a similar genetic background as yours, and because they did some terrible things to people of dissimilar genetic background (Native Americans or Africans, for example), then you should feel guilty about it, and feel responsible for it, and people of your genetic background should do something to make amends for it."

Not many people say this outright, but it is an unspoken basic assumption in the hearts of a large percentage of people of European descent. It is a presupposition so widespread, it is almost never even spoken aloud, and yet it underlies much of what is spoken and done.

This guilt is a major weakness, and orthodox Muslims are aggressively exploiting it. And it is one of the main reasons we cannot get through to our fellow non-Muslims with simple information.

As long as we are paralyzed by this arrow through our heel, we are vulnerable.

Many of us have familiarized ourselves with Islamic doctrine, and we seek to educate our fellow non-Muslims about the information, and we seek to propose solutions to the problem, but we are often labeled as "racists."

It is an oxymoron. It doesn't make any sense. It's crazy.

But it is effectively making many people in prominent places — politicians and news commentators, for example — back off from saying anything honest about Islam.

Very few people have examined the guilt clearly enough to recognize the unarticulated, mistaken assumption it is based on, so a public charge of racism can be devastating to a person's career.

A sizable portion of the population is motivated to bend over backwards for Muslims because of an undiscerning guilt — a guilt that stems from a feeling that “we” have harmed people of other religions and races and that we can (and should) make it up to the “oppressed” and “downtrodden” underdogs of the world.

And the point of view has consequences. When the Muslim Students Association wants to create their own prayer room just for Muslims on a college campus, they make their appeal to administrators who have a deep-seated, well-ingrained white guilt, and these Muslims know the administrators have this guilt, and they jab their appeal right into the Achilles' heel.

If the administrators acquiesce, a little Muslim enclave has just been created. A little piece of Sharia law has been implemented (every concession to Islam is the establishment of Sharia law). And as time goes on, the concession becomes accepted as permanently established because it has “always been there.”

Muslims are getting away with this sort of thing all over the free world. In this gradual way, Western culture is giving way to Islamic culture.

If a student had come in and said, “We are Scientologists and we want our own prayer room,” the administrator would have chuckled and wondered how someone could be so stupid as to think they could demand such a thing on a college campus! Why the different response? White guilt does not apply to Scientology. Or Catholicism. Or Protestantism.

Everywhere orthodox Muslims are pressing for concessions — concessions they would not get if they were Catholics or

Scientists — the white guilt blinders need to be removed so the request can be seen for what it is, and those special privileges and special considerations can then be refused in exactly the same way all the others would be refused, and with no guilt.

Guilt is a major source of your difficulty in getting through to people. Let's look at a different kind of guilt. People in developed nations are acutely aware of the inequalities of the world — we enjoy a material quality of life far better than billions of other people — and for a lot of us, this presents a serious ethical problem.

Some people feel guilty about it. They need to assuage their guilt in some way.

But they want to assuage their guilt in some way other than giving up the goodies, because even though they don't like the inequality, they don't want to give up the high quality of life, either.

In other words, many people need to have a way to keep enjoying the material riches, but still relieve the guilt they feel about others being so poor.

The solution many have chosen is to go out of their way to see what's wrong with their own culture, and to give other cultures an indiscriminating reverence.

This solution is something we are familiar with in our personal relationships. If you are more successful than a friend of yours, for example, one way you can help him feel better and prevent him from resenting you is to point out your own faults. Those who are very successful often habitually make it a point to admit their own personal imperfections.

The successful person can do this with integrity because everyone has faults, even very competent people, and because every success is partly a result of pure luck — the luck of being born in

a free country, the luck of being born with ambition, a high energy, basic intelligence, good health, etc. The self-criticism helps a successful person continue to enjoy the material goodies without feeling too guilty about it around other people, and without making other people feel bad about themselves or resentful of the successful person.

It shows no class to put down the “less fortunate” as lazy, stupid, ignorant, etc. It is the height of vulgarity to criticize or ridicule the less fortunate, or to brag about how superior you are.

And the people who will not listen to us, or who argue in defense of Islam even when they know nothing about Islam, are doing the same thing on a cultural scale. In other words, when you, a fellow member of the fortunate class start bad-mouthing another culture — when you start criticizing Islamic doctrine — you have violated an important code of etiquette. And for them to listen to you and accept what you say is for them to violate it too.

What we’re dealing with is a “cultural humility” about our own culture and achievements. People are going out of their way to point out what is wrong with their own culture or their country. They’re not casual about this — there is an underlying intensity. They seem hell-bent on criticizing their own country or culture.

Now it makes sense that it seems so deeply felt — that our listeners seem so committed to stopping us from criticizing Islam and committed to criticizing their own culture.

Many people rely on this criticism to allow them to enjoy their iPads and nice cars and cell phones without too much guilt. They feel less guilty because they express a “sufficient degree of contempt” for their own highly successful culture, and they feel (or at least profess) sufficient admiration for all other cultures.

The simple, factual information about Islam you want to share threatens to undermine this whole unformulated creed, which endangers the linchpin of their emotional harmony and ethical

congruence. They can't let it in. To accept what you say would be to admit that some cultures are better than others. To let it in would require them to rearrange an important feature of their worldview and their self-image. This is not a minor matter.

It is similar to survivor guilt. People who have survived plane crashes or concentration camps or some other event where others have died sometimes suffer a painful, unrelenting guilt because they survived while others perished. It wasn't fair, and they have a problem dealing with the unfairness.

People in the free world are in a similar position on a global scale. Think about it. We've seen close-up, full-color pictures of our fellow human beings starving in Africa, we've read about people being unjustly imprisoned in China and tortured in Iran, we've read about women being executed in Saudi Arabia for the "crime" of being raped, and meanwhile we drive in safety to and from our pleasant activities in clean, comfortable cars, go to grocery stores overflowing with food, come home to a sturdy, agreeable shelter with cable television, microwave ovens, high-speed internet, and enjoy an immense degree of personal freedom.

It isn't fair. Yes, we may have worked to earn the money, but if we had been born in Iran or China, our lives would be tragically different, regardless of how hard we worked.

We got lucky and it definitely isn't fair. At some level, I think most of us feel some kind of guilt about this. How do YOU live with the inequality of the world? Some people think those of us in free countries have created a superior culture, so we deserve our wealth. Some think their race is genetically superior. Some good evidence indicates the inequalities are a result of geography. And some just consider themselves lucky and try to help others when they can.

We've all found a way to live with it, but the people we're having a hard time communicating with about Islam have found a less-

than-optimal way of dealing with it. It's better than the path self-righteous racists use perhaps, but it is not ideal (or even adequate) — it's preventing them from confronting and accepting important facts about the real world.

Multiculturalism is one way this guilt manifests itself. Multiculturalism says all cultures are equal. None is better than others. Moral equivalence is another. Moral equivalence says, "Yes, that other culture does terrible things, but look, we've done terrible things too," so again, we are not better than others. White Guilt is another. Each of these different manifestations all stem from the same fundamental need to relieve guilt while still enjoying the safety and wealth and comfort of our free, modern society.

We have a need, wrote Victor Davis Hanson, for "cultural neutrality" — for seeing ourselves as no better than anybody else. This doesn't sound so bad, but the need for cultural neutrality can be so well-ingrained that it causes a kind of willful blindness that overrides common sense and the basic instinct of self-preservation.

It has gone off the deep end. Hanson wrote: "...so strong is the tug of cultural neutrality that it trumps even the revulsion of Western progressives at the ... jihadist agenda, with its homophobia, sexism, religious intolerance, and racism."

It is important to clearly understand this perplexing, confusing, exasperating phenomenon we are all running into: The compulsive reflex to defend Islam and criticize our own culture and country.

The primary source of the resistance we're coming up against is this: People feel guilty for having so much more than others, and this prevents them from accepting your legitimate criticisms of Islamic doctrine.

With this understanding, we have found we communicate differently with people, and it is easier to get through.

Elsa: What are your hopes and fears?

CW: We hope this can be resolved peacefully. We hope anti-Sharia legislation will be passed in every state and at the federal level in the U.S. and all over the world. We hope enough people will become aware of the basic nature of Islamic doctrine so that simple, straightforward legislation can curb most of Islam's relentless encroachment. And we hope that fuel competition will take hold around the world, breaking oils' monopoly and cutting off money to orthodox Muslims. And we hope that, regardless of what happens, women around the world will see their freedoms expand — their rights to be educated, to choose their own spouse, to live their lives in safety and freedom.

We fear that the hardcore racists and the "nuke-the-Middle-East" crowd will dominate the counterjihad movement and ruin it.

And we fear that we will not get through quickly enough to enough people and the committed orthodox Muslims will beat us to the punch and cut off free speech, which would allow them to take over our governments as they have in so many places around the world.

Elsa: What do you see as potential solutions? What do you consider the most effective strategies? What do you consider least effective strategies? What strategies do you consider counter productive?

CW: The first and most important thing an ordinary citizen can do is to learn about Islam and share what they learn with others in the most convincing and pleasant way possible.

Everyone should join ACT! for America. It is important that our political efforts are organized. And we need to pass legislation to prevent any Sharia law from getting a foothold in free nations.

We should also do our best to avoid using gasoline for fuel. And most importantly, we should support the rights of women around the world.

Arguing with Muslims is not worth the time. Trying to win arguments with anyone is not really worth the time. Just give a little good information and then give them some time to come to grips with it. Later, give a little more information.

Generally speaking, having a conversation about Islam with more than one person isn't a good idea. As soon as there are two or more people you're talking to, a different dynamic occurs and it is harder to get through.

Judging people doesn't work. If you decide that everyone who doesn't listen to you is a fool, you will reach very few people. The only people who will listen to you are people who already agree with you, so you're wasting your breath. We spend considerable time trying to figure out why people don't want to listen, not just because it's interesting, but because having a different way of interpreting their reluctance to listen helps you feel differently toward them, which helps you get through to them.

Whenever we have tried to talk to someone while believing "He's an idiot," we have failed to change his mind. But when we come from the attitude of, "I used to feel exactly as you do, and I understand the difficulty of accepting it," getting through is a lot more likely.

Elsa: Do you have any last messages to others, about the truths that you see, and about holding out and speaking out in the face of many kinds of opposition?

CW: It's easy to get discouraged. If you feel discouraged, you should read the book, "[Learned Optimism](#)," by Martin Seligman, and use the material to prevent yourself from becoming disheartened by this work.

And we should all continually try to improve our ability to get through to people. Read "[How to Win Friends and Influence People](#)" by Dale Carnegie, and read our new book, "[Getting Through: How to Talk to Non-Muslims About the Disturbing Nature of Islam](#)" by Citizen Warrior. Study and practice. Let's get good at this, let's reach people and open their eyes, and let's win.

Elsa: Finally, are there any links you'd like to share with people?

CW: For sure.

<http://thereligionofpeace.com>

<http://politicalislam.com>

<http://citizenwarrior.com>

– our main blog

<http://citizenwarriors.com>

– tributes to heroes

<http://inquiryintoislam.com>

– to share with people who are skeptical

<http://whatyoucandoaboutislam.com>

– what ordinary citizens can do

<http://concess.blogspot.com>

– concessions Islam has wrested from the free world

