

Is America Being Set Up For an Arab Spring?

By WILLIAM J. FEDERER

In 1928, the Muslim Brotherhood was founded and began to infiltrate Middle East countries. In 2010, they helped coordinate Muslim fundamentalist groups to stage protests, riots, and uprisings in countries such as: Bahrain, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Morocco, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, and Mauritania.

They participated in overthrowing Tunisia's President Zine El Abidine Ben Ali; Egypt's President Hosni Mubarak; Libya's leader Muammar Gaddafi; and Yemen's President Ali Abdullah Saleh, as well as waged civil war against Syrian President Bashar al-Assad.

The Muslim Brotherhood strategy was twofold: *first* infiltrate the host country; *second* organize and overthrow its government. They modeled this after the two cities Mohammed lived in: Mecca and Medina.

In Mecca, Mohammed was a religious leader; in Medina, he transitioned into a political and military leader.

As Mohammed's life is called the sunna, or example, it is necessary to examine his transformation to fully understand those following him.

Mohammed was a religious leader in 610 AD in the pagan city of Mecca and only made 70 converts in 12 years. When he became confrontational, the Meccans drove him out for disturbing the peace. He attempted to go to the city of al-Taif, but they pelted him with rocks and chased him away.

With nowhere to go, Mohammed was a Muslim refugee.

In 622 AD, he fled 210 miles north to Medina, a city controlled by three Jewish tribes.

They let Mohammed in as a Muslim immigrant.

Mohammed lived in Medina's minority pagan neighborhood and began to organize the community, particularly among those who had grievances with the Jewish-controlled government.

He then pressured the Jews to accommodate him and his followers politically.

The Jews made a treaty with Mohammed, recognizing him as a political leader in addition to being a religious leader.

Back in Mecca, Mohammed's followers became confrontational and were chased out for disturbing the peace.

They were Muslim refugees. The Jews in Medina let them in as Muslim immigrants.

Mohammed allowed his followers to rob trade caravans headed to Mecca in retaliation for the Meccans driving them out.

This was in contrast to the example of Jesus, who taught: love your enemies; bless them that curse you; do good to those hate you; and if they take your coat, give them your shirt.

Mohammed taught, in essence, that if they take your house, you retaliate and take their caravan.

Mohammed had 300 warriors and they robbed caravans.

He received a whole chapter of the Qur'an, Sura 8, on how to distribute booty from robbing caravans. His portion was a fifth of the booty.

In 624 AD, the pagans of Mecca sent a thousand soldiers to escort and protect their caravans. Mohammed, with only 300 warriors, defeated them at the Battle of Badr.

This amazing victory, having been outnumbered 3 to 1, convinced Mohammed to be a military leader.

He fought in 66 battles and raids in the next eight years before he died, killing an estimated 3,000.

He even used the catapult when attacking the city of al-Taif.

William J. Federer is the author of 20 books, including George Washington Carver — His Life and Faith in His Own Words, America's God and Country: Encyclopedia of Quotations, The Faith of FDR, The Ten Commandments and Their Influence on American Law, and What Every American Needs to Know About the Quran: A History of Islam and the United States.

When he was told the catapult was hurling stones that were killing innocent women and children, Mohammed's response was "they are among them." In other words, they got to be killed too.

Today's suicide bombers, ISIS fighters, and Muslim Brotherhood members are striving to follow Mohammed's example: religiously, politically, and militarily.

The recent effort to split the religious side of Islam away from the political-military side is, in a sense, an effort to split Mohammed.

In America, there is freedom for all religions, but is Islam just a religion?

Alexis de Tocqueville wrote in *Democracy in America*, 1840:

"Mohammed ... put into the Koran not *religious* doctrines only, but *political* maxims, *criminal* and *civil* laws."

For example:

- The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees the government will not "prohibit the free exercise" of religion, yet Islamic Law imposes the death penalty for those who leave Islam, as Mohammed said "Whoever changes his Islamic religion, kill him." (Hadith Sahih al-Bukhari, Vol. 9, Book 84, No. 57).

- The Eighth Amendment states there shall be no "cruel and unusual punishments inflicted," yet the Qur'an states: "Cut off the hands of thieves" (Sura 5:38) and a woman who has been raped is also punished "with a hundred stripes." (Sura 24:2)

- The Thirteenth Amendment states there shall be no "slavery or involuntary servitude," yet the Qur'an accommodates slavery as Mohammed owned slaves.

- The Fourteenth Amendment guarantees citizens "equal protection of the laws," yet the Qur'an does not consider non-Muslims equal to Muslims.

Supreme Court Justice Robert Jackson wrote in the foreword of the book *Law in the Middle East* (1955): "Islamic law...of the Middle East is the antithesis of Western law."

If one sets aside the religious aspect of Islam and just compares it politically and militarily with other systems, one will see similarities.

In the last 70 years, what political-military systems had:

First, a goal of global conquest; and second in areas they conquered, non-adherents were not treated with equality?

During World War II, the attitude was, we love Germans but we have to stand against the political-military system of Nazism; we love Italians but we have to stand against Mussolini's Fascism; we love Japanese but we have to stand against Emperor Hirohito's Imperialism.

During the Cold War, the attitude was, we love Russians but we have to stand against the political-mil-

itary system of Communism; we love Chinese but we have to stand against Mao Zedong's Collectivism; we love Cambodians, but we have to stand against Pol Pot's killing fields.

Today, the understanding is, we love Arabs, Turks, Egyptians, Indonesians, Pakistanis, Somalis, and others, but we have to stand against the political-military system of fundamental Islam.

Why?

First, Islam has a goal of global conquest; and second, wherever Islam conquers, non-Muslims are not treated with equality.

What happened to the three tolerant Jewish tribes who let Mohammed into Medina?

The first Jewish tribe, Banu Qurayza, did something that offended Mohammed. He stirred his followers to suddenly break out into violence. They attacked the Banu Qurayza tribe, confiscated their property, and drove them out.

Then the second Jewish tribe, Banu Nadir, did something that offended Mohammed. He again stirred his followers into an outbreak of violence, attacked that tribe, confiscated their property, and drove them out.

This set a precedent in Islam called "hudna," which means, when you are weak make treaties until you are strong enough to disregard them.

Mohammed bottled Medina's third Jewish tribe, Banu Qurayza, in their neighborhood for 25 days. When they surrendered, Mohammed took them into the market, had some 700 men beheaded, and sold the women and children into slavery. He did keep one of the Jewish wives for himself, Rayhana.

Within five years of Mohammed immigrating into the Jewish city of Medina, there was not a Jew left in the city. They were driven out, killed, or enslaved.

Within five years of Mohammed's death, every pre-existing culture in Arabia was driven out.

It was a three-step process: Like Caesar's three steps: *veni, vidi, vici* ("I came, I saw, I conquered"), Mohammed's three steps were immigrate, increase, eliminate:

Immigrate as a religious refugee into the host-victim country by taking advantage of their tolerance, multiculturalism, diversity, and freedom of religion.

Then increase followers among disadvantaged minorities harboring grievances against the government and demand political accommodation.

Then finally eliminate the previous civilization with sudden outbreaks of militant violence.

A behavioral tactic utilized in this process is called "psychological projection," where the attacker blames the victim.

Though large numbers of Muslim immigrants simply want to live their lives under the laws of the country

they have moved into, fundamentalist Muslim Brotherhood types take advantage of the tolerance of host communities to move in and then accuse their hosts of being intolerant, thus justifying their violent retaliation and intolerance against them.

This political tactic of “blaming your opponent for what you are guilty of” was alluded to by David Axelrod, the President’s political adviser, in an NPR interview, April 19, 2010:

“In Chicago politics, we have a tradition where you throw a brick through your own campaign office window, then call a press conference to accuse your opponent.”

Psychological projection is used by bullies on playgrounds, wife-beaters, and, in international politics, by aggressor nations as a pretense for invasion. The Islamic apologist organization CAIR (Council on American-Islamic Relations) adeptly utilizes this tactic.

There are two sets of verses in the Qur’an. The verses Mohammed received in Mecca, which were relatively more peaceful as he was then just a religious leader; and the verses he received in Medina, which were political and militant.

The later verses supersede and abrogate the earlier verses.

By way of comparison, the Bible has some violence in the Old Testament; and in the New Testament, Jesus and the apostles never killed anyone.

What is the Christian saying: “WWJD”-What Would Jesus Do? In other words, the later more peaceful example is what devout Christians strive to imitate.

It is the same way in Islam, only in reverse. Their peaceful verses came first in Mecca, and these were superseded and abrogated by the later political-military verses received in Medina.

Islam is a religion of peace, but the Islamic definition of peace is different than that commonly understood among Westerners.

In the West, peace is achieved when different groups get along.

In Islam, peace is achieved when the world submits to the will of Allah.

To a fundamental Muslim, world peace means world Islam.

This is like Abraham Lincoln’s statement at the Sanitary Fair in Baltimore, Maryland, April 18, 1864: “We all declare for liberty, but in using the same word, we do not all mean the same thing.”

Muslim apologists explain that terrorist attacks are not true Islam, as Islam teaches that it is wrong to kill the innocent.

But fundamental Islam considers a person innocent only if they are a faithful follower of the way of Allah.

If they reject Islam or are an unbelieving infidel,

the Qur’an teaches:

“Allah loveth not those who reject Faith.” Sura 3:32

“Be ruthless to the infidels.” Sura 48:29

“Make war on the infidels.” Sura 9:123; 66:9

“Fight those who believe not in Allah.” Sura 9:29

“Kill the disbelievers wherever we find them.” Sura 2:191

When they say it is wrong to kill the innocent, it is code for, it is wrong to kill faithful Muslims.

To be fair, fundamental Muslims view non-violent moderate Muslims as having backslidden from the way of Allah, and they are just as motivated to kill them as they are to kill infidels.

In Islam, the world is divided in two: the half that has submitted to Allah, called the Dar al-Islam—the house of Islam; and the half that is in the process of submitting to Allah, called the Dar al-harb—the house of war.

The non-Muslim world is supposed to be at war as it is in the process of submitting.

The push for “democracy” in Muslim countries is always cleverly co-opted by fundamentalist Muslims into establishing “Shariah Law.”

Their ultimate goal is to set up a totalitarian Islamic mega-state called a “Caliphate.”

Moderate Muslims believe the Caliphate will be set up in the distant future, at the end of the world, or even figuratively. Fundamental Muslims, on the other hand, believe the Caliphate is to be set up now, and they are very motivated to make it happen.

The dilemma for the West is that the more it shows itself nice, accommodating, respectful, and careful not to offend, the more the moderate Muslims begin to rethink, saying, this has never happened before, and that maybe the world is, in fact, submitting to Allah now rather than later, and that the Caliphate is coming into existence before their eyes.

Moderate Muslims then migrate from the “future” non-violent mindset into the fundamental “it is happening now” mindset, which unfortunately is the more violent mindset.

This is called getting radicalized.

Fundamental Muslims view niceness as weakness, reaffirming their belief, that when your enemy shows weakness, that is Allah giving them to you.

Adding to this misunderstanding were the mixed signals given by President George W. Bush when he became:

- the first President to mention the Qur’an in an Inaugural Address, January 20, 2005;
- first to celebrate Muslim Ramadan in the White House, November 19, 2001;
- first to speak at an Islamic Center, December 5, 2002;

- first to issue an Islamic postage stamp, “Eid mubarak,” during his administration, August 1, 2001;
- first to appoint a Muslim U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, Zalmay Khalilzad, April 17, 2007, and
- first to put a Qur’an in the Presidential Library.

Nancy Pelosi was the first U.S. House Speaker to submit to Islamic Law by covering her head with a Hijab (veil) while visiting Syria, April 5, 2007.

Keith Ellison (D-MN 5th District) became the first Muslim Congressman to swear in upon a Qur’an. Andre Carson (D-IN 7th District) was the second.

On September 25, 2009, a thousand Muslims gathered on the Capital lawn to bow toward Mecca.

Barack Obama, whose father and stepfather were Muslim, became the first President with a Muslim name, Hussein.

In 2009, President Obama bowed to Saudi King Abdullah; said America is not a Christian nation; said America was one of the largest Muslim countries; chose not to publicly celebrate the National Day of Prayer but instead celebrated Ramadan with a White House dinner; broadcast a message to Muslims of the world; and appointed numerous devout Muslims to key government positions, including:

- Arif Alikhan and Kareem Shora to the Department of Homeland Security;
- Dalia Mogahed as a White House adviser;
- Rashad Hussain as U.S. Special Envoy to the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (more on this below);
- Mohammed Elibiary a senior member of the Department of Homeland Security Advisory Council.

Others included in circles of national influence are: Salam al-Marayati, Imam Mohammed Magid, and Eboo Patel.

Additionally, rumors have circulated that the head of the CIA, John Brennan, converted to Islam; and that the President’s senior adviser, Iran-born Valerie Jarrett, is suspected to be a Muslim.

Another person of note is the Turkish expatriate, Fethullah Gulen, who is allowed to operate from an armed camp in Pennsylvania’s Poconos where he has directed the setting up of hundreds of taxpayer-funded Muslim schools across America.

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton led in executing the President’s initiatives, which empowered the Muslim Brotherhood in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, and Syria.

WND.com published an article May 13, 2016, titled “Persian Gulf sheikhs gave Clintons \$100 million”: “These regimes are buying access.... There are massive conflicts of interest.”

The U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, written with the help of Eleanor Roosevelt, was adopted by the U.N. General Assembly, December 8, 1948.

Though neglecting to reference the “Creator” as the source of rights like the Declaration of Independence, the Declaration did include articles such as:

“Article 18. Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief.”

This conflicted with Islamic Sharia law, which imposes the death penalty for anyone leaving Islam.

Over time, leaders of 57 Islamic countries formed their own group called the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, or OIC.

In 1990, OIC passed the Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam, affirming Shariah law as supreme, with:

- the death penalty for those leaving Islam;
- allowing men to be polygamous;
- permitting wife beating;
- punishing women who are victims of rape; and
- censoring speech insulting Islam.

On December 12, 2011, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton began a three-day, closed-door meeting with the OIC, promising to support their Istanbul Process to universally “criminalize” speech insulting Islam.

By definition, the Christian Gospel or saying Jerusalem is the capital of Israel insults Islam.

In fact, all speech contrary to Islam insults Islam.

What the OIC effectively wanted was to have the United Nations enforce “dhimmi” status on non-Muslims worldwide.

At the end of the meeting, OIC Secretary General Ekmeleddin Ihsanoglu remarked: “The Istanbul Process initiated with Secretary of State Hillary Clinton...must be carried forward.”

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton responded: “We now need to move to implementation.”

In the following months, Hillary Clinton’s State Department denied repeated requests by Ambassador Chris Stevens for security.

On September 11, 2012, he was killed with three other Americans in the Benghazi attack.

Immediately, Secretary Clinton’s State Department blamed a video, and sent memos to YouTube and Google recommending they censor speech insulting Islam, consistent with her promises made at the OIC Istanbul Process meeting.

U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Susan Rice added to this narrative, as did President Obama when he told the U.N. General Assembly, September 25, 2012: “The future must not belong to those who slander the prophet of Islam.”

It was then uncovered that the Benghazi attack had nothing to do with a video, and that U.S. weapons were used to oust Libya’s President Gaddafi.

Requests made by Judicial Watch through the

Freedom of Information Act revealed emails of weapons being moved from Benghazi in a “Fast and Furious” gun-running operation to arm fundamentalist Muslim fighters to oust Syria’s President Assad.

This is part of the larger plan to remove all the current moderate Middle Eastern leaders in order to reestablish the Caliphate.



Ambassador Chris Stevens

When Russia came to Assad’s defense, Muslims armed and trained by the U.S. attacked into Syria and Iraq, calling themselves ISIS, and proceeded to torture, rape, behead, and displace hundreds of thousands, in what Secretary of State John Kerry declared was “a genocide.”

President Obama exacerbated the crisis in 2014 by reducing U.S. support of moderate leaders and by pulling troops out of Iraq and Afghanistan to leave a power vacuum.

In exchange for Army defector Sgt. Bowe Bergdahl, the U.S. released five senior Afghan Taliban commanders who, according to a 2008 Pentagon dossier, were capable of leading Muslim fighters in the Middle East and in America: Mullah Mohammad Fazl, Mullah Norullah Noori, Abdul Haq Wasiq, Khairullah Khairkhwa, and Mohammed Nabi Omari.

Since the Benghazi attack, over a quarter of a million have been killed in Syria and Iraq by fundamentalist Muslim ISIS fighters.

Retired Gen. Wesley Clark reported on CNN’s “The Lead” with Jake Tapper, August 25, 2014, that ISIS is supported by U.S. allies of the Arab Gulf, including Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Turkey.

Reuters reported July 14, 2014, the U.S. is selling to Qatar \$11 billion of Apache attack helicopters and Patriot and Javelin air-defense systems.

Fundamentalist Muslims have employed the use of different names: Wahhabi; al-Qaeda; Taliban; Muslim Brotherhood; ISIS; ISIL; Syrian rebels; etc.

This is consistent with what political organizer Saul Alinsky recommended, constantly changing tactics to keep opponents off-balance. Though using different names, these groups are united in the same ultimate goal of re-establishing the Caliphate.

Concern exists that any support the U.S. may send will be diverted into the hands of ISIS fighters operating under another name, and be used to remove Assad in the quest to re-establish the Caliphate.

Gen. Thomas McInerney stated in a Fox News interview, September 4, 2014: “We backed I believe, in some cases, some of the wrong people and not in the right part of the Free Syrian Army, and that’s a little confusing to people, so I’ve always maintained...that we were backing the wrong types... Some of those weapons from Benghazi ended up in the hands of ISIS — so we helped build ISIS. Now there is a danger there.”

Senator Rand Paul told Erin Burnett in a CNN interview in May 9, 2013:

I’ve actually always suspected that, although I have no evidence, that maybe we were facilitating arms leaving Libya going through Turkey into Syria... I have never quite understood the cover-up — if it was intentional or incompetence... Were they trying to obscure that there was an arms operation going on at the CIA annex?...

I’m a little curious when employees of the State Department are told by government officials they shouldn’t testify and then they are sort of sequestered and kept away from testimony, so I think there may be more to this.

In June of 2014, reporter Aaron Klein of WND.com was told by Jordanian officials:

Dozens of future ISIS members were trained at the time as part of covert aid to the insurgents targeting the regime of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad in Syria... (They) were trained in 2012 by U.S. instructors working at a secret base in Jordan...

The officials said dozens of future ISIS members were trained at the time as part of covert aid to the insurgents targeting the regime of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad in Syria. The Jordanian officials said...ISIS members...received U.S. training to fight in Syria.

German journalist Manuel Ochsenteiter explained to RT.com, August 21, 2014, how the U.S. is supporting ISIS:

In order to fight against the Islamic State in a successful way the West needs to sanction and punish all those powers that are supporting the Islamic State, namely Turkey and the Gulf states... We have to see the Islamic State terrorists as a Western-created monster...

The Islamic State would not exist without the fierce Western help and also the support by the Arabic Gulf States, as well as the support from Turkey... Nobody was talking about Christian and Yazidis minorities are given the choice: convert to Islam or die, or pay the exorbitant dhimmi jizyah tax.

Hundreds of thousands of Christians fled. ISIS destroyed hundreds of Christian churches in Syria and Iraq, such as the ancient 1,800-year-old church in Mosul.

Since the first invasion by Islam in 634 AD, the Assyrian Church of the East, the Syriac Orthodox Church, the Syriac Catholic Church, the Maronite Church, and the Chaldean Catholic Church, quietly suffered 33 major genocides, averaging one every 40 years.

The recent War on Terror and the current "Arab Spring" has renewed the persecution.

As reported by CNSnews.com, the Patriarch of Antioch, Gregory III, who oversees the 1.6 million members of the Melkite Greek Catholic Church in Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, Jordan, Israel, Palestinian territories, and Sudan, stated:

Who created this hell in which our people have been living for months?... Every day, Islamic extremists from all over the world are pouring into Syria with the sole intent to kill and not one country has done anything to stop them...

For the last two and a half years, Eastern and Western countries have not stopped sending weapons, money, military experts, secret service agents, and Salafist fundamentalist armed gangs of thugs and criminals, who have fallen on Syria like a destructive new flood.

The Chaldean Catholic Church comprises an estimated 500,000 ethnic Assyrians in northeast Syria, northern Iraq, and areas bordering southeast Turkey and northwest Iran.

Chaldean Catholic Church Patriarch Louis Sako stated in September 2014, when asked by reporters at Beirut's airport about remarks attributed to him in the daily Ad-Diyar in which he accused the U.S. of supporting ISIS:

The U.S. is indirectly responsible for what is going on in Iraq... Our Muslim neighbors did not help us... Issuing a fatwa preventing

Muslims from killing fellow Muslims is not enough... For the first time in the history of Iraq, Mosul is now empty of Christians.

The Western World's tolerance of Islam has not resulted in Muslim's being more tolerant of non-Muslims.

On the contrary, it has emboldened some moderate Muslims to become fundamentalist by convincing them that their long-awaited desire of the West submitting to Allah is imminent.

The British newspaper *Daily Mail* (Associated Newspapers, Ltd., www.dailymail.co.uk) published an article titled "Multi-culturalism drives young Muslims to shun British values," January 29, 2007:

Multi-culturalism has alienated an entire generation of young Muslims and made them increasingly radical... In contrast with their parents, growing numbers sympathize with extreme teachings of Islam, with almost four in ten wanting to live under Shariah law in Britain.

The study identifies significant support for wearing the veil in public, Islamic schools, and even punishment by death for Muslims who convert to another religion. Most alarmingly, 13 per cent of young Muslims said they 'admired' organizations such as Al Qaeda which are prepared to 'fight the West.'

The poll exposes a fracture between the attitudes of Muslims aged 16 to 24, most of whom were born in Britain, and those of their parents' generation, who are more likely to have been immigrants.

A report published alongside the poll, commissioned by the think tank Policy Exchange and carried out by Populus, said the doctrine of multi-culturalism was at least partly responsible ... Labor ministers have broken recently with the idea that different communities should not be forced to integrate but should be allowed to maintain their own culture and identities.

Trevor Phillips, head of the Commission for Racial Equality, and Dr. John Sentamu, the Archbishop of York, have also expressed serious doubts about multi-culturalism.

Academic Munira Mirza, lead author of the report, said:

The emergence of a strong Muslim identity in Britain is, in part, a result of multicultural policies implemented since the 1980s which have emphasized difference at the expense

of shared national identity and divided people along ethnic, religious, and cultural lines. (See Telegraph.co.uk article, “Extremism flourished as UK lost Christianity” by Michael Nazir-Ali, January 1, 2008)

Gerard Batten, Member of the European Parliament from the UK Independence Party, addressed the European Parliament, February 14, 2007:

Mr. President... The free democratic world is not engaged in a war on terrorism. This is a misconception repeated in this report. We are engaged in a war on ideology — a war we did not start. The ideology is that of fundamentalist and extreme Islam, an ideology without any humanitarian or civilized constraint.

A sign held up by a Muslim demonstration in Dearborn, Michigan, read “We will use the freedoms of the Constitution to destroy the Constitution!” (Dr. Irwin Lutzer, *The Cross in the Shadow of the Crescent*, 2013).

This is similar to what Muslim organizer Anjem Choudary of Islam4UK declared in the *London Daily Express*, October 15, 2009:

We have had enough of democracy and man-made law... We will call for a complete upheaval of the British ruling system... and demand full implementation of Shariah in Britain.

President Eisenhower warned in *Time* magazine, October 13, 1952:

The Bill of Rights contains no grant of privilege for a group of people to destroy the Bill of Rights. A group...dedicated to the ultimate destruction of all civil liberties, cannot be allowed to claim civil liberties as its privileged sanctuary from which to carry on subversion of the Government.

Franklin D. Roosevelt addressed the subject of Nazi terrorist agents, December 29, 1940:

There are also American citizens, many of them in high places, who, unwittingly in most cases, are aiding and abetting the work of these agents. I do not charge these American citizens with being foreign agents, but I do charge them with doing exactly the kind of work that the dictators want done in the United States.

FOX News’ Joseph Abrams reported January 9, 2009:

Minnesota Rep. Keith Ellison’s groundbreaking pilgrimage to Mecca last month was paid for by an American Muslim organization that has ties to Islamic radicals and is ‘the Mus-

lim equivalent of the neo-Nazi party... It is the de facto arm of the Muslim Brotherhood in the U.S.’ said Steve Emerson, director of the Investigative Project on Terrorism.

Should America be concerned with a growing population having “a passionate attachment” to what could be considered a foreign influence?

As Islam is not just a religion, but also a political and military system, could a Muslim’s bowing five times a day be the equivalent of pledging allegiance to Mecca?

Does it affect a Muslim’s loyalty to America to have one of Islam’s five pillars be the Hajj, a pilgrimage once in their life to a city in Saudi Arabia?

Is America being set up for an Arab Spring?

Hugo Chavez reportedly brought large numbers of Iranian terrorists over from the Middle East, who learned Spanish, migrated north, and infiltrated drug gangs.

These make up many of the OTM’s (Other Than Mexicans) who are crossing America’s southern border. Promises to stop them has made one Presidential candidate very popular.

Un-vetted Syrian refugees, many suspected of being ISIS and Muslim Brotherhood members, are being brought into America and sent to cities without the knowledge or permission of local citizens.

This raises significant questions as to whose agenda is being implemented and why?

Most are aware that the riots in Ferguson, Missouri, were orchestrated by political organizers, as were the riots in Baltimore.

Afterwards, the decision was made that the local police departments were inadequate and needed to be federalized in a “Strong Cities Initiative,” an innocuous term for giving the President a standing army.

When one studies the tactics of Machiavelli, Hegel, and Alinsky it becomes clear that there must be a crisis before the government forces can claim an excuse to usurp power.

This has traditionally been accomplished with agent provocateurs, (provoking agents), community organizers, labor organizers, agitators.

Could some of these Syrian immigrants be part of an orchestrated Arab Spring across America, maybe even before the next election?

Will it be serious enough for someone to ask the President to declare a national emergency and use his “Strong Cities Initiative” to enforce martial law, assuming dictatorial powers?

Is America being set up for an Arab Spring? It is sincerely hoped that this will not be the case and that the details cited above are just innocent misinterpretations of coincidental facts. But on the other hand, there is an old adage: “forewarned is forearmed.” ■