

Ayaan Hirsi Ali

Stockholm the 15th of January, 2009

First, I would like to congratulate Per Ahlmark on his 70th birthday. I cannot think of a better celebration of that landmark age than in a reflection on democracy and where it stands today. Per devoted all his life trying to understand democracy. He worked in it and he is tireless in defending it.

The title of this seminar, “The Victory and Crisis of Democracy,” is seemingly neutral. I suspect, behind this academic title is a deep concern, maybe even fear that democracy in the West, especially in Europe, is in a crisis. If I were to come to Holland, Sweden, or the US today instead some years ago, I would be just as surprised as I was then at how peaceful, prosperous, and optimistic the West is. I would be impressed by the clean streets, by the beautifully landscaped cities, by the cars parked outside well ordered homes, by the interaction of men and women in such a self-evident way. I would be even more impressed, if I stayed longer, in the way elections are conducted in Western countries. Confrontation between different parties and interest groups is intense, and is carried out publicly. Political rivals and their supporters can say whatever they like to each other and about each other, and as the conflict escalates, it gets its climax in the ballot box - and nowadays, ballot machines. That, if you come from Africa or Asia or the Middle East, is impressive, surprising and at face value, can only lead one to think that in the West, there is no crisis of democracy.

Democratic notions, the rule of law, the idea of freedom, the idea of equality, the idea of compromise - these are deeply ingrained values in Europeans and Americans.

Or are they? How deeply ingrained these values are in European leaders and citizens was put to the test by the Nazis and the Fascists. Even though, in the 1930s, European leaders waited too long to fight for democracy, and America got involved later than was appropriate, democracy triumphed. The West was tested once again by Stalin and the establishment of the Iron Curtain. And even though big mistakes were made, the West stood by its values, defended them, and once again, democracy triumphed. In good times and in bad times, democratic states are challenged. And the challenges can vary from economic crisis to natural disasters, from intolerant minorities and a risk of class differences when some become too rich and others too poor. All of that is just part of the natural fabric of democracy.

Today, the Western democracies are faced with a new and insidious enemy. Today, Western society is faced with the challenge of an interplay between Islamic fundamentalism and moral relativism. It is important to point out that there is Christian fundamentalism and Jewish fundamentalism present in the West. It is also important that Nazism and Fascism have not been eradicated. In some places there is even a revival of Communism. Agents of collectivist ideas have plagued the West since 1945 and will continue to do so.

What is it that makes the agents of Islamic fundamentalism different - Are they more evil, more destructive, and so much more of a threat than all these other collectivist and utopian dogmas? The answer lies in the reaction from the West to the Islamic utopia. The moral relativism that we see in response to Islamic fundamentalism is more profound than the reaction to the other fundamentalisms. Everywhere you will find laws, organizations, newspapers, universities and action groups whose purpose is to be vigilant against skinheads, against the rise of bigotry, against Christian fundamentalism. One can openly discuss and combat these evil networks, infiltrate them, research them, publish about them, prosecute them and educate the young on the consequences of buying into their ideas. Radical Islam enjoys a respect and an opportunity to go unchecked. Radical Muslim organizations in the West develop their ideas, publish them and preach them openly. They have schools and mosques and charities. They have public relations bureaus and enjoy legal aide. They pedal their ideology of intolerance, of us versus them, of Jewish hatred, of misogyny, in the name of religion and in the name of a religious minority.

What these wealthy agents of Islam do is target vulnerable communities that are poor and that have escaped the tyranny of Islamic societies into the West. They target them and label them their natural constituencies. Imams and Mullahs in Western suits proclaim themselves to be representatives of these so-called Muslim communities. They seek to segregate those communities, and in their isolation, indoctrinate them with the utopia of seeking global Islamic dominance.

Secular, liberal, democratic leaders first reacted by ignoring this creeping Shariaization, and then by underestimating it. The rise of Islamic fundamentalism

was seriously acknowledged only after a series of terrorist attacks, first, in America, then in Europe. The reaction to these attacks in itself was relativist. President George Bush's speech after the 11th of September 2001 was a declaration that Islam is peace. European leaders followed suit. The strategy of the Western leaders was understandable. Only a small group of perpetrators had committed the horrible acts of terrorism. It would be immoral and impractical to suggest that 1.2 billion Muslims in the world are potential terrorists. It would be wrong to persecute Muslims because of the act of a handful of men. From a democratic political leader's perspective, it was a good and principled way to protect Muslim minorities from anger and bigotry from the wider society. But to call Islam peace was to ignore the basic principles of that doctrine. It was to ignore how those principles are radically different from the principles of democracy. It was to ignore the successful campaign of indoctrination of large groups of Muslims scattered around the globe; a campaign that had been going on for a long time. It was a relativist reaction, and that moral relativism that concludes that - Islam is peace; Democracy is peace, therefore, Islam is equal to democracy and democracy is equal to Islam. Until today, that position and its implications give the agents of Islam, especially its political and social dimension a breathtaking opportunity to go on schooling people in their ideas and it's an opportunity that Christian fundamentalism, Nazis, Fascists, Communists and the mafia do not enjoy.

Multiculturalism and moral relativism is stronger in Europe than it is in America. America has a constitution based on values that are easy to define and an immigrant in America can apply for naturalization but will get it only if, among other criteria, he pledges political allegiance to the Constitution and he promises not to be loyal to another foreign power. American relativists may condemn the activities of the White House and, like Noam Chomsky, accuse America of being evil and capitalist and portray the rest of the world as victims of America. Radical Muslims in America try as much as they can to find an opportunity to infiltrate and destroy the US from within, but this clear Constitution makes it hard for the relativists and the radical Muslims to gain a strong foothold in America.

Europe is different. There is no consensus in Europe on what European values are. There are no demands of immigrants to swear allegiance to the various crowns. Last year, in October, the American Enterprise Institute hosted a three-day

conference for European academics, judges, intellectuals and journalists on citizenship and its meaning . I got into a discussion with a German editor of *Die Zeit*. I proposed that citizenship be defined clearly for immigrants, and the principles of democracy - all of them, not just holding elections, but freedom of conscience, freedom of expression, tolerance, and equality between men and women, equality between gays and heterosexuals, etc. Understanding that and rearing children with these values should be conditional to giving citizenship.

The German journalist mocked me and asked, “What does it mean to be German? Do you want us to tell our immigrants that becoming a citizen is conditional to drinking beer and eating sausages?” This is the mentality here. His reaction is very familiar to me. Some of my Dutch opponents used to challenge me, “What do you want us to ask of our Muslim immigrants? Do you want them to walk on wooden shoes and eat cheese?” Even some of the French who are supposed to be staunch Republicans are uncertain about what it is to be French. Is being French all about eating frogs and snails, and washing it down with red wine? Is there nothing more to being French? My dear Swedish friends, when you debate in Parliament about who to include into the Swedish society, is the first thing that comes to your mind eating fish? Perhaps for the Danes, citizenship means drawing cartoons?

At first, I was amused with this trivialization of citizenship, but now I’m deeply concerned that Europeans have lost sense of what it is to be democracies and why democratic values should be defended. The generations born after 1945, especially in North Europe, are like some third generations of family businesses that are doing poorly. Take any family business. The first generation of the family built the business. The second generation works hard to expand the business and still remembers what it was like to have been poor and to struggle to be successful. The third generation is born into financial security. Pretty soon, they lose focus, overspend and if you ask them what is the mission statement of their business, they vaguely know what it was all about. Soon enough, they are taken over. That takeover can be hostile, but it can be perfectly friendly too.

Watching some of the European leadership, who were born into peace, democracy, and progress, they find it difficult to agree on what their values are. This gives the agents of radical Islam a wonderful opportunity. They have clear goals. They have

the resources, the determination. They have developed strategies that work well and they sense the confusion and insecurity among Europeans on what their own values are. So they push and prod and preach and intimidate. They ask, “Integrate into German society? Do you want me to drink beer and eat sausages?” Using the argument that the mindless relativist provided them.

The morality behind the veil is not discussed. If, and when, Islam’s treatment of women is put on any agenda, what is discussed is whether to cover the face or not; whether wearing the veil is a security matter, or whether it is a religious matter. In Muslim schools, the hearts and minds of young children are manipulated into distancing themselves from the Infidel, they are filled with anti-Jewish propaganda, boys and girls are separated. The result is a generation of children born in Europe who hold European citizenships but who are ignorant, hostile, xenophobic and alienated from their fellow countrymen. In every European country where there are Muslim schools, the debate has been stifled by the relativist dogma that if you allow Jewish schools and Christian schools, then you must be fair and permit Islamic schools.
End of debate!

The point is, the agents of Islamic fundamentalism continue to chip away at the building blocks of European democracies and the relativists, - useful fools - always change the subject.

What can be done to reverse this crisis of democracy? What have we learned from the years between the first and the second world wars? How can attitudes of complacency and appeasement be changed? Perhaps the first step is to define clearly what democracy is so that every European can be self-assured enough about the values of democracy – the rule of law, freedom of expression, freedom of conscience, free press.

Ladies and gentlemen, think about the following question. Are you willing to fight and risk death for your country to safeguard your democratic institutions? If your answer is no, then the radical fundamentalists have won, because they are willing to die for their creed. Are you willing to demand from an immigrant that when he applies for citizenship it’s clear to him he must be willing to die and sacrifice his

property for the society that he wants to belong to? If that's not the case, then the Muslim fundamentalists win, because they are willing to kill and die for their creed. This sounds dramatic, but unless Europe is prepared to defend the values of freedom to the end, then unfortunately the future looks very somber. The relativist will feign shock at these questions and deny that we live in circumstances where these questions are relevant. He will change the subject. To those who do not view themselves as relativists; to those who are proud to be democrats it is time to compete.