

This Is What Is Necessary to Win This War

Eighty-four people in France are dead this morning, killed by a Muslim truck driver named Mohamed, according to news reports. Although Mohamed was a known street thug and criminal, French authorities insist they had no indication that he had been radicalized. That's small comfort to the families of the latest victims of jihad.

According to The Religion of Peace website, in 2016 alone there has been a staggering total of 1,268 attacks in the name of Allah, in 50 different countries, leaving an unconscionable death toll of 11,664 and a casualty account of 14,087 injured.

Newt Gingrich's response is that we must test every Muslim in America. Those who believe in Sharia law need to be returned to their native land. In other words, if any Muslim comes to America and does not wish to fully assimilate, he needs to find another country to call home.

Newt is right about Sharia law. Sharia law is fundamentally contrary to every historic and classic American value and is diametrically opposed to the Constitution. In Sharia, there is absolutely no freedom of religion, no freedom of speech, no freedom of the press, no freedom of peaceable assembly, and no freedom to petition the government for the redress of grievances. There are no equal rights for women, and slavery is still alive and well in many Muslim countries around the world with the full approval of the Qur'an.

In other words, "Muslim-American" is an oxymoron. We should insist that in every case in which Muslim values clash with American values, the immigrant must choose American values and reject Muslim ones. If an immigrant wishes to remain a Muslim

first and an American second, then we should happily help him find the Muslim nation of his choice and help him and his family relocate. Most Americans will be happy to do so at taxpayer expense.

It is not a problem for an American to say he is a Christian first and an American second because this is a Christian nation founded on Judeo-Christian values. The more devout a Christian becomes, the more he will love America and the values on which it was founded. The stronger his Christian faith becomes, the more of a patriot he will be.

The reverse is true for someone of the Muslim faith. The values of his religion are fundamentally incompatible with American values, and the more devout he becomes in his Muslim faith, the more of a threat to our national security he becomes.

Major Nidal Hasan, who, in 2009, killed 13 soldiers at Fort Hood and wounded more than 30 others, is a case in point. He killed his fellow soldiers precisely because he was a Muslim first and an American second. He could not bear the thought of being part of a military that would send soldiers to Afghanistan to fight his fellow Muslims. And over a dozen Americans died as a result.

Can Muslim immigration be restricted constitutionally? Of course. The Constitution, in Article I, Section 8, gives unilateral authority to Congress to set whatever immigration parameters it wishes. While there is a ban on the use of a religious test to hold office in the federal government, there is no such prohibition with regard to immigration. Congress is free to prohibit immigration to those who represent a threat to our national security for any reason, religious or otherwise. It can constitutionally prohibit immigration to those who adhere to the ideology of Islam just as it still to this day prohibits immigration to those who adhere to the ideology of communism.

Is banning Muslim immigration a strong step to take? Yes. Is repatriating Muslims who refuse to assimilate a strong step? Yes. Are they necessary steps? Newt thinks they are, and I agree with him. If we don't want every city in America to become Nice, we have no time to lose.

Bryan Fischer *is host of the daily two-hour "Focal Point" program on American Family Radio.*