Islam: Gateway to Terrorism

By Jean-Georges Estiot

This booklet has been created to encourage open discussion, thoughtful study and careful critical enquiry. It is intended as a resource that invites readers to question, reflect and explore ideas deeply, rather than accept them without consideration. Permission is given to reproduce the content of this booklet for any purpose.

My email is jgestiot@gmail.com and your feedback is welcome.

The elephant in the room

For decades, the Western world has bent over backwards to avoid saying the obvious. A global pattern of religious violence exists, and Islam is at the centre of it. Not because Muslims are inherently violent. No one is born with a bomb strapped to their chest. But because a set of sacred texts, believed by over a billion people to be the literal word of God, contains passages that are blood-soaked, intolerant, and open to interpretation by anyone with a grievance and a gun. This is the elephant in the room. It stomps through every debate on terrorism, crushes every attempt at polite evasion, and sits squarely on the chests of those who try to pretend Islam is just another peaceful religion hijacked by extremists.

The phrase "not all Muslims" is repeated like a holy chant, and indeed, not all Muslims are violent. But the problem is not who follows the religion. It is what the religion actually says. Unlike Christianity, which has been weakened over centuries by secularism and reform, Islam remains a time capsule of seventh-century conquest fused with modern technology and geopolitics. And when you treat a seventh-century war manual as a timeless moral compass, you do not get peace. You get jihad. You get suicide bombings. You get fatwas calling for murder. You get medieval punishments enforced with digital precision.

Western leaders have gone out of their way to assure us that Islam means peace. Apparently, if you squint hard enough at the word "Islam", it resembles "salaam", meaning peace in Arabic. But words are cheap. More important are actions. The actions carried out in the name of Islam, from the massacres of Yazidis by ISIS, to the murder of cartoonists in Paris, to the grooming gangs in Britain, all point to something far darker. These are not misinterpretations. They are not distortions. They are faithful executions of scripture, taken seriously and literally, as billions are told they should.

The moral cowardice of Western institutions in confronting this is staggering. Journalists censor themselves. Academics twist into intellectual pretzels to avoid drawing the obvious lines between belief and behaviour. Politicians pretend the problem is poverty, or lack of education, or Western foreign policy. Anything except the texts themselves. And yet, the killers always cite the Quran. The bombers always shout "Allahu Akbar". The justifications always come with chapter and verse.

To challenge this is not to hate Muslims. It is to ask a basic question of any

ideology. What happens when its most committed followers do exactly what it says? If that leads to violence, oppression, and theocratic tyranny, then the ideology is the problem, not merely its followers. Islam is not immune from scrutiny simply because it is a religion. In fact, it demands more scrutiny precisely because it claims divine authority. That is a dangerous claim. One that must be interrogated, especially when it leads so often to carnage.

This booklet will not waste time in theological labyrinths or philosophical hand-waving. It will go straight to the source. The texts, the teachings, the examples set by Muhammad himself, and the modern attempts to live them out. It will examine the role of Sharia as a system of religious law that, in practice, often means barbarism codified. It will follow the trail from verse to violence, from faith to fanaticism. And it will do so without flinching.

It is time to talk about the elephant. It is time to stop pretending that all religions are equally benign, or that all interpretations are equally valid. Some ideas are dangerous. Some books inspire murder. Some prophets were warlords. And some religions, left unchecked, become blueprints for terror. Islam is not the only religion to produce violence. But in today's world, it is the one doing it most consistently, most globally, and most unapologetically. That is not prejudice. It is pattern. And it is time we said so.

The meaning of jihad

Jihad is one of those words that gets treated like a puzzle. Western politicians and Muslim spokespeople often tell us it means an inner struggle, like the effort to be a better person. They describe it as a peaceful idea, something spiritual and noble. But this is not how jihad has been understood throughout most of Islamic history, and it is certainly not how it is used by those who take up weapons in its name. When men blow themselves up in crowded markets or shoot up concert halls shouting "Allahu Akbar", they are not thinking about self-improvement. They are following a very different version of jihad. One that is loud, violent, and backed by centuries of tradition.

The word "jihad" comes from an Arabic root meaning "to struggle" or "to strive". That much is true. But the question is, struggle for what? The Quran and Hadith make this clear. Jihad is often described as a physical fight against non-believers. It is not a metaphor. It is not poetry. It is warfare, with rules for when and how to kill. Some

passages in the Quran speak about defending the faith, others go much further, calling for the spreading of Islam by force if needed. This is not hidden. It is repeated. And it is treated as a command.

From the earliest days of Islam, jihad was used to justify military conquest. Muhammad himself led armed campaigns. His followers expanded the Islamic empire through battle, not by handing out pamphlets. The idea that jihad is only about personal discipline is a modern invention, pushed mainly by people trying to protect Islam's image in the West. But history, scripture, and the actions of many Muslims over the centuries tell a different story. In Islamic law, jihad is classified in different ways, but the one that matters here is the one involving weapons. This is the jihad that fills the news. The one that turns religious belief into military action.

Terrorist groups like Al-Qaeda, Boko Haram, Hamas, and ISIS all use the word jihad to describe what they are doing. They quote the Quran. They issue fatwas. They list the same verses that have been used for centuries to encourage war in the name of Islam. These are not fringe ideas. They are drawn directly from accepted Islamic texts. And millions of Muslims around the world, while not joining the fight themselves, still believe that violent jihad can be justified under certain conditions. That alone should concern anyone who values peace.

Supporters of violent jihad do not invent their beliefs out of thin air. They follow a pattern. They look to Muhammad's example, because he is considered the perfect man in Islam. They look at the battles he fought, the people he killed or enslaved, and the rules he gave for how to treat enemies. Then they follow him. They are not disobeying Islam. They are acting on it. And because the religion has no central authority like a pope, anyone can claim to be following the true path. That is why jihad becomes so dangerous. It is not a private idea. It is a public licence for war, available to anyone who can read a few lines and wants to feel righteous while doing harm.

The Western effort to rebrand jihad as harmless is not just wrong, it is dishonest. It ignores history, scripture, and reality. It is part of a broader refusal to accept that some religious ideas are violent at their core. Peaceful Muslims may interpret jihad as a personal journey, and that is their right. But they are not the only ones reading the Quran. And their interpretation does not cancel out the others. Both exist. Both are based on the same texts. But only one leads to body parts in the street.

Understanding jihad means being honest about what the word means to those who act on it. It means accepting that a sacred struggle can be sacred and brutal at the

same time. It means facing the fact that religion, far from always bringing peace, can just as easily bring war. And it means finally admitting that for many, jihad is not about self-control. It is about control of others, with blood if needed.

The religion of peace

When people say Islam is a religion of peace, they are not quoting the Quran. They are quoting press releases. The Quran is not a peaceful book. Nor is it vague or difficult to understand on this point. It is filled with instructions about how to deal with non-believers, apostates, critics, and enemies, and those instructions are often violent. The Hadith, which records the sayings and actions of Muhammad, adds even more. Together, these texts form the backbone of Islamic teaching. And they read more like a military manual than a spiritual guide.

The Quran contains verses that tell Muslims to fight until Islam dominates. It orders believers to strike the necks of unbelievers, to kill them wherever they are found, to wage war until all worship is directed only to Allah. These are not buried in obscure chapters. They are repeated throughout the book. Yes, there are also verses about mercy and forgiveness, but the violent ones are not cancelled out. In fact, Islamic scholars follow a rule called abrogation, which means later verses can override earlier ones. And the later verses tend to be the more violent ones, written after Muhammad had built his army and started conquering. So the message gets stronger, not softer, as the book goes on.

The Hadith is even more direct. It tells Muslims not only what to believe, but how to act. It includes instructions for killing apostates, for punishing thieves, for treating women as property, and for waging jihad. These are not just old stories. They are examples of ideal behaviour. Muhammad is considered the perfect man, and what he did is seen as what all good Muslims should do. So when the Hadith records him ordering assassinations, fighting battles, or taking captives, those actions become models to follow.

None of this is accidental. The Quran does not speak in riddles. It tells Muslims they are the best of people, chosen to lead the world, and that unbelievers are the worst of creatures. It divides humanity into two camps: believers, who are rewarded, and unbelievers, who are warned, threatened, and eventually attacked. The call to violence is not just allowed. It is encouraged. And those who die while fighting are

promised the highest rewards in paradise. This is not moderation. It is a system of rewards for killing the right targets.

Defenders of Islam often say the violent verses are only meant for times of war, and that they must be read in context. But the context of the Quran is war. Muhammad spent much of his prophetic career in conflict, first defending himself, then expanding his power. The text reflects that. It was not written in a vacuum. It was shaped by raids, battles, treaties, and betrayals. It is filled with stories of enemies being defeated, rules for dividing spoils, and threats against anyone who resists. The context is not peace. It is conquest.

The idea that you can reinterpret these texts into messages of tolerance is absurd. You can reinterpret anything if you try hard enough. But the words remain. The calls to violence are still there, as they have been for over a thousand years. They are read in madrasas, shouted in sermons, carved into walls, and printed on flags. They are used to justify actions that no civilised society would accept. Beheadings, stonings, lashings, honour killings, suicide bombings. All done by people who say they are simply following what the book says.

And in many ways, they are. Because the book does say these things. The Hadith does record these acts. The problem is not that extremists are twisting Islam. The problem is that they are taking it seriously. They are not modernising or interpreting. They are obeying.

If a book contains messages that can lead people to kill, then it must be questioned. If a religion says its founder led armies and ordered deaths, then it must be examined. And if its sacred texts reward violence with paradise, then no amount of whitewashing can hide the danger. These texts are not peaceful. They are not neutral. They are violent. And they are the source from which terrorism drinks.

Muhammad the warlord

In most religions, the founder is remembered as a figure of peace or enlightenment. Jesus turned the other cheek. Buddha sat in silence. But Muhammad, the central figure of Islam, was not a man of peace. He was a man of war. He led armies, raided caravans, ordered assassinations, and built a state through conquest. This is not a smear. It is Islamic history. And it is not denied by Muslim scholars, who accept his role as both prophet and military leader. In fact, they honour it. They teach it. And that is where the trouble begins.

Muhammad started preaching in Mecca, where he faced ridicule and rejection. But everything changed after his move to Medina. There, he built alliances, gained followers, and began using violence to spread his influence. He authorised raids on Meccan caravans, justifying them as divine punishment. These were not defensive actions. They were calculated attacks on trade routes. The profits from these raids were shared among his followers, along with captives, some of whom were turned into slaves. This was the foundation of his growing power.

As his following increased, so did his aggression. The Battle of Badr was a key moment, where a smaller Muslim force defeated a larger Meccan army. It was seen as a sign of divine favour. After that, Muhammad became more confident. He began to demand submission, not just belief. Tribes that resisted him were attacked. Those who surrendered were often spared, but only if they accepted Islam or paid tribute. This was not spiritual persuasion. It was military dominance. Religion came with a sword.

The examples are many. The Jewish tribes of Medina, who had once made treaties with Muhammad, were later expelled or slaughtered. The Banu Qurayza, one such tribe, were accused of betrayal. After a siege, the men were separated from the women and children. The men, reportedly between 600 and 900, were executed in a mass beheading. Muhammad approved it. In fact, he is said to have personally helped with the process. The women and children were taken as slaves. These were not metaphors or parables. They were acts of war.

Muhammad also ordered the killing of critics. Poets who mocked him were assassinated. Those who opposed him were silenced. This is not the behaviour of a spiritual leader who values freedom of speech or thought. It is the behaviour of a man building a theocratic state, where disagreement is a threat to be removed. And because Muhammad is held up as the perfect man in Islam, everything he did is seen as not just acceptable, but ideal. That includes war, conquest, and punishment.

This creates a serious problem. In Islam, you are supposed to follow Muhammad's example in all things. If he married young girls, then so can you. If he raided enemies, then so should you. If he killed apostates and critics, then that too is justified. Nothing is off limits, because everything he did is considered holy. This means Islam is not just a religion. It is a blueprint for total life control, including how to deal with enemies. And the answer, again and again, is force.

Muslim apologists often try to soften this by saying Muhammad only fought in self-

defence. But the record shows otherwise. He attacked caravans. He initiated sieges. He sent letters to rulers demanding they convert or face consequences. That is not defence. That is expansion. And it is how Islam spread across the Middle East, North Africa, and beyond. Not through gentle persuasion, but through battle and submission.

This is the man at the heart of Islam. Not a mystic on a mountain, but a general with a sword. Not a symbol of peace, but a commander of armies. And because his actions are preserved and praised in the Quran and Hadith, they continue to inspire. Not just faith, but warfare. Not just belief, but bloodshed.

Understanding Muhammad is essential to understanding Islamic violence. He was not hijacked by extremists. He was their model. And they are following him with deadly accuracy.

Justifying terror

Terrorism in the name of Islam is not an accident. It is not a misfire. It is the result of a system that allows murder to be recast as martyrdom and mass killing to be framed as divine justice. When jihadists strike, they do not hide their motives. They speak clearly, quoting the Quran, citing the Hadith, and invoking the life of Muhammad. These are not atheists with mental problems or criminals seeking profit. They are believers, and they believe they are doing exactly what God wants.

Before every major act of Islamic terror, there is always a message. Sometimes it is a video, sometimes a manifesto, often it is a simple declaration. The 9/11 hijackers left behind letters explaining their actions. They spoke of cleansing the world of unbelief, of striking the enemies of Islam, of securing a place in paradise. The London bombers did the same. So did the Paris attackers, the Madrid train bombers, the Bali bombers, and countless others. They saw themselves not as murderers, but as soldiers of God. And the proof they offered came straight from their own religion.

Verses from the Quran are cited repeatedly in these declarations. "Kill them wherever you find them." "Strike at their necks." "Fight those who do not believe in Allah." These are not taken from obscure or disputed texts. They are core parts of Islamic scripture. And they are read literally by those who commit acts of terror. The same applies to the Hadith, which is filled with examples of Muhammad punishing enemies, fighting non-believers, and promising paradise to those who die in battle for the faith.

This is why groups like Al-Qaeda and ISIS always wrap their violence in scripture. It gives them moral cover. It allows them to see their actions as noble. It lets them turn planes into bombs and crowds into targets, all in the belief that they are serving something higher. And because their actions are framed as religious, they attract others. Not just from war zones, but from peaceful cities. From London, Sydney, Toronto, and Brussels, young Muslims have left their homes to join Islamic terror groups. They were not forced. They were convinced. By sermons, by scriptures, by stories of glory in the afterlife.

Martyrdom is a powerful idea in Islam. Those who die in battle for the faith are promised immediate entry into paradise. They are told their sins will be forgiven, that they will be honoured, that they will be rewarded. This is not a fringe belief. It is taught, preached, and celebrated. And it is what allows a man to strap explosives to his chest and walk into a market. He does not see a suicide mission. He sees a fast track to eternal reward. His victims are not innocent. They are enemies of God. And killing them is, in his mind, a holy act.

Islamic terrorism is not driven by politics alone. It is powered by belief. A belief that the world must be made to submit. That unbelievers are an obstacle to be removed. That violence is not only allowed, but required. And this belief does not come from nowhere. It comes from the texts, the teachings, and the example of Muhammad.

It is worth asking what kind of system turns murderers into martyrs. What kind of book offers paradise for slaughter. What kind of moral logic celebrates the deaths of strangers because they worship differently. These are not just questions of theology. They are questions of safety, of civilisation, of truth.

To defeat Islamic terror, you must understand what fuels it. Not just poverty or war, but certainty. The certainty that killing in God's name is right. The certainty that scripture supports it. The certainty that death is a gateway, not an end. Until that certainty is broken, the killings will continue. And no amount of candlelight vigils or hashtags will change that.

Terrorism in the name of Islam is not a corruption of the religion. It is a consequence of taking it seriously. That is the uncomfortable truth. And it is one the world must face.

❖

The apologists

When a terrorist attack occurs and the blood is still drying on the pavement, there is always a rush. Not by the killers, but by the defenders. Not of the victims, but of the religion. Before the names are known, before the motives are clear, the apologists appear like clockwork. They tell us the attack had nothing to do with Islam. They say it was about foreign policy, mental illness, unemployment, alienation, anything but belief. And they say it with such urgency that one wonders if they are more afraid of public opinion than of the bombs themselves.

This is the game of Islamic apologetics. A whole industry now exists to convince the public that Islam is peaceful, tolerant, and endlessly misunderstood. Its champions range from Muslim scholars to non-Muslim academics, journalists, and politicians. Together, they perform a strange dance of denial and distraction. They quote peaceful verses from the Quran, ignore the violent ones, and pretend that centuries of Islamic conquest were nothing more than cultural exchange. They accuse critics of bigotry, racism, and Islamophobia, as if pointing out a problem is worse than the problem itself.

One of the favourite tricks of the apologists is to isolate a verse from the Quran and declare it proves Islam is peaceful. "If anyone kills a person, it is as if he had killed all mankind." This verse is quoted endlessly. What they never mention is the full context, which includes exceptions and is aimed only at those who follow Islamic law. In other words, unbelievers do not count. Another favourite is "There is no compulsion in religion." Yet the same Quran demands death for apostates, lashes for critics, and war against unbelievers. The peaceful quotes are not lies, but they are incomplete. And using them to defend the entire religion is dishonest.

The Hadith is rarely quoted at all. Probably because it is far harder to sugar-coat. Muhammad's actions are on full display, from battles and assassinations to child marriage and slavery. These are not radical interpretations. They are documented traditions, accepted as authentic by mainstream scholars. But the apologists do not want you to read the Hadith. They want you to believe that Islam is whatever they say it is today, in this moment, shaped to suit Western tastes and modern politics.

Academic defenders of Islam are often the worst offenders. They write long papers about colonialism, Orientalism, and the West's role in othering Muslims, while ignoring the plain meaning of texts that call for violence. They claim the problem is

interpretation. That anyone who takes the Quran literally is missing its deeper meaning. But when thousands of jihadists say they are acting on the clear words of scripture, maybe the problem is not interpretation. Maybe it is the words themselves.

This apologetic culture has consequences. It protects bad ideas from criticism. It makes it harder to have honest conversations. It puts feelings above facts. Worse, it empowers extremists by pretending their ideas have no link to religion. When the link is denied, the root is ignored. And when the root is ignored, the violence grows.

Some Muslims genuinely believe Islam is peaceful. They live quiet lives, obey the law, raise their children, and want no part in violence. But Islam is not defined by its quietest followers. It is defined by its teachings. By what the Quran and Hadith say. By what Muhammad did. And if a religion can justify both kindness and killing, then defending it without addressing its dangers is not tolerance. It is negligence.

Apologists may think they are helping. That by shielding Islam from scrutiny, they are protecting innocent Muslims. But the truth does not harm the innocent. It harms the guilty. And in this case, the guilt lies in the words, the deeds, and the doctrines that inspire terrorism. Denying that will not make it go away. It will only make it harder to stop.

The ISIS experiment

For years, people asked what a true Islamic state would look like if the Quran and Hadith were followed to the letter. ISIS answered that question. When the so-called Islamic State declared its caliphate in 2014, it was not inventing something new. It was resurrecting something old. Its leaders were not modern revolutionaries or rogue ideologues. They were deeply religious men, well-versed in Islamic scripture, who took the texts seriously and applied them without apology. What followed was not a distortion of Islam. It was an execution of it, in every sense of the word.

From the beginning, ISIS made clear that its authority rested on Islamic law. Its spokesman, Abu Muhammad al-Adnani, said, "We are the caliphate," and they meant it. The group's rules were drawn directly from Sharia, and its punishments were lifted straight from Islamic legal tradition. Thieves had their hands cut off. Adulterers were stoned. Apostates were executed. Women were veiled, confined, and controlled. There was no need for reinterpretation, modernisation, or compromise. The text said what it said, and ISIS followed it.

In territories it controlled, ISIS implemented a legal system that would have been

familiar to any medieval Muslim jurist. Music was banned, smoking was banned, and praying incorrectly could get you flogged. Christians were given the traditional option: convert, pay the jizya tax, or face death. Yazidis, seen as polytheists, were treated worse. Thousands were slaughtered or taken as sex slaves, justified by Hadith that permit the enslavement of war captives. This was not some warped ideology. It was what the texts allowed, and in many cases, prescribed.

ISIS made extensive use of Islamic scripture to justify its actions. In its magazine, Dabiq, it published long theological justifications for its brutality, citing Quranic verses and prophetic traditions with precision. When it burned a Jordanian pilot alive, it quoted scholars who had discussed similar punishments. When it threw men off buildings for being homosexual, it cited Hadith describing the same punishment. Every horror was paired with a reference. This was not savagery for its own sake. It was savagery with footnotes.

And the recruits came. Tens of thousands of Muslims from around the world left their homes to join ISIS. They came from Europe, from North Africa, from the Middle East, from Asia. They were not all poor or uneducated. Many were young, well-informed, and motivated by belief. They had seen the Islamic State promise a return to glory, to a pure and powerful Islam that had been lost. And they wanted to be part of it. They did not see ISIS as extremists. They saw them as true believers.

The brutality of ISIS shocked the world, but it should not have surprised anyone. Every beheading, every mass execution, every piece of propaganda was drawn from a tradition that has always included violence. The difference was not in the content, but in the transparency. ISIS did not hide its religious foundations. It announced them. It broadcast them. It wrapped its bullets in verses and its bombs in blessings. And it reminded everyone that this was not a perversion, but a fulfilment.

Even when Muslim leaders condemned ISIS, they rarely addressed the core issue. They called the group un-Islamic, but could not explain why its actions aligned so perfectly with scripture. They condemned the violence, but ignored the texts that bless it. The truth was too uncomfortable. If ISIS was not Islamic, then why did it look so much like early Islamic empires? Why did it act so much like Muhammad himself? Why did it quote the same sources that all Muslims are taught to revere?

The answer is obvious. ISIS did not invent a violent Islam. It inherited it. What it created was not a deviation, but a demonstration. It showed the world what happens when scripture is taken seriously and applied completely. The Islamic State was not

an accident. It was a mirror. And what it reflected was not pleasant to see.

Life under Sharia

For many, Sharia is just a word they hear in headlines or political debates, often treated as something distant, vague, or symbolic. But for millions around the world, Sharia is not an idea. It is a daily reality. It governs what they can eat, wear, say, and believe. It dictates how they must pray, who they can marry, and what happens if they disobey. Sharia is not just about personal guidance. It is a legal system, and when enforced by the state, it becomes a tool for control, punishment, and fear.

At its core, Sharia is Islamic law derived from the Quran, the Hadith, and centuries of interpretation by scholars. It is often described as a complete way of life, because it does not separate religion from law or from government. There is no space for individual conscience, no room for debate, and no tolerance for competing beliefs. In countries where Sharia is enforced fully, religious freedom does not exist. Apostasy, the act of leaving Islam, is often punishable by death. Blasphemy, which can be as simple as questioning a religious teaching, can lead to prison, lashes, or execution. And these are not fringe examples. They are codified in law across many Islamic countries.

Women under Sharia are treated not as equal individuals, but as legal minors, permanently under the authority of men. Their testimony in court is worth half that of a man. They can be forced into marriage. They can be beaten for disobedience, a punishment explicitly permitted by the Quran. If they are raped, they often need male witnesses to prove it, or risk being charged with adultery. Dress codes are strict and enforced by morality police. In places like Iran and Afghanistan, a single strand of uncovered hair can result in fines, imprisonment, or worse.

Punishments under Sharia are harsh and public. Theft can mean amputation. Drinking alcohol can mean lashes. Homosexuality can mean death. There is no jury, no appeals process, and no leniency. The law is seen as divine, and to question it is to question God. This is not justice. It is theocracy. And it does not adapt to modern values. It demands that modern values adapt to it.

In places where Sharia exists alongside civil law, the result is confusion and division. Parallel court systems develop, often for family law, where Muslim women are pressured to settle disputes through religious judges who enforce traditional norms. These systems operate in secrecy, with no transparency and little protection

for those seeking equality. In the name of multiculturalism, some Western countries have allowed such courts to exist, pretending that voluntary religious arbitration is harmless. But when religion has the force of law, there is no freedom. There is only obedience.

Supporters of Sharia claim it is misunderstood, that it is not as strict as critics say, and that it can be applied gently and fairly. But this ignores what happens when Sharia is actually in power. Look at Saudi Arabia, where executions are carried out in public squares, and women only recently gained limited rights to drive and travel. Look at Iran, where protesters are jailed or killed for refusing to wear a hijab. Look at Pakistan, where people are murdered over rumours of blasphemy. These are not accidents. They are the results of a system where religion and law are one and the same.

And even in less extreme forms, Sharia still carries a message. It tells Muslims that the perfect society is not democratic, not pluralistic, and not secular. It is a religious state, governed by divine law, where punishment is sacred and power cannot be challenged. That idea alone is dangerous. It breeds intolerance, fuels extremism, and keeps billions trapped in a legal framework that belongs in the seventh century.

When people say Sharia is peaceful, they are either lying or ignorant. When they say it is just about prayer and fasting, they are leaving out the amputations, the stonings, and the executions. And when they defend it in the name of cultural respect, they are defending the indefensible. Sharia is not just a religious tradition. It is a system of control. And wherever it is allowed to rule, freedom dies.

Global jihad

The violence inspired by Islamic texts is not limited to one country or one conflict. It is not a local issue or a temporary surge. It is a global phenomenon, fuelled by a shared belief that Islam must dominate, that non-believers must submit, and that those who resist can be killed. This is not the work of one group or movement. It is the result of a common scriptural foundation followed by many who interpret it as a call to arms. From the Middle East to Africa, from Asia to Europe, the pattern repeats: Islamic groups using religious texts to justify terror, conquest, and control.

Al-Qaeda was not the first, and it certainly was not the last. Its attacks, including the destruction of the World Trade Center, were carried out in the name of jihad, supported by Quranic verses and Islamic legal opinions. Its leaders, like Osama bin

Laden, were not deranged loners. They were educated, disciplined, and driven by scripture. They saw the world as divided into believers and infidels, and they believed that war against the infidels was not only allowed, but required.

In Africa, Boko Haram has terrorised Nigeria for over a decade, kidnapping schoolgirls, massacring villagers, and declaring an Islamic caliphate. Their name literally means "Western education is forbidden", a phrase rooted in their interpretation of Islamic values. They burn churches, bomb mosques that oppose them, and shoot anyone who does not conform to their version of Islam. Like Al-Qaeda, they quote the Quran and the Hadith. Like ISIS, they enforce Sharia with blood.

In the Philippines, Abu Sayyaf has used Islamic teachings to justify kidnapping, extortion, and murder. In Somalia, Al-Shabaab imposes Sharia law and kills those who violate it. In Europe, so-called lone wolves inspired by Islamic preaching have attacked cafes, concerts, offices, and pedestrians. Whether with bombs, guns, or knives, they act with the same motivation: to strike terror into the hearts of unbelievers, just as the Quran instructs.

The global spread of jihad is not a coincidence. It follows a clear pattern: religious leaders preach hatred, sacred texts are used as ammunition, and believers carry out attacks. This pattern is supported by networks of funding, often from wealthy donors in Islamic countries who see jihad as a religious duty. It is promoted online, through videos, sermons, and encrypted chats. And it is taught in schools and mosques where young Muslims are told that martyrdom is the highest honour and that the West is the enemy.

Even in countries where Muslims are a minority, the ideology spreads. In Britain, radical preachers have openly called for Sharia to replace democracy. In France, Jewish citizens have been murdered in the name of jihad. In Australia, Islamic State supporters have planned and carried out attacks on innocent civilians. And in every case, the justification comes not from political manifestos or economic theory, but from religious belief.

It is important to understand this as a network of ideas, not just a network of people. You can arrest terrorists, kill their leaders, or shut down their camps, but unless the ideology is confronted, the violence continues. The texts remain. The beliefs remain. And as long as young Muslims are taught that fighting in the name of Islam is noble, they will find new ways to carry it out.

This is not a smear against Muslims. It is a warning about an idea. An idea that says the world must submit to Islam, that violence is justified to achieve that end, and that dying for this cause is not a tragedy, but a triumph. This idea travels across borders, languages, and cultures, because it is rooted in the one thing all these movements share: scripture.

Global jihad is not fringe. It is not rare. It is not misunderstood. It is widespread, it is deadly, and it is openly justified by religion. And until the world stops pretending otherwise, the list of victims will only grow longer.

Islam in the West

The presence of Islam in Western countries has created a tension that few are willing to speak about honestly. On one side are values built over centuries: freedom of speech, gender equality, secular government, and the rule of law. On the other side is a religion that, when taken seriously, often opposes all of these. The problem is not with individual Muslims, many of whom live peacefully and follow the law. The problem is with the ideas carried in with the faith, ideas that do not disappear when people cross borders.

Western countries have welcomed millions of Muslim immigrants over recent decades, often in the name of tolerance and diversity. In many cases, this has gone smoothly. But in far too many others, it has not. The result has been cultural enclaves, parallel societies, and rising levels of tension between Islamic values and Western norms. In cities across Europe and parts of Australia, there are suburbs where Sharia is enforced informally. Where women are pressured to cover, where criticism of Islam is dangerous, and where police hesitate to enter. These are not signs of integration. They are signs of a growing divide.

Mosques in the West are not always centres of peace and charity. Some have hosted radical preachers who glorify martyrdom and insult non-Muslims. Some distribute literature that praises jihad, condemns democracy, and urges followers to avoid friendships with unbelievers. These messages are not shouted in public, but they are taught behind closed doors. And the results are clear. Young men leave their homes to fight for terrorist groups. Women are told to obey their husbands without question. Children are taught that Islamic law is above the laws of the country they live in.

When Islamic practices clash with Western law, the response from authorities is

often silence. Out of fear of appearing racist or intolerant, police and politicians look the other way. Grooming gangs in Britain operated for years without serious investigation, because the offenders were Muslim and the victims were white. In Germany, authorities downplayed mass sexual assaults during New Year celebrations in Cologne, because the attackers were mostly from Muslim backgrounds. In France, entire suburbs are labelled "no-go zones" not by racists, but by police who know they cannot enforce the law there without triggering violence.

The fear of speaking honestly about these issues has allowed them to fester. Critics of Islam are accused of hate speech. Books are banned. Journalists are attacked. Cartoonists are murdered. All for the crime of saying what the religion teaches or showing what its prophet did. In what other context does truth become hate? In what other case is pointing out facts seen as an act of aggression?

The influence of Islam in the West is not limited to immigrants. Second and third generation Muslims, born and raised in democratic countries, have still carried out attacks in the name of Islam. They were not oppressed. They were not poor. They were motivated by faith. This tells us that the problem is not background or hardship. It is belief. A belief that Islam is not just a religion, but a political system that must dominate.

Some politicians call for assimilation, others for accommodation. But you cannot assimilate a religion that believes it is already superior. And you cannot accommodate values that oppose your own. The West cannot continue pretending that Islam is just like any other religion. It is not. It comes with a legal system, a political ideology, and a historical model of conquest. It brings more than prayers. It brings demands.

Tolerance does not mean accepting everything. It means defending your own principles while allowing others to live peacefully within them. But when a group refuses to accept those principles, and instead seeks to replace them, that is not integration. That is invasion. Not with armies, but with ideas. Ideas that undermine freedom, reject equality, and silence criticism.

The West must decide whether it values its own foundations enough to defend them. Because Islam in the West is not just about diversity. It is about whether those foundations will survive the clash with a belief system that does not share them.

❖

The Islamophobia myth

The moment anyone criticises Islam, the word "Islamophobia" is thrown like a grenade into the conversation. It is not a rebuttal, it is a shutdown. The term has become a shield, protecting not people, but ideas. It is used to conflate criticism of a religion with hatred of individuals, to make legitimate questions sound like racism, and to brand anyone who raises concerns about Islamic beliefs or practices as a bigot. It is a word designed to end debate, not start it.

The truth is simple. A religion is not a race. An ideology is not an ethnicity. And Islam is both a religion and a political system. It contains laws, commands, and doctrines that affect how people live, treat others, and govern society. Criticising these is not hatred. It is scrutiny. And scrutiny is essential, especially when those doctrines are used to justify violence, oppression, and the destruction of basic freedoms.

The term "Islamophobia" was invented not to protect Muslims from violence, but to silence criticism. It was popularised by groups with clear political and religious goals, who understood that if they could blur the line between belief and identity, they could control the narrative. It worked. Western media, terrified of appearing intolerant, now treats any negative comment about Islam as suspect. Politicians refuse to name the problem, journalists walk on eggshells, and even victims of Islamic violence are sometimes told their opinions are dangerous.

This distortion has had serious consequences. Real concerns about Islamic extremism, Sharia law, honour killings, and gender inequality are pushed aside because they might offend someone. People are more afraid of being called Islamophobic than of the ideas they are trying to challenge. Meanwhile, preachers who incite hatred go unchecked, books that question the religion are censored, and comedians, writers, and artists face threats to their lives. All because a religion that preaches supremacy cannot tolerate being questioned.

There is no doubt that some Muslims face prejudice. Just as some Christians, Jews, atheists, and others do. That is wrong, and it should be condemned. But prejudice against people is not the same as criticism of beliefs. The two are not even close. Opposing the ideas in Islam that support violence, subjugation, and theocracy is not a phobia. It is common sense. It is what any free society should do when faced with a doctrine that seeks to dominate.

The irony is that Islam, unlike most religions today, makes universal claims. It demands that all people believe in it, or submit to its law. It claims to be the final and perfect truth. And yet, when those claims are challenged, the accuser is called irrational. The one who says "your religion wants to kill apostates" is treated as more dangerous than the religion that wants to kill apostates. The person quoting the Quran is blamed, not the book itself.

This is not how a healthy society functions. In any other area of life, bad ideas are challenged. Political ideologies are debated. Scientific theories are tested. Economic policies are criticised. But when it comes to Islam, criticism is treated as a moral failure. This double standard has allowed dangerous ideas to spread without resistance, under the protection of victimhood.

To fear Islamophobia more than Islam is to reverse reality. It is to say that words are worse than weapons, that offence is worse than violence, and that the comfort of the few is more important than the safety of the many. It is an act of cowardice dressed up as compassion. And it has allowed real harm to continue, while those who try to speak the truth are punished.

There is no phobia in pointing out that Islam, as taught in its texts and practised by its prophet, supports violence against unbelievers. There is no bigotry in saying that women under Sharia are not free, or that apostates face death, or that jihad is not a peaceful internal struggle. These are facts. And calling them phobic does not make them disappear.

The myth of Islamophobia must be shattered. Not because prejudice is acceptable, but because truth is necessary. And no belief system, no matter how loudly it demands respect, has the right to escape criticism. Especially one that continues to leave bodies in its wake.

The flexible book

One of the most dangerous features of the Quran is its ability to say everything and its ability to justify anything. It is not a clear manual with fixed principles and simple rules. It is a sprawling collection of commands, stories, warnings, threats, and contradictions, written over two decades and reshaped as Muhammad's situation changed. What this means in practice is that the Quran can be read to support peace or war, tolerance or tyranny, compassion or cruelty. It is not a book of truth. It is a book of options.

This flexibility is not a strength. It is a loophole. It allows the reader to pick the version of Islam they want to follow and pretend it is the only true one. If you want a peaceful life, you can quote verses about kindness. If you want a violent crusade, you can quote verses about killing unbelievers. Both are there, side by side. This is why Islamic apologists can argue Islam is peaceful, while jihadists argue it is a call to war, and both can quote scripture without lying. The book supports them all.

Muslim scholars recognised this problem early on and developed the doctrine of abrogation. This means that later verses, revealed after Muhammad gained more power, can cancel out earlier ones. Unsurprisingly, many of the later verses are more aggressive. So the peaceful messages of Mecca are overwritten by the battle cries of Medina. This is not a conspiracy. It is Islamic theology. And it means that the most violent parts of the Quran are often considered the final word.

The Quran is also full of vague language. It refers to "those who spread corruption" or "those who make war against Allah". These phrases sound poetic but are deliberately open-ended. Who decides what counts as corruption? Who defines war against Allah? In practice, these words have been used to label anyone who disagrees, anyone who leaves the religion, or anyone who fails to obey. And once someone is labelled in this way, violence against them is not just allowed. It is commanded.

Another problem is the complete lack of context. The Quran does not tell a story from beginning to end. It jumps from topic to topic, switches tone without warning, and repeats itself constantly. It assumes the reader already knows the background. It was not written for outsiders. It was written for followers, and it tells them what they must do, not why. This makes it hard to question and easy to misuse. A verse can be pulled from the middle of a chapter and used to support anything the reader already wants to believe.

This is why the Quran has been used to justify everything from slavery to science, from mercy to massacre. It is not because the book is rich. It is because it is unclear. It does not guide. It offers ammunition. And because it is claimed to be the direct word of God, it cannot be reformed, edited, or criticised. The result is a book that is dangerous precisely because it is sacred. Its contradictions cannot be corrected. They can only be chosen.

This is not how a moral book works. A moral book gives clear guidance. It does not offer two opposite answers and let the reader pick one. It does not praise peace in

one breath and violence in the next. It does not create a system where a terrorist and a reformer can both claim divine support. But the Quran does exactly this. And because of that, it becomes whatever its reader wants it to be.

So when people say Islam is what Muslims make of it, they are partly right. But that is the problem. A belief system that can lead to charity or to carnage depending on how it is read is not a stable foundation for a society. It is a loaded weapon, and the safety is off. The Quran is not flexible in a good way. It is flexible in a deadly way. And until that is acknowledged, the cycle of denial, violence, and confusion will continue.

The morality of holy war

Islamic teachings do not just permit violence. They sanctify it. War in the name of religion is not treated as a necessary evil or a last resort. It is celebrated, rewarded, and moralised. Jihad is not just allowed. It is virtuous. Dying in battle for Islam is not a tragedy. It is the highest possible achievement. And the enemy is not defined by what he has done, but by what he believes, or rather, what he does not believe. This is not morality. It is tribalism dressed as divine command.

The Quran repeatedly praises those who fight in Allah's cause. It promises them paradise, forgiveness, and eternal honour. Those who stay behind are criticised. Those who fear battle are warned. There is no suggestion that peace is better, or that negotiation is preferred. The only question is whether the fight is done correctly, according to the rules. Kill the right people for the right reasons, and you are a hero. It is not murder. It is obedience.

The Hadith expands on this. Muhammad is recorded encouraging his followers to fight, promising rewards to those who do, and describing martyrdom in glowing terms. He tells them that one night spent on the battlefield is more valuable than decades of prayer, that a drop of blood spilled in jihad wipes away sins, that the martyr will intercede on behalf of seventy relatives. This is not restraint. This is religious bribery. A moral system that treats killing as holy cannot claim the moral high ground.

The targets of this holy war are not limited to armed enemies. They include apostates, blasphemers, and anyone who resists the spread of Islam. The religion itself draws the lines. If you are inside the faith and leave it, you can be killed. If you mock it, you can be killed. If you refuse to accept it, you can be fought. The justification for violence is not behaviour. It is belief. Or more precisely, the lack of it.

This inversion of morality turns basic human rights into sins. Freedom of conscience becomes apostasy. Freedom of speech becomes blasphemy. Equality becomes rebellion. And because the violence is religiously sanctioned, it is removed from ordinary moral judgement. You cannot question it without questioning God. That is why it is so powerful, and why it is so dangerous.

This is what makes Islamic violence different from political or nationalist violence. It is not about land or policy. It is about submission to a divine order. It is moralised at the highest level. The killer believes he is good. The victim is evil by definition. And the community that supports the killer sees itself as just. This is how honour killings happen, how suicide bombings are celebrated, how children are taught to admire martyrs. Not because people are evil, but because the system tells them it is right.

No decent moral code rewards killing with paradise. No sane ethics teaches that murder is a path to forgiveness. No civilised worldview claims that belief in the wrong god justifies death. But Islam, when followed as written, teaches all of these things. That does not mean all Muslims believe them, but it does mean the religion provides the framework, the justification, and the spiritual rewards for those who do.

The defence that all religions have violence is a dodge. Yes, many religions contain troubling passages. But Islam has something more. It has a prophet who fought, killed, and ordered others to do the same, and who is considered the perfect man. It has scriptures that bless the violent and warn the peaceful. And it has an unbroken line of believers who have carried out that violence across centuries, always with the same excuse: it is God's will.

A religion that moralises war is not just dangerous. It is broken. It replaces ethics with obedience, kindness with conquest, and humanity with ideology. And the more seriously it is followed, the worse the result. Holy war is not holy. It is war given false dignity. And any system that teaches it is not moral at all.

Faith turned weapon

There is a point at which belief stops being a private matter and becomes a public danger. That point is reached when sacred texts are read as instructions for violence, when a prophet's wars are treated as moral examples, and when martyrdom is used to excuse mass murder. Islam, in its unfiltered form, has reached that point. It is not simply a religion among others, but a system that, when followed sincerely and literally, leads not to peace, but to conflict; not to harmony, but to conquest; not to

mercy, but to war.

This is not an attack on individuals, but a judgment of ideas. The fact that many Muslims are peaceful does not change the reality that the religion they follow contains commands that are anything but. That many reject violence does not erase the verses that demand it, and that some hope to reform Islam does not undo centuries of doctrine and tradition that sanctify bloodshed. The pattern is too consistent, the consequences too deadly, and the evidence too overwhelming to ignore.

Islamic terrorism did not emerge from a vacuum. It came from scripture, from preachers and scholars who repeat exactly what the Quran says, what the Hadith records, and what Muhammad did. It came from believers who are told that paradise awaits those who kill in Allah's name, from a religion that has never separated spiritual belief from political rule, never questioned the moral perfection of its founder, and never subjected its holy texts to real reform. These are not distortions of Islam. They are the logical outcome of taking it seriously.

Every major Islamic terror group cites the same sources, follows the same logic, and sees itself not as deviant, but as devout. When bombs explode in cities, when girls are abducted and enslaved, when artists are murdered for their drawings, it is not a mystery. The killers are not confused. They are convinced. They are obeying, not inventing. And their authority lies in scripture that has gone unchallenged for far too long.

The response from Western institutions has been feeble and dishonest. Instead of confronting the source, they try to explain the violence away, calling it extremism as if that word floats free from doctrine, blaming poverty as if religious texts only matter to the unemployed, or invoking Islamophobia as if outrage at criticism is a greater problem than the violence itself. They ask what went wrong, when the answer is painfully clear. Someone read the book and believed it.

Religion can uplift, but it can also destroy. What determines the outcome is the content of the belief. In Islam, the core content includes divine permission to kill, to dominate, and to suppress. It holds up as a moral example a man who conquered by force and ordered executions. It offers eternal rewards for violent obedience. This is not a foundation for peace, but a blueprint for war.

It is time to stop pretending. The evidence is not subtle. It is found in the verses of the Quran, in the words of the Hadith, in the actions of believers across the world, and in the wreckage left behind after every jihadist attack. To claim Islam has nothing to

do with terrorism is not just wrong, it is reckless. It protects the disease while condemning the symptoms.

Islam must be seen for what it is. Not the fantasy of politicians desperate to protect feelings, but a faith that, when taken seriously, justifies and demands violence. This is not bigotry. It is truth. And if belief can act as a weapon, then it must be treated like one. Not with superstition, not with cowardice, but with honesty and courage. The blood is real. The scripture is clear. And the time for denial is over.

More free booklets can be found at:
https://github.com/jgestiot/free_books/blob/main/README.md

Revision 1.1