
FREE SPEECH UNDER FIRE

The Red-Green Axis' Unrestricted Warfare In OSCE and Beyond



29 November 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION BY FRANK GAFFNEY	3
HOW AUSTRIA AND THE OSCE TRIED TO STAMP OUT MY DISSENT BY ELISABETH SABADITSCH-WOLFF	6
THE OSCE: A GLIMPSE OF AMERICA’S ORWELLIAN FUTURE? BY CHRISTOPHER C. HULL, PH.D.	8
CRIMINALIZING ISLAMOPHOBIC SPEECH BY DEBORAH WEISS	15
THE OSCE AND EU NEED TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE ISLAMIC ASPECT OF ISLAMIC TERRORISM BY ROBERT SPENCER	19
OSCE: WORKING SESSION 6: FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS, INCLUDING FREEDOM OF THOUGHT, CONSCIENCE, RELIGION, OR BELIEF BY CLARE M. LOPEZ	22
OSCE: WORKING SESSION 18: DISCUSSION OF HUMAN DIMENSION ACTIVITIES BY CLARE M. LOPEZ	23

INTRODUCTION

Free speech in the West is under fire.

It seems that every day, from every direction, the enemies of freedom encroach more upon what our Founders rightly described as a God-given and inalienable right.

We see “snowflakes” on college campuses shouting down or even *attacking* speakers with whom they disagree.

We see the politically correct mainstream media exploding in outrage over every utterance of President Donald J. Trump that does not conform to their standards.

We see politicians too mealy-mouthed to tell the truth – especially when it comes to the brutal, totalitarian Islamic ideology known as Sharia – lest they be subjected to charges of the wholly made up and phony syndrome dubbed “Islamophobia.”

We see social media giants stamping out the speech of those with whom they disagree, while they allow the speech of jihadis to flourish.

We see international organizations, from the United Nations to the Organization of Islamic Cooperation to the little-known Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), each working in its own, insidious way to strangle expression.

And from all these quarters, we hear warnings about the ostensibly burgeoning danger of “hate speech.”

But what is hate speech, exactly?

More and more, it appears it is simply shorthand for depicting – and curbing – whatever expression the radical Left and

Sharia-supremacists may find objectionable. Anything with which they disagree is dubbed “hate” and must be terminated.

In short, this “Red-Green Axis” – i.e., the collusion between neo-Marxist and Islamist forces against America and the West – works systematically to punish speech to which such partisans take offense, a category that seemingly expands with each passing day.

This Occasional Paper is the latest in a series of products addressing such subjects to be published by the Center for Security Policy Press, including:

1. *The Organization of Islamic Cooperation’s Jihad on Free Speech*, which addressed the part the OIC in particular plays in the Red-Green Axis’ attempt to stifle the truth about Islam’s supremacist Sharia doctrine.¹
2. *The Red-Green Axis: Refugees, Immigration and the Agenda to Erase America*, which explored how the Left and its Islamist allies join force to maximize the influx of immigrants from Sharia-adherent countries who are, althogether too often inadequately vetted.²
3. *Team Jihad: How Sharia-Supremacists Collaborate with Leftists to Destroy the United States*, an analysis of the specific links between Leftist and Islamist organizations, including funding from

¹ See Deborah Weiss, Esq., *The Organization of Islamic Cooperation’s Jihad on Free Speech* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Security Policy), 2015, https://www.centerforsecuritypolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/OIC_Free_Speech_Jihad.pdf accessed November 28, 2017.

² See James Simpson, *The Red-Green Axis: Refugees, Immigration and the Agenda to Erase America* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Security Policy), 2015, <https://www.centerforsecuritypolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Red-Green-Axis-10-05-15.pdf>, accessed November 28, 2017.

one to the other to help both better defeat us.³

Free Speech Under Fire provides a further examination of the unrestricted warfare now being mounted in forums like the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe that is inexorably garrotting free peoples' ability to speak. It includes:

- An essay by Austrian dissident Elisabeth Sabaditsch-Wolff, telling the story of how in 2011 the Austrian state convicted her of “denigration of religious beliefs” – without regard to whether those beliefs, notably regarding pedophilia, deserve to be criticized;
- A piece on the OSCE’s missteps in its dealings with Jihad and Islamism by renowned expert on Islamic history and doctrine Robert Spencer, who recently recovered from being poisoned by a Leftist radical who disagreed with his extraordinarily well-researched;
- An article by Deborah Weiss, Esq., a gifted attorney, 9/11 survivor and Center for Security Policy Senior Fellow, on how the OIC and other international organizations, as well as national and even local governments, are clamping down on free speech;
- Two “interventions” made during plenary sessions of the OSCE’s fall 2017 meeting in Warsaw by Center for Security Policy Vice President for Research and Analysis Clare Lopez; and

³ See Matthew Vadum, *TEAM JIHAD: How Sharia-Supremacists Collaborate with Leftists to Destroy the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Security Policy), 2017, <https://www.centerforsecuritypolicy.org/2017/06/26/book-launch-team-jihad-how-sharia-supremacists-collaborate-with-leftists-to-destroy-the-united-states/> accessed November 28, 2017.

- An article by Christopher C. Hull, Ph.D., CSP’s Executive Vice President, who also attended the most recent OSCE meeting devoted to shutting down speech critical of Sharia supremacism, while catering to the speech of Islamists.

Taken together, these essays validate the proposition that the Red-Green Axis’ dark machinations amount to “unrestricted warfare” against free expression. That term was featured by two colonels in the People’s Liberation Army in their 1999 book, *Unrestricted Warfare: China’s Master Plan to Destroy America*. Translated from original PLA documents, this volume describes how “American military doctrine is typically led by technology; a new class of weapon or vehicle is developed, which allows or encourages an adjustment in strategy.”⁴

The authors, Chinese military strategists Qiao Liang and Wang Xiangsui “argue that this dynamic is a crucial weakness in the American military, and that this blind spot with regard to alternative forms of warfare could be effectively exploited by enemies” – a point not lost on the West’s alt-Left and its Islamic infiltrators as well.

Unrestricted Warfare teaches that the front lines can be almost anywhere.

It has become increasingly obvious that the front lines of the unrestricted war on free speech are on university campuses, where enemy-planted radical thought and rhetorical excess thrive.

The front lines are in newsrooms, long

⁴ See Qiao Liang and Wang Xiangsui, *Unrestricted Warfare: China’s Master Plan to Destroy America* (

populated by not only totalitarians' useful idiots, but active agents as well.

The front lines are on Facebook, Google, YouTube and Twitter as they crack down on conservative and counter-jihad speech, while allowing not only Russian influence operations, but jihadist propaganda and incitement, as well.

And the front lines are certainly at multilateral forums like the OSCE, where Sharia-supremacists work hand-in-hand with globalists to advance their common aim of centralizing and exercising control over both the means *and the content* of communications.

American policymakers and citizens alike must stand firm in the face of the relentless assault currently being mounted on the foundational freedom of speech that is described in the pages that follow.

It's time to challenge the Left's selective indignation about "hate speech" that gives a pass to Black Lives Matter, Antifa and many jihadists' incitement of violence.

It's time to take on the Sharia-supremacists who condemn as "Islamophobia" what, in reality, is simply truthful renderings of their anti-freedom political, military and legal system really means knowing too much about Sharia, and saying it aloud.

And it's past time we reined in international organizations including by refusing to submit to their boa-like constriction of free speech.

We at the Center for Security Policy hope that you will stand with us – and stand up for free speech.

Frank J. Gaffney, Jr.

President and CEO

HOW AUSTRIA AND THE OSCE TRIED TO STAMP OUT MY DISSENT

By Elisabeth Sabaditsch-Wolff

In early 2008 I began a series of seminars in Vienna explaining to interested parties what Islam, the Qur'an and the hadith really teach, along with basic tenets of Islamic law. In my presentations I discussed the consequences for democracy, freedom and human rights today.

As interest in my seminars grew, attendance increased. The success of my lectures drew the attention of Austrian leftists, who are determined to discredit and destroy the work of those who criticize the tenets of Islamic doctrine. To them we are “racists”, “fascists”, and “Islamophobes”. Unbeknownst to me, a left-wing magazine sent a reporter to one of my seminars to make a surreptitious recording of it.

As a result, a criminal complaint was filed against me for “hate speech”, i.e. incitement to hatred.

During my trial the issue of pedophilia came up, in light of Muhammad's status as the perfect example for Muslims, as stated in Quran 33:21. I explained the relevance of hadith collections, and that they constitute an indispensable part of Islamic scripture. I emphasized that I had made up none of what I said, but simply quoted canonical Islamic scripture concerning Muhammad's conduct, including his marriage to a little girl named Aisha.

The judge then discussed my statement that the conduct of Muhammad is exemplary for Muslims, and took particular issue with the statement “What exactly that would be called

today, if not pedophilia?” — which was a reference to the prophet's marriage to a six-year-old girl as well as a rhetorical question. In addition, I asked, “What do we name Mohammed's action? Which word do we use?”

Evidently aware that the charge of “incitement to hatred” was never going to fly, the judge, *at her own discretion*, eventually announced a new charge: “Denigration of religious beliefs of a legally recognized religion,” under Section 188 of the Austrian code, which according to the online catalogue of laws was enacted in January, 1975. My defense was unprepared for this, and requested that the trial be adjourned.

When court reconvened, events moved swiftly to a close. The judge decided that the language used in my seminars did not incite hatred, but the utterances regarding Muhammad and pedophilia were punishable. In particular, the judge found that the use of “pedophilia” was factually incorrect, as this is a sexual preference solely or mainly directed towards children. The judge stated that this cannot apply to Muhammad, who was still married to Aisha when she attained the age of 18. Thus, I was found not guilty on the count of “incitement to hatred”, but guilty on the charge of “denigration of religious beliefs of a legally recognized religion”, to be punished with a €480 fine or 60 days in prison.

The charge on which I was convicted was ludicrous on the face of it. Not only did I never say that Muhammad's actions constituted “pedophilia”, but Muhammad's actions — which were undisputed by the court — included having sex with a nine-year-old girl.

I have exhausted my options for justice in

Austria, so the case was put before the European Court of Human Rights. It was accepted, and has been pending now for several years.

There are those who argue that my activism at an international organization called the OSCE, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, may have contributed to my court case. This is an organization which a decade or so ago was still a champion of civil liberties and free expression.

The OSCE was formed during the Cold War (as the CSCE) to challenge the Soviet Union to engage in truth-telling. It could rightly claim a share of the credit for prompting the push towards *glasnost* that eventually dissolved the U.S.S.R. With its headquarters in Warsaw, where memories of Soviet repression remained fresh, the OSCE managed to hold onto its mission for more than a decade after the Iron Curtain disappeared from Europe.

But not anymore.

An alliance of globalists and Muslims gradually has infiltrated and subverted virtually all the institutional components of the OSCE. To achieve their disparate ends, both subversive groups have been using the same weapon: Politically Correct Multiculturalism, a.k.a. Cultural Marxism. PC/MC is an effective tool for sapping the civic will among well-meaning Westerners to maintain a commitment to free speech. With its goal of eliminating “racism”, “xenophobia”, and “intolerance”, an illiberal political culture has formed at the OSCE that is diametrically opposed to the principles of those who founded it.

If the OSCE were to stay true to its original

intentions – championing true freedom – its officials and participating States should be calling out those who have been successful in curtailing freedom of speech, such as my own country, Austria. Instead, Austria has shown its true colors when its representative scolded my colleagues and me for daring to connect the obvious dots between terrorism and Shariah-compliant actors.

As a result, we in the West are being forced to sacrifice ever-more fundamental freedoms at the PC altar to total tolerance and non-discrimination, summoning censorship today, and tomorrow ever more likely polygamy, child marriage, and slavery.

This is why my case before the European Court of European Rights must be won.

THE OSCE: A GLIMPSE OF AMERICA'S ORWELLIAN FUTURE?

By Christopher C. Hull, Ph.D.

I just returned from Europe, where I heard an eerie echo of its past.

That echo emanated from a meeting of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) in Warsaw, Poland, which I attended with Center Vice President for Research and Analysis Clare Lopez in September.

This OSCE “Human Dimension Implementation Meeting” (HDIM) should send a chill down every American’s spine – and make George Orwell roll over in his grave because it was also a peek into America’s future. This is a future where:

- “Hate crimes” are deemed the cause of terrorism
- “Hate speech” is banned and leftist governments define it in ways that protect both jihadis and their own open borders policies
- “Hate incident” reporting is viewed as a path to security from jihad; and worst of all,
- Western law increasingly and suspiciously rhymes with the totalitarian Islamic law known as Sharia.

The Story of OSCE: A Cold War Relict Going Bad

It didn’t start out this way. OSCE was founded in Copenhagen on July 3, 1973 as a multilateral forum where East and West could come together in détente to discuss issues of

concern. This worked famously for the West which used this forum to highlight the systematic denial of freedom in the Soviet Bloc. The Soviets and their satellites thought they could simply lie and ignore their way through such criticism but the West systematically exposed the Soviet Bloc’s brutal corruption and mistreatment of its people. Ultimately, this pin-prick pressure joined with the force of history led the Wall to fall.

But when it did, something at OSCE began to go wrong. An OSCE entity set up in 1990 for election monitoring morphed into the amusingly acronymed Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR, pronounced “Oh Dear”), which has devolved into a twisted forum for cultural Marxism and political correctness, laced with just a hint of Sharia compliance. Its logo of all-seeing eyes says it all.

ODIHR originally cleaved in part to OSCE’s Copenhagen Document of 1990, which “recognize[d] that pluralistic democracy and the rule of law are essential for ensuring respect for all human rights and fundamental freedoms.”

In that document, participating states “welcome[d] the commitment expressed by all participating States to the ideals of democracy and political pluralism as well as their common determination to build democratic societies based on free elections and the rule of law.”

No problem so far. Even better, the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) found on July 31st, 2001 – two months before September 11, 2001 – that “the institution of Sharia law and a theocratic regime, were incompatible with the requirements of a

democratic society.”

Thus if ODIHR was playing fair, it would acknowledge that its founding document’s declaration of dedication to democracy must be read in the context of the ECHR’s finding that Sharia is incompatible with what that democracy demands.

It doesn’t. Instead, over time, ODIHR’s capture by the radical Left and Sharia enablers has transformed the OSCE from a Cold War strategic asset into an orgy of Western self-deception.

For instance, the OSCE Charter on Preventing and Combatting Terrorism, agreed to in 2002 in Porto, Portugal, “Firmly reject[s] identification of terrorism with any nationality or religion.”

ODIHR staff echoed this Porto statement three times in personal conversations with me – in spite of 31,805 attacks by Islamic terrorists, honor killings or Sharia executions just since 9/11, in which literally thousands of times terrorists identified their terrorism with the religion of Islam.

ODIHR’s willful blindness infects all too many OSCE countries. Austria is a case in point. I attended the meeting as part of a team led by Elisabeth Sabaditsch-Wolff, an Austrian prosecuted under an Austrian anti-blasphemy law for stating at a private event that Mohammed was a “pedophile” since he took a six-year-old girl as a wife and then consummating the marriage when she was nine.

The veracity of Sabaditsch-Wolff’s statement was an insufficient defense. Worse, whether deliberately or not, her conviction all-but-complied with Sharia.

Likewise, at HDIM, Sabaditsch-Wolff aired the case of Michael Stürzenberger, a German journalist recently sentenced to six months in prison for posting a historical photo of a Nazi officer shaking hands with the then-Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, arguing it was evidence that Islam was “fascist.” She argued “it is a perversion of tolerance when it is used as an excuse for censoring views which are deemed offensive.”

But even more frightening, Germany sentenced a journalist to prison for criticizing a pro-Nazi figure, an argument implicitly critical of Chancellor Angela Merkel’s policy of open borders for so-called “refugees.”

What We Argued: Beware Sharia

The counter-jihad, pro-free speech team I was honored to be part of showed up at the OSCE’s conference as what the Bible calls *vox clamantis in deserto* – a lone voice crying in the wilderness. Our team argued Sharia drives the current surge of terrorism – and innumerable other ills – in Europe and around the world.

The meeting agenda quoted from the Copenhagen Document that “participating States clearly and unequivocally condemn totalitarianism, racial and ethnic hatred, anti-Semitism, xenophobia and discrimination against anyone, as well as persecution on religious and ideological grounds.”

That all sounds lovely, but does “discrimination against anyone” shield child abusers? Rapists? Jihadis?

Regardless, in at least 13 appearances before the OSCE meeting’s plenary session, my team made arguments like this one:

“By embracing so-called tolerance and non-discrimination, participating states risk promoting totalitarianism, anti-Semitism and persecution on religious grounds. That is because according to many of its critics and supporters, Islamic law, known as Sharia, is a totalitarian system, built on texts with pervasive anti-Semitism, which results in significant religious persecution.”

Is this fair? You be the judge.

Sharia is Totalitarian

In the last century at least, totalitarianism has come in three primary colors: National Socialism, a.k.a. Nazism or fascism; Communism, a.k.a. non-democratic socialism, and a much older ideology: Sharia.

Former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher wrote in *The Guardian* on February 12, 2002 of Islamic extremism: “like Bolshevism in the past, it is an armed doctrine. It is an aggressive ideology promoted by fanatical, well-armed devotees.”

Not only Sharia’s critics but also its advocates agree it is totalitarian. According to one scholar’s characterization, Islamist philosopher Syed Abul A’la Maududi argued that “Islamic states must be established based on pure Islam, and that Islam is a militant ideology and program which seeks to alter the social order of the whole world and rebuild it in conformity with its own Islamic tenets and ideals. Islamic Jihad would necessarily destroy non-Islamic systems and would bring about a universal revolution”.

Likewise, Sayyid Qutb, a leading member of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood in the

1950s and 1960s, called for a more aggressive attempt -- not simply to defend the homeland of Islam, but to carry the movement of Islam throughout the world to the whole of mankind.

One need only see theocracies like Iran and the Islamic State to understand what Sharia looks like the closer it gets to full implementation.

Sharia is Anti-Semitic

Second, Sharia’s anti-Semitism has been exhaustively documented. One study found that while Adolph Hitler devoted only 7% of *Mein Kampf* to “anti-Jew text,” fully 9.3% of the Islamic trilogy of the Koran, the Sirah (biography of Mohammed) and the Hadith (collection of the sayings and traditions of Mohammed) fell into the same category.

Likewise, the landmark book *Antisemitism* notes that there are mostly negative references to Jews in the Koran and the Hadith. For example, both Koran 2.65 and Koran 7.166 says of Jews who have transgressed the will of Allah, “Be ye apes, despised and rejected.”

Koran 5.60 refers to those among the People of the Book, which includes Jews, who “incurred the curse of Allah and His wrath,” as “apes and swine” and “those who worshipped evil.” Koran 7.164 includes a reference to Jews who have transgressed the will of Allah as “a people whom Allah will destroy or visit with a terrible punishment.”

Various the Koran requires “abasement and poverty” for the Jews and states that “wretchedness and baseness were stamped upon the Jews, and they were visited with wrath from Allah, that was because they

disbelieved in Allah's revelations and slew the prophets wrongfully.”

In the modern day, the Sharia-friendly so-called refugees virtually never mentioned at HDIM 2017 bear the marks of those beastly ballads. A German study found that fully 50% of Muslim refugees hold anti-Semitic views. Those from Syria in particular have been steeped in anti-Semitic teachings throughout their schooling. According to an April 2017 *Newsweek* article, “the most senior Jewish official in Germany” has raised the concern that many of the refugees come from countries “where hatred of Jews and Israel are a *raison d'état*.”¹

According to the Times of Israel, Angela Merkel has put the marker down that refugees who settle in Germany “must unlearn the anti-Semitism fed to them in their home countries.” In the Netherlands, a critic of the Dutch far-right nevertheless worries that many Middle East refugees come from cultures “with little regard for the rights of homosexuals, Jews and women and who have been indoctrinated and brainwashed to hate Western norms” and thus prefers they be settled in Gulf states.

Sharia Both Supports and Results in Religious Persecution

Sharia is replete with both doctrinal and historical of persecution on religious grounds. According to a 2010 study:

- Religious persecution is “very much worse in Muslim-majority countries”
- 62% of Muslim-majority countries “have moderate to high levels of persecution”

- Persecution of more than 1,000 persons is present in 45 percent of Muslim-majority countries, “compared to 11 percent of Christian-majority countries and 8 percent of countries where no single religion holds a majority”
- Thirteen of 14 countries in [the worst] group are predominantly Muslim”, and, most importantly,
- “The cause of this is not ethnic or wealth-related; it stems from Muslim teachings and internal movements towards stricter Islam.”²

Such teachings are in direct conflict with the principles underlying OSCE. The Copenhagen Document correctly states that:

“The participating States recognize that the questions relating to national minorities can only be satisfactorily resolved in a democratic political framework [that] guarantees full respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, equal rights and status for all citizens, the free expression of all their legitimate interests and aspirations, political pluralism, social tolerance and the implementation of legal rules that place effective restraints on the abuse of governmental power.”

None of that will be operative if Western Europe refuses to acknowledge the reality that it is importing a permanent pro-Sharia constituency.

Sharia Endorses Slavery, Polygamy, and Female Genital Mutilation

At the conference, my colleague Clare Lopez gave a speech challenging the OSCE to:

- "Confront the painful reality that under shariah, Muslim and non-Muslim, men and women, are explicitly unequal;
- "Realize that Islamic Law has never explicitly banned slavery or sex slavery;
- "Know that Islamic Law allows polygamy and the marriage of little girls as young as 9 years old;
- "Understand that Islamic Law allows, approves or makes obligatory Female Genital Mutilation; [and]
- "Face the fact that the hudud punishments impose amputation, beheading, flogging and execution for adultery, apostasy and homosexuality."

How OSCE Reacted: You Can't Say That Here

In response to our appeals, over and over the ODIHR Moderator "reminded" us of OSCE countries' commitments with respect to tolerance and non-discrimination. Newly minted ODIHR Director Ingibjörg Sólrún Gísladóttir of Iceland herself decried that meeting participants "unfortunately witnessed discourse which does not belong in a forum set on how we can further tolerance."

"In fact," she said, "it does not belong anywhere."

Incredibly, Director Gísladóttir believes that speaking out against Sharia's intolerance and discrimination is not only out of place at a meeting expressing concerns about tolerance and non-discrimination, she apparently thinks it should be banned.

Director Gísladóttir argued further that, "from the very beginning the understanding of the vital role of...fundamental freedoms and of

promoting tolerance and non-discrimination in preventing conflict have been hardwired into the OSCE comprehensive concept of security."

If you accept her specious argument, you must accept that some fundamental freedoms, including freedom of expression, must be sacrificed to promote tolerance of intolerance and non-discrimination against jihadis who are fundamentally distinct from the vast majority of Western citizens.

By the way, you might also have to chalk up the 3,323 deaths in the conflict in Northern Ireland to hate incidents, in spite of the cold, hard fact that it pitted Catholics against Protestants – and is frequently cited by Christianity's critics and Sharia's apologists as a result.

Was freedom of religion, tolerance and non-discrimination truly the right path to follow there – no acknowledgment at all of either my own Catholic Church's role in furthering the conflict, or that it was the Protestants and not just the forces of the U.K. who were fighting back systematically?

Likewise, Ambassador Florian Raunig, head of the Taskforce of the Austrian OSCE Chairmanship, scolded us for daring to tell the truth about the link between Sharia and terrorist violence. Without irony, he decried our statements "which were not aimed to preserve our OSCE principles and unanimously adopted commitments on human rights and fundamental freedoms."

Strange, because that is exactly what we said we were doing – trying to save human rights and fundamental freedoms from Sharia supremacists, and sadly from the cultural

Marxists at HDIM as well.

Instead, Ambassador Raunig said, “we should all uphold the principles of tolerance and show respect and understanding for one another.”

So according to Ambassador Raunig, we must uphold the principles of tolerance even if that means violating fundamental freedoms like freedom of expression in order to tolerate those who came to Europe and America with the explicit intention of imposing arguably the most intolerant legal regime the world has ever known, Sharia.

He further argued that OSCE countries “adopted a wealth of commitments in the area of human rights over the years. We must preserve them, if we want to live in peaceful, harmonious, safe, and secure societies.”

Apparently this means that remaining silent to the influx of Sharia enthusiasts will somehow make us more peaceful, harmonious, safe, and secure, in spite of the now incontrovertible evidence that doing so is making Europe more violent, discordant, unsafe, and treacherous.

Moreover, three times ODIHR staff, once including Director Gísladóttir, politely shut down private conversations with me mid-sentence rather than delve into actual arguments on the conflict between OSCE’s founding principles and Jihad and Sharia.

The meeting was rife with references to Islamophobia, hate crimes, hate speech, and now “hate incidents,” occurrences to which the Left or its minions object, even if it is not a crime, and even if it is legally protected speech.

Yet the London Tube Jihadi attack took place during the meeting and generated not a single

mention.

As my ally Ms. Sabaditsch-Wolff stated at the conference, the bottom line is this: to use OSCE commitments as an excuse to shut down fundamental freedoms, to which Copenhagen refers 21 times, including especially free expression, to which it explicitly refers twice, in order to protect advocates of Sharia, which the ECHR has held is incompatible with democracy, is a travesty that will cost human lives, and potentially will shatter the foundations of European civilization in the process.

America’s Future?

This crazy confab may seem simply symptomatic of a European totalitarian relapse combined with a bad case of the dhimmis.

But America may be contracting the same ailment.

As noted earlier in Deborah Weiss’ article, in the wake of Charlottesville, House and Senate leaders railroaded through Congress, and the President signed, a law that “urges the President and his administration to use all resources available to the President and the President’s Cabinet to address the growing prevalence of...hate groups in the United States.”

As one sickened by the tiny handful of remaining American KKK members, I might support such a resolution, had the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC), a “scam” that itself “profit(s) from hate-mongering” not already smeared so many mainstream conservative organizations as “hate groups.”

All Americans should see where this is

headed: straight to OSCE-land, where journalists are sentenced to prison for posting historical facts. Where it is a crime to criticize Sharia, rather than to promote it. Where speakers are convicted of blasphemy for accurate statements about Islam. Where terror strikes in which people are maimed and murdered are ignored, to focus instead on hate incidents in which people are offended and annoyed.

In his masterwork 1984, Orwell described the concept of “thoughtcrime” that deemed treason even thinking something out of line with Big Brother. Had Orwell been with us at HDIM, he would have recognized the baby steps Europe is taking in that direction – and that America is following in its tiny footsteps. You would have recognized it, too.

I just returned from Europe, where I saw a terrifying vision of its future. And of ours.

Christopher C. Hull, Ph.D. currently serves as the interim Executive Vice President of the Center for Security Policy. A former chief of staff from Capitol Hill, he is the author of *The White House Commission on Radical Islam: A Recommendation* (Middle East Forum, 2107), as well as *Grassroots Rules* (Stanford University Press, 2007), a book on presidential politics. This article is an expanded version of “Hull: European Confab Pushes Censorship, Shelters Sharia,” which ran on Breitbart on September 29, 2017, and appeared in the current form in *Secure Freedom Quarterly*, 3rd Quarter 2017.

CRIMINALIZING ISLAMOPHOBIC SPEECH

By Deborah Weiss, Esq.

There's a movement afoot to criminalize "Islamophobia," led by Islamist organizations and their Leftist bedfellows. Oddly, nobody can quite define the term that these organizations condemn. So what is their real purpose?

Leading the charge on an international level is the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), a 57 nation state body. This little-known organization holds great sway, as it constitutes the U.N.'s largest voting bloc.

Though it holds itself out as a moderate organization, the OIC's members consist of some of the most egregious human rights violators in the world. It includes Iran, Pakistan, Sudan and Saudi Arabia, where religious persecution, gender apartheid, and prohibitions on free expression are part and parcel of everyday life. Nevertheless, it has been given legitimacy, in part by the U.S., when the Obama Administration's Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, decided to work with the OIC to "combat Islamophobia".

The OIC works primarily through multilateral consensus building and international legal instruments like U.N. resolutions, to achieve its goals. In furtherance of what some experts assert is its ultimate desire to re-establish an Islamic Caliphate and implement Sharia worldwide,⁵ the OIC seeks to criminalize all criticism of Islam, in a way that is tantamount to Islamic blasphemy laws.

⁵ See, e.g.

http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2010/09/oic_and_the_modern_caliphate.html, accessed November 27, 2017.

Having relinquished its eleven year run of passing U.N. resolutions to "combat defamation of religions", by which it meant defamation of Islam, the OIC worked with the Obama Administration's State Department to pass the infamous Resolution 16/18⁶ to combat intolerance based on religion or belief. The initial intent of the State Department in encouraging this resolution was to preserve free expression while condemning "Islamophobia". However, the OIC, while dropping the speech-stifling phrase "combatting defamation of religions", never dropped its long term goal to outlaw Islamic blasphemy and religious insult.

As a master manipulator of language, after the passage of Resolution 16/18, the OIC interpreted the resolution's language advocating the criminalization of incitement to imminent violence to employ a "test of consequences".⁷ This means that if someone decides to riot, maim or murder in response to a religiously offensive cartoon or film, the cartoonist or film producer would be responsible for the violence, rather than those committing it.

To make matters worse, Secretary Clinton and then-Secretary General of the OIC, Ekmeleddin Ihsanoglu, announced that they would implement this resolution, meaning they'd put it into practice. This was unprecedented, as U.N. resolutions usually remain in the realm of the theoretical. The

⁶

http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/16session/A.HRC.RES.16.18_en.pdf, accessed November 28, 2017.

⁷

http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2012/12/fatal_attraction_us_flirts_with_international_speech_codes.html#ixzz2EZuM8NoW, accessed November 27, 2017.

implementation process, known as the “Istanbul process” became a pitfall for freedom of speech. Somehow, in closed-door meetings of approximately 30 countries and NGOs from around the world, during the first conference on the Istanbul Process, Secretary Clinton’s position moved closer to the OIC’s position. She advocated “peer pressure and shaming” to ensure that those who espoused Islamophobic positions or engaged in Islamophobic rhetoric would be discouraged from doing so, in lieu of legal speech restrictions, due to America’s First Amendment. Subsequently, outreach programs and professional “training” programs were commenced as part of the Istanbul Process often designed to de-link Islam from Islamic terrorism, and censor professionals who connected the dots. The Istanbul Process and related international conferences continue to this day.

The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) is another international organization in which participating states are working to outlaw so-called Islamophobia. The OSCE originally was formed as a forum in which East and West could come together to engage in discussions and negotiations on a variety of issues during the Cold War. When the Soviet Union collapsed, the OSCE’s mission morphed. It purportedly became a key player in the prevention of conflict, the promotion of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law. Ironically, it also claims to promote freedom of the press, but apparently that’s only so long as the press’ rhetoric is not “Islamophobic”.

For the past several years, the OSCE has been holding hearings at its annual conference on human rights and democratic institutions in

Warsaw, Poland, on the issue of Islamophobia. Year in and year out, pro-Islam countries and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) argue that Islamophobia should be illegal. Western countries, however, have been unable to extract a working definition of the term at these conferences. Further, while experts testify on the perils to free expression in outlawing “Islamophobia”, the OSCE moderator repeatedly chastises those who point this out, asserting that their factual commentary violates the OSCE participating states’ commitments to “tolerance” and “non-discrimination.”

There is no question that the organizations working to stifle speech on Islam-related topics are targeting the West. Using accusations of Islamophobic speech, hate speech, bigoted speech, politically incorrect speech and other name-calling tactics, these organizations, along with Islamist groups and their Leftist allies, are working hard to censor speech, primarily on conservative viewpoints, and especially on the issue of Sharia.

In Europe, pressure from the OIC on European Parliaments exacerbates the pre-existing demands to restrict “group hate” or “group defamation” that are outlined in the UN Declaration of Human Rights (the U.S. opted out of this provision,) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. (The latter was proposed by the Soviet Bloc, and the provisions were later exploited to silence criticism of or dissent against tyrannical governments.)

To make matters worse, in 2008 the EU

Commission issued a Framework Decision⁸ announcing that certain forms of xenophobic, racist or hate speech (including that based on religion) should be penalized with dissuasive fines or imprisonment. Most EU countries have some form of punishment for prohibited speech; those that do not have faced increased pressure to adopt them from the European Council, OSCE and others in recent years.

Notably, criticism of Islam is targeted speech in virtually every European country. This is true even, and perhaps especially, when the content of the comments is factually true (read: “Islamic terrorism”), or when it constitutes mere opinion, both categories of which constitute constitutionally protected speech in America. The laws which prohibit the portrayal of Islam in a negative light go by different names in Europe, depending on the country. They can be labelled hate speech laws, laws prohibiting the denigration of a recognized religion, or public order laws. Yet, they all serve as proxies for Islamic blasphemy laws by censoring speech that violates Islamic blasphemy and punishing it when it occurs.

Keep in mind that these are countries that thus far consist of non-Muslim majorities, and were built on Judeo-Christian values. Yet, even separate and apart from codified law, those in the West, including America, face potentially dire consequences if they criticize Islam, or otherwise “insult” Islam. Salmon Rushdie who wrote the book, “Satanic Verses” in the U.K. was forced to live in hiding for scores of years due to Fatwas calling for his death. The famous actress Brigitte Bardot was fined no less than five times for criticizing

the cruelty of Halal slaughter in France.

Several people have been forced to live in hiding or with security due to death threats from Muslims for speaking their minds or simply drawing a cartoon of the Muslim Prophet Muhammad. They include Dutch Member of Parliament Geert Wilders for producing the film “Fitna,” Nolly Morris in the United States for calling for a draw Muhammad Day on Facebook, (now living under an assumed name at FBI advice), Pamela Geller who has a Fatwa over her head for holding a Draw Muhammad cartoon contest, and Kurt Westergaard, for drawing one of the original Danish cartoons of Muhammad that resulted in riots.

In Ireland, then-78 year old Pastor James McConnell was arrested for disseminating a sermon over the radio, asserting his belief that Islam is a Satanic religion. Though he was acquitted in the end, the mere process of being accused, arrested and enduring lengthy court trials can in and of itself constitute punishment for espousing one’s views.

In America, though the First Amendment protects freedom of speech including so-called Islamophobic speech or hate speech, there is undoubtedly a push toward self-censorship and censorship as a matter of policy. Almost half of college students believe America should have hate speech restrictions.⁹ It is now commonplace for conservative speakers to be chased off college campuses by Leftists who insist *a priori* that these speakers are “bigots”. Islamophobia conferences are being held throughout the country in universities as well as within the interfaith movement. These fora

⁸ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=LEGISSUM:133178>, accessed November 28, 2017.

⁹ <http://www.businessinsider.com/should-hate-speech-be-protected-college-students-poll-2017-10>, accessed November 27, 2017.

are co-opted by Islamists who exploit the good will of the naïve to persuade them that speech connecting Islamic doctrine to Islamic terrorism constitutes bigotry. Even some local governments have been seduced into considering the passage of non-binding anti-Islamophobia motions. Additionally, in 2015, 145 out of 186 Democrats in Congress co-sponsored legislation that condemned, among other things, Islamophobic speech (H.R. 569). It went nowhere only because Republicans were in control.¹⁰

These censorship efforts are spreading across the West. Those who advocate them are engaged in disinformation campaigns designed to keep the public from knowing the truth about Islamic terrorism and related issues. Though the speech-stifling measures are always framed in a way to sound as though they promote “tolerance” or “inclusion”, do not be fooled. The Founding Fathers enshrined the First Amendment in our Constitution to encourage robust political debate. Those who want to dismantle it seek to muzzle the same. This is not about politeness; it’s not even about speech. Name calling and censorship serve to function as thought-stopping measures. Those who have conservative views must not be allowed to express them. The positions they hold and the policies that would emanate from those views are precluded from consideration by the age-old tactic of name calling, or as Hillary Clinton called it, “peer pressure and shaming.”

It is very possible that we cannot change the tyrannical governments in the Middle East

and elsewhere. And it might even be true that we can’t convince Europe that it is heading in the wrong direction by flooding its countries with un-vetted refugees and economic migrants.

However, here in America, we must know who we are. We must understand our roots. We must not be shy about asserting the superiority of the Judeo-Christian values of freedom, equality and human rights, over the Islamist values of tyranny, gender apartheid, religious oppression, and blasphemy laws. We must keep our borders strong, stem the influx of poorly-vetted refugees and immigration, and educate our youth about the role free expression plays as a cornerstone of democracy.

Those in the Red-Green Axis are playing victimhood in order to acquire power and impose censorship against opposing views. You know who is in power, in part, by observing whom you are forbidden from criticizing.

Orwell said that the more a society drifts from the truth, the more it will hate those who speak it. We must stand firm in our defense of the First Amendment’s freedom of speech if we want America to remain a beacon of light to the world.

Copyright@2017 by Deborah Weiss, Esq. Republication and distribution permitted for non-commercial purposes with proper attribution to the author.

¹⁰ <http://www.frontpagemag.com/fpm/261550/democrats-castigate-anti-muslim-speech-proposed-deborah-weiss>, accessed November 28, 2017.

THE OSCE AND EU NEED TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE ISLAMIC ASPECT OF ISLAMIC TERRORISM

By Robert Spencer

In the wake of the September 11 jihad attacks, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Charter on Preventing and Combatting Terrorism¹¹, agreed upon in 2002 in Porto, Portugal, “Firmly reject[ed] identification of terrorism with any nationality or religion.”

One reason why this is a wrongheaded and self-defeating policy is that jihad terrorists themselves routinely point to Islam as their motivation. Just a few of many examples:

1. “Jihad was a way of life for the Pious Predecessors (*Salaf-us-Salih*), and the Prophet (SAWS [*sallallahu alayhi wa salaam*, or in English may God’s prayers and peace be with him]) was a master of the Mujahideen [those who wage jihad] and a model for fortunate inexperienced people...The Messenger of Allah (SAWS) used to go out on military expeditions or send out an army at least every two months.” — Abdullah Azzam, co-founder of al-Qaeda, *Join the Caravan*, p. 30
2. “Many thanks to God, for his kind gesture, and choosing us to perform the act of Jihad for his cause and to defend Islam and Muslims. Therefore, killing you and fighting you, destroying you and terrorizing you, responding back to your attacks, are all considered to be great legitimate duty in our religion.” — Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and

his fellow 9/11 defendants¹²

3. “Allah on 480 occasions in the Holy Koran extols Muslims to wage jihad. We only fulfil God’s orders. Only jihad can bring peace to the world.” — Taliban terrorist Baitullah Mehsud¹³

Even if these terrorists are misinterpreting the Qur’an and Islam, and violence over more than 1400 years suggests that are not, it is vital to understand their point of view, their motives and their goals, in order to devise means to counter them effectively, if OSCE is to contribute to rather than detract from security in Europe.

Instead, OSCE’s participating states’ official denial that jihad terrorism has anything to do with Islam has in part led to:

- **Insufficient oversight of mosques with extreme leaders**, such as the Finsbury Park Mosque. Organizers of OSCE’s Human Dimension Implementation Meeting (HDIM) 2017 had the imam from the Finsbury Park Mosque speak in September. At that meeting, he acknowledged past problems, but claimed that he and his new leadership had cleared the extremists from the mosque. However, on November 7, 2017 it emerged that a leader of the mosque is a member of Hamas’ political wing.¹⁴
- **The proliferation of false “moderate” Muslim organizations**, for instance the Muslim Council of Britain, which

¹¹ <https://www.thereligionofpeace.com/pages/articles/ira-islam.aspx>

¹² <https://www.jihadwatch.org/2009/03/911-defendants-we-ask-to-be-near-to-god-we-fight-you-and-destroy-you-and-terrorize-you-the-jihad-in>

¹³ <https://www.jihadwatch.org/2007/01/allah-on-480-occasions-in-the-holy-koran-extols-muslims-to-wage-jihad-we-only-fulfil-gods-orders>

¹⁴ http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-5057547/Leader-Finsbury-Park-Mosque-Hamas-official.html?ito=social-twitter_dailymailUK

OSCE quoted¹⁵ on May 24, 2006 in “Seeking ways to counter discrimination against Muslims in the media,” and with which the UK government worked directly until in 2009 several of its officials signed¹⁶ the Istanbul Declaration. That document advocates attacks on British troops and Jewish communities, followed by a 2102 UK government report¹⁷ linked the group to Jamaat-e-Islami, a South Asian Islamist movement that committed acts of genocide during the Bangladeshi civil war.

- **Collaboration with Muslim organizations that are anything but moderate:**

- OSCE’s HDIM 2017 also featured a side-event, “Islamophobia As New Normal?,” sponsored by, among others, the Muslim Anti-Racism Collaborative (MuslimARC), which was “created in response to a call to action on the issue of the role of African American Muslims issued by Council on American Islamic Relations (CAIR) Michigan Chapter head Dawud Walid.” A U.S. federal court found¹⁸ in July, 2009 that “the government has produced ample evidence to establish the associations of CAIR...with Hamas,” the terrorist group. In addition, MuslimARC’s

cofounder Margari Hill has been linked¹⁹ to efforts to create a “Muslims Only” enclave in Philadelphia – hardly a model of diversity or inclusion.

- Another participant in this OSCE side event was the European Muslim Initiative for Social Cohesion (EMISCO), whose founder, Lord Nazir Ahmed, has made anti-Semitic comments including blaming the “Zionist lobby”²⁰ for the ban of Iranian satellite TV programs in the UK. Ahmed has even called for jailing British Jews²¹ who serve in the IDF (on Iran’s state-run Press TV, no less). Lord Ahmed has also joined UK Islamists²² with links to Hamas and the Muslim Brotherhood in praising Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan for walking out of a debate with Israeli President Shimon Peres over Gaza.

- **Collaboration with Government Organized NGOs, or GONGOs, even while appearing to crack down on them.** For instance, OSCE allowed the Foundation for Political Economic and Social Research (SETA) to host a side event; SETA is a pro-Erdogan think

15 <http://www.osce.org/odihr/57493>

16 <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2009/mar/25/islam-terrorism>

17 <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20120920001118/http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/communities/pdf/1170952.pdf>

18 <https://www.investigativeproject.org/2340/federal-judge-agrees-cair-tied-to-hamas>

19 <https://townhall.com/columnists/kyleshideler/2015/11/25/social-justice-warriors-slam-americas-oldest-muslim-brotherhood-group-on-twitter-n2085134>

20 <http://www.timesofisrael.com/british-lord-blames-zionists-for-ban-of-iranian-tv/>

21 <https://web.archive.org/web/20100205131635/http://www.presstv.com/detail.aspx?id=84530§ionid=3510302>

22 <http://www.jpost.com/International/British-lord-joins-UK-Islamists-in-praising-Erdogan>

tank²³ and front for Turkey's Islamist ruling party, the AKP.

- The application of false remedies that are doomed to failure, such as monetary benefits for Muslim individuals, organizations, and nations. OSCE's 2015 report *Working with Youth for Youth: Protection Against Radicalization* claims: "Economic and social disparities, environmental challenges, lack of the rule of law, weak governance, corruption, widespread poverty and high unemployment are among the factors that contribute to global threats such as terrorism and violent extremism." (p. 22) In reality, according to a Rand Corporation report²⁴ prepared for the Secretary of Defense in 2009, "Terrorists are not particularly impoverished, uneducated, or afflicted by mental disease."

Instead, the OSCE should:

1. Tell the truth about Islamic jihad and Sharia supremacism.
2. Recommend that Participating States enforce existing laws, rather than allowing Muslim communities to establish *de facto* Sharia enclaves.
3. Call on Muslim groups to renounce the aspects of Sharia that contradict existing laws and accepted principles of human rights.
4. Reevaluate immigration and refugee resettlement policies in light of the fact that Islamic State has successfully infiltrated the refugee stream.

²³https://web.archive.org/web/20091215004423/http://www.setadc.org:80/index.php?option=com_content&view=section&layout=blog&id=9&Itemid=99

²⁴

https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG849.pdf

**OSCE: WORKING SESSION 6:
FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS, INCLUDING
FREEDOM OF THOUGHT, CONSCIENCE,
RELIGION, OR BELIEF**

**INTERVENTION AT THE ORGANISATION FOR SECURITY
AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE (OSCE)**

**HUMAN DIMENSION IMPLEMENTATION MEETING
(HDIM) 2017**

WARSAW, POLAND SEPTEMBER 14TH, 2017

***Clare M. Lopez, Vice President for Research and
Analysis, Center for Security Policy***

America's Founding Fathers understood that tyranny takes hold when men allow governments or religious systems to usurp the rights of the individual unto themselves.

For this reason, they enshrined freedoms of belief, conscience & speech in 1st Amendment of our Constitution.

These principles & these freedoms are Judeo-Christian-based, first articulated among the brilliant thinkers of the Enlightenment in Europe - although their roots trace back to Athens, Rome & Jerusalem.

They derive from the revolutionary idea that the individual is the key pillar of society - not the clan, or tribe, or a religious belief system.

The individual human being is entitled to these rights & freedoms because the laws of nature - which are knowable thru human reason - endow each & every person - men & women equally - w/human dignity & the right to live free.

Freedom of speech is among the most essential of our human liberties & one that

gives voice & meaning to all the others - especially freedom of conscience & belief.

Islam doesn't have such beliefs or freedoms - there's no such thing as 'freedom of speech' or belief articulated in Islamic Law (shariah).

Instead there is the "Law of Slander" - which defines 'slander' as anything that a Muslim would dislike - including the truth.

Slander under shariah can carry the death penalty - indeed the Sira & hadiths tell us that some of the first assassinations ordered by Muhammad were precisely against poets for writing verses that he found insulting - apostasy from Islam likewise is a capital crime.

I refer to the Council of Europe report from October 2016 on the 'Compatibility of Sharia law with the European Convention on Human Rights: can States Parties to the Convention be signatories of the 'Cairo Declaration'?

And I suggest the answer is 'No.' A government or system that defines itself as liberal, Western & democratic does not impose restrictions on free speech to shield itself from criticism - much less impose a death penalty for belief or lack of belief.

We of Western Civilization dignify the individual by permitting all speech, no matter how we dislike it, if it is not explicitly inciting to immediate violence - and all beliefs or lack of belief.

And so I recommend for the ODIHR 2017: Let us leave here today, renewed & inspired to reject liberty-crushing concepts like 'hate speech' & death penalties for religious beliefs or rejection of belief & instead committed to defend freedoms of belief, conscience & speech & all the principles of liberty we hold so dear.

OSCE: WORKING SESSION 18: DISCUSSION OF HUMAN DIMENSION ACTIVITIES

INTERVENTION AT THE ORGANISATION FOR SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE (OSCE)

HUMAN DIMENSION IMPLEMENTATION MEETING (HDIM) 2017

WARSAW, POLAND SEPTEMBER 15TH, 2017

Clare M. Lopez, Vice President for Research and Analysis, Center for Security Policy

The Center for Security Policy offers the following suggestions for how OSCE institutions and field operations might best implement their mandates and programming for maximum effectiveness in meeting human dimension commitments.

Citing from the OSCE Human Dimension Implementation Meeting Annotated Agenda for 2017, I will focus on the following priority:

- Ensuring equal enjoyment of rights and equal protection in political and public life

As has been noted here, the elevation of the individual as the key pillar of society, with equality in human dignity for each and every person, is a cherished principle of Judeo-Christian-based Western Civilization.

The absolute equality of all persons before the rule of man-made law is the foundation of other rights and freedoms: for if we are all equal with one another, then none rightfully may rule over another except by consent freely given - all are granted the same rights and the same liberties - also share the same obligations before that law.

Understanding that the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) chose with the 1990 Cairo Declaration to abrogate the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights in favor of acknowledging only such rights as might be accorded under Islamic Law, the OSCE is therefore accorded a significant challenge - but also a tremendous opportunity.

OSCE, here is your challenge:

- Confront the painful reality that under shariah, Muslim and non-Muslim, men and women, are explicitly unequal;
- Realize that Islamic Law has never explicitly banned slavery or sex slavery;
- Know that Islamic Law allows polygamy and the marriage of little girls as young as 9 years old;
- Understand that Islamic Law allows, approves or makes obligatory Female Genital Mutilation;
- Face the fact that the *hudud* punishments impose amputation, beheading, flogging and execution for adultery, apostasy and homosexuality.

Tough, yes. But here is the tremendous opportunity: by confronting such difficult realities, this exceptional organization and all the dedicated people in its institutions and field operations may set their sights on education, dialogue, and the prioritization of programming and projects that can blaze an international pathway to truly championing the rights of

- Women who long for equal respect and the freedom to make their own decisions;
- Children who dream of finishing their education before being forced into

married life;

- The targets of genocide and enslavement who yearn for someone to take *their* side for once;
- Gays and lesbians who deserve the right to love whom they will;
- And all who today in the 21st century still face inequality and oppression under the horrors of shariah.

OSCE, the challenge and the opportunity are yours. *Carpe Diem.*