Unprecedented Migration Crisis Affecting Europe: Will Western or Russian Style De-radicalization save the European Way of Life? (Part 2)
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Why Transformation of Europe to an Islamist State is literally a Death Sentence for the European Culture and Way of Life as a Whole?

Such a transformation – if allowed by Western “political correctness” and suicidal inability to preserve our culture and way of life – would necessarily result in forms of Muslim political and religious dictatorship truly unacceptable for the majority of the indigenous European population. It will change all major aspects of our way of life. The secular Western style democracy will collapse, an Islamist state (or states) would take over. Not only would the contemporary Christian (secular) culture be literally destroyed but the entire cultural heritage as well.

Christian churches which are truly a pillar of European cultural heritage would either be erased or transformed into mosques where portrayal of a human face would be prohibited. The museums which constitute another fundamental pillar of European culture would also be destroyed. According to an optimistic scenario most of their treasures would be sold around the world, some by chance would be left in Western museums in the US, Canada and Australia, who might be able to preserve a fraction of the artefacts. The majority of the artefacts of Europe would probably be destroyed as they constitute a part of an alien culture.

The logic is exactly the same as when the Taliban destroyed the 1700 year old Buddha sculptures in Afghanistan. [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [7] [8] [9] (Annex 1) ISIS systematically destroys all cultural heritage that contradict their interpretation of Islam. They destroyed countless buildings and artefacts in Iraq and Syria. [10] (Annex 2–5) When ISIS destroys buildings of cultural heritage they attempt literally to erase it as a deliberate act to make rebuilding from original stones impossible. As a part of this incredible sin against cultural heritage several buildings and artefacts of Christianity were destroyed by ISIS, including the 1400 year old St. Elijah’s monastery in Mosul, Iraq. [11] [12] (Annex 3–4)

The destruction of cultural heritage is not limited to religiously obvious cases, such as the prohibition of the depiction of human faces. Ancient Roman and other archaeological sites are destroyed (Annex 5) as well with no obvious or credible explanation, except the will to destroy everything that shows that ISIS does not represent the only culture on Earth. Such extremism is a new phenomenon since the cultural heritage ISIS destroys managed to survive centuries of wars.
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We must see clearly that there is a huge difference between the vast majority of Muslim people who live in peace and the Islamist fundamentalists whose actions have been illustrated. Muslim parties gaining power in Europe will most likely support unlimited immigration of their Muslim brothers. Once tens of millions or hundreds of millions of Muslims enter Europe, Islamism will take over the formerly Christian (secular) continent. If Islam becomes a new majority religion and way of life in Europe, we can be sure that radical Islam will also gain space. Radicals would feel the necessity to conquer the “infidel” land making sure that there is no turning back. This will result in a systematic destruction of all forms of European culture, even if the majority Muslim population newly inhabiting Europe were to be peaceful and tolerant towards Christianity and secularism.

Barbaric modes of destruction of rival cultures based on religious ideology are not the monopoly of radical Islam. Similar incidents occurred even within Christianity, when the Reformation fought Catholicism, resulting in the destruction of religious figurative art. [13] (Annex 6) But at least the walls of the churches survived in most of the cases and a different form of Christianity was practiced in the same churches. We also need to see the big difference between destruction of religious cultural heritage centuries ago, and right now, in the 21st century. From this point of view, Christianity has “grown up”. On the other hand, radical Islamism represented by ISIS attempts to drag us back to the darkest realities of the past.

Unfortunately, if such historical precedents of destruction of cultural heritage in the name of radical religious ideology are not convincing, or destruction does not occur at all – which is highly unlikely when considering a Muslim takeover of Europe – less radical tendencies would have the same or very similar results. If there is an Islamist takeover in Europe, no matter how “gentle” or “politically correct” it might be in our fantasies, it will establish a new cultural reality where indigenous Christian culture is a question of the past. In other words: unpracticed and ultimately dead.

Why it is Very Difficult to Integrate Large “Blocks” of Muslim Populations into European Culture?

While contemporary Christianity is an individualist religion, Islamism is truly communal. [14] Contemporary Christian religion in Europe is the private business of individuals. It is up to the individuals whether they are religious or not, or which religious faith they might believe in. Christianity expects not much more than that the faithful sometimes visit the appropriate church, keep some distinguished holidays, and maybe attend during ordinary weekends as well. The faithful need to avoid certain sins. Generally speaking, the faithful should share some prayers with other believers in a church and that is more-less all that the Christian churches expect from the faithful.

To the contrary of contemporary Christianity, the Muslim religion is not individualistic but truly communal. All individuals should obey teachings of the Quran, and there are many customs for daily life that must be followed. The individualist liberties that exist in Christian (secular) societies do not exist in a Muslim society.

If we compare the power of an individualistic or a communal religion, in this case Christianity and Islam, we can safely conclude that the communal religion has a bigger effect on masses, than the individualistic religion, since more practices and feelings are shared by definition. We can also conclude that a communalistic religion is less tolerant if some individuals
have a different faith, different customs to what the Quran prescribes. This lack of tolerance has far reaching consequences when a communalistic religion becomes a majority, even if it is just a local majority in a village.

“Atomized” individuals can more easily assimilate into a different cultural environment than entire communities, living in separate districts, villages, cities etc. It is far more difficult to assimilate entire communities “glued” together by a communalistic faith, especially when they live separately in big groups. If they live in poor districts, ghettos, they would also become frustrated and desperate. To de-radicalize the extremists coming from ghettos surrounded by their own culture is of utmost difficulty.

It is also difficult to de-radicalize the indigenous extremists in Europe, who are well aware of the unresolved issues of the migration crisis and frustrated by the realities according to which no successful assimilation of entire migrant communities is taking place.

Can an Islamist Transformation of Europe be reversed at an Early Stage?

Today, there is a significant but nevertheless still “manageable” immigrant Muslim population in Europe. It is difficult to assess the percentage of the Muslim population in Europe, though when they successfully establish their own political parties it will have a significant influence on European decision-making.

Once they become a significant part of the European political system, we would expect that any limitation of mostly Muslim immigration will become ever more difficult, since it would require greater unity on the side of the indigenous population, which – in spite of some promising tendencies – is not yet in sight. Thus, we end up with an example of a Trojan horse on a strategic scale in Europe. The difference is that according to the original story the soldiers had to hide inside the Trojan horse because their presence was a secret. In our case, the massive inflow of Muslim migrants to Europe happens openly, in front of everybody’s eyes.

The European leaders and the indigenous masses must be well aware of political, economic, cultural etc. realities of the countries in the Middle East, North Africa and Afghanistan. If they deliberately want to ignore basic facts and tendencies because of indifference or in order to be falsely “politically correct”, it would lead to disastrous consequences.

Once the gates of Europe are wide open because of the permissive policies of European leaders, the indifference and the dividedness of the indigenous population and the active “help” of pro-Muslim parties will be a critical point in European history when unwanted changes will speed up. At a certain stage, there will be no chance to stop the massive inflow of migrants, unless help comes from outside Europe.

Once a sort of an Islamic state is established in Europe, or in certain European countries, a fundamental question will arise, is there anything the Western world can do to reverse it? The answer is “yes”, but the “solution” is an extremely “bitter pill”. The solution would be a last resort in nature, namely: military intervention, resulting in a massive repatriation of Muslim populations from Europe, especially the economic migrants arriving to Europe since 2015, definitely not the true asylum seekers.

No matter how we evaluate such a “solution”, we might agree on the following principles:

• There is a need to limit migration in order to preserve European cultural heritage and way of life.
• As long as Western Christian (secular) culture is a majority, we can expect “political correctness” as a rule of the game, however once Muslim culture becomes a dominant player in Europe, such rules should be considered obsolete.

Who Organized the Wave of Muslim Migrant Violence in Germany on New Year’s Eve and Why? Who Attempted to Cover It Up and Why?

It caused a series of “headaches” to understand what happened in German cities on New Year’s Eve, when massive sexual violence hit hundreds of German women, especially in Cologne. [15] We might accept, that there are *individuals*, who are “bad apples” in all societies around the world, who commit crimes, such as sexual harassment and even rape. Since the violent incidents took place in several German cities simultaneously, and a Muslim mob comprising 1 thousand young males (or more) committed sexual violence in Cologne, we can be confident when attributing such events to premeditated organization. It is far from evident who organized such a “bombshell” of violence and why, shaking up the German society as a whole.

The first idea that came to our mind was that the organizers could be Muslim leaders of mass migration. According to Muslim culture women are far from being equal: they are a sort of a “property” of men. Young, “infidel” girls, improperly dressed according to strict, Muslim customs, unattended by their husbands or parents are considered to be prostitutes and a sort of free prey, such as “infidel” sex slaves.

Intentional Muslim organization of mass rapist events, when it becomes entirely visible for the masses of the indigenous Christian (or secular) society raises doubts. The reason for that is quite simple. It is a very bad “advertisement” for further Muslim immigration to Europe that will surely continue. The potential awakening of the European indigenous Christian (secular) population in the number one country in terms of adopting masses of Muslim migrant population in Europe – that is clearly Germany at this time – could ring a powerful alarm bell. Such an awakening of the German majority population could result in policy changes, *fatal* for the consideration of a comparable level of adoption of Muslim migrants from Africa and the Middle East in the foreseeable future.

To show that it is even more complicated, the Quran is sometimes permissive, sometimes a little bit prohibitive when it comes to sex with infidels. [16] Since faithful Muslims consider all infidels as inferiors, and women – with no exaggeration – as property, there is no barrier preventing Muslims from committing sexual violence against unattended “infidel” young girls. Unfortunately, New Year’s Eve in Germany was a “perfect event” when masses of unattended, ‘infidel’ young girls were in sight.

For those who truly believe in Western “political correctness” when it comes to gender issues, it is advised to visit the Quran in reference to sex slavery, especially regarding ‘infidel’ women. “Politically correct” people will most likely come into contradiction with their own beliefs, when they might attempt to justify whatever they find in the Quran. They might even come to a conclusion, that whenever they protest against “Islamophobia” when dealing with Muslim gang rapes throughout German cities in New Year’s Eve, they become defenders of the sexism of Muslim males against indigenous Christian (or secular) women of their own nations, their own societies.
Since our first conclusion was that such mass sexual violence was a bad “advertisement” for Muslim immigrants, we tended to think that Muslims were not the main organizers of the violent attacks in German cities. We also assumed, that the Muslim population in Germany is still far below the level of seriously considering terrorizing indigenous Christian population into submission in the short run, whatever that might mean.

Such considerations resulted in our first conclusions, that – since truly religious (faithful) Muslim organization is unlikely – it could have been a case of “False Flag Operations”, meaning the German secret services’ “helped” to organize the violent attacks to “facilitate” certain policy changes by the German government. Even though it will most likely sound bad for “politically correct” analysts, such arguments appeared to be convincing for a while.

The motives of the organization of the rapist attacks in German cities could even be much worse, than “False Flag Operations” organized by German secret services aimed to somehow curb massive Muslim immigration to Germany, if the events mark a stage of Jihad.

Is Mass Migration a Stage of Jihad?

The suggestion that Jihad itself is going on when organizing the entire Muslim migration flow affecting Europe – not only the violent attacks on women in Germany on New Year’s Eve – might shock us: “The wave of ‘refugees’ entering Europe in 2015 was an instance of the Islamic hijra, or migration, into infidel lands. It is one of the principal phases of jihad. In their migration Muslims are following the example of Mohammed, who made hijra to Medina and forcibly established Islam there. When the number of Muslims in the new land increases sufficiently – by further migration, or by da’wa, proselytizing to convert infidels – then violent jihad can be launched, and the final conversion of the new territory will be complete. Europe is experiencing the earliest stages of a major hijra operation.” [17]

We had to check that Arabic terms do not mislead our analysis. We found 372,000 hits in a Google search for two key words: “hijra” and “jihad” on 21st February, 2016. “Migration is part of the doctrine of jihad. Migration is so important that the Islamic calendar is based upon the hijra, Mohammed’s migration from Mecca to Medina. Why? Because it was migration that lead to the creation of jihad in Medina. And it was jihad that made Islam triumphant.” [18]

If we agree that mass migration of Muslims is historically interpreted as a first stage of Jihad, which would later be followed by the establishment of an Islamic state, [19] [20] and that this could be the case concerning contemporary Europe, the entire way we view mass migration will change. Such a discovery truly shocked us since we have been responsible for migration issues in a Ministry of Defense and none of the “politically correct” sources we have ever read ever mentioned it. Even scholars lecturing us have omitted hijra.

We can argue that not all migrants entering Europe are Muslims. They – as individuals – all have different reasons why they want to settle in Europe. There are real refugees amongst them, escaping from war, violence, various forms of oppression, political persecution etc. Real refugees however are a minority in comparison with economic migrants who seek higher living standards. There is a powerful reason why they target rich European states with high living standards and well-developed social security systems, such as Germany or Sweden.

We are most likely unable to provide hard evidence that the majority of the Muslim migrants are entering Europe with a clear vision to later transform it to an Islamic State. They
might not even wish to colonize Europe in a cultural sense. However, the problem is even if the Muslim migrants have different beliefs concerning the future of Europe, a historical transformation is going on with its challenges and opportunities. Even if at this stage we are far from having a Muslim majority in Europe, unlimited migration to Europe presents immense cultural and social dangers.

Integration must include education, employment and social cohesion. None of them are easy for the majority of Muslim immigrants. European languages are entirely different to those they spoke in their countries of origin. Many of them are illiterate, when they arrive in Europe. Finding a job could take years, even when the language barrier appears to be overcome.

If Labor Force Considerations Play a Major Role in Shaping German Policies when Handling Migration, why are Masses of Muslim Migrants Preferred to Christian Ukrainians?

In Western democracies the people elect political parties, governments, and presidents etc. who represent the will of the population. However, elections are not the only factor determining the “political landscape” of countries: representatives (owners, lobbyists etc.) of big capital/business also heavily influence political decision-making. The question arises why there are no limits of migrant inflow from Muslim countries to Europe, especially to Germany. Is it the will of German big business to incorporate masses of migrants into the German labor market thereby making the German labor force cheaper? Is German big business indifferent to the fate of the country, the EU and the European culture and way of life when doing so? Is something similar going on, like what happened when the big capital of the car industry in Detroit relocated production to China where labor costs were significantly lower than in the US?

Such decisions of big business could prove to be successful, when we talk about logic of business, most importantly about profits of private companies worldwide. It is also suicidal concerning the social costs in the nation state that exported capital. We need to note that the key driver of private companies is clearly not to satisfy needs of a society including taking into account the cultural context, but to earn maximum profits. Such a logic leads to a terrifying conclusion, that German big business disregards the faith of the nation state and also Europe as a whole, when advising the chancellor to accommodate an unlimited amount of migrants from the Middle East, North Africa and Afghanistan.

We managed to share this disturbing analysis with our colleagues and there was no resistance at all against such a theory. They themselves emphasized the short-sightedness of big business when it comes to policy issues of the survival of European civilization. Luckily, we managed to cause confusion when we mentioned that the German state is clearly rejecting the mass cheap workforce that would come from Ukraine to be employed in Germany. Our argument was that we are far from being an advocate of Ukrainian integration into EU, but these people could be far more easily integrated than Muslim migrants coming from war zones. Such German policies provided hope that the big business advising the chancellor is not following the logic of the economic and social destruction of Detroit in the United States, but is doing something else when the unstated policy goals are still unclear.
Why Uncontrolled and Unlimited Migration to Europe is Inhumane for the Migrants

Any “politically correct” attempts to cover up all sorts of problems related to uncontrolled mass migration to Europe, such as the dangers of the world’s deadliest migration route through the Mediterranean, [26] [27] and the connection between migration and organized crime are ultimately bad for the migrants themselves. [28] Trafficking in human beings, sexual abuse, organ trafficking [29] [30] [31] are just few examples of connections between migration and organized crime. Countless problems affect migrants, such as a staggering amount of migrants – including children – missing after they have reached Europe. According to Europol data from January 2016, 10,000 unaccompanied migrant children have gone missing since entering Europe. [32] Organized criminal gangs are targeting immigrant children for sex work, slavery, organ trafficking etc. [33]

There is already a tendency that on one hand European social security systems are overwhelmed, on the other hand government aid to migrants is decreasing. [34] This is bad news if we consider the chances of the integration of masses of Muslim immigrants into European societies. We need to keep in mind that we are still at an early stage of the migration crisis that is apparently building up. Record numbers of migrants arrived to Europe in January 2016: 55,000 migrants entered the EU that is 35 times more than in the same period in 2015. [34] Even though it is too early to assess the number of migrants entering Europe in 2016, the tendency of more people coming in unfavorable weather conditions clearly points to the increase of migration pressure.

Ever increasing numbers of migrants in Europe combined with overwhelmed social security systems, growing crime rates, segregation and poverty of migrant population, growing frustration amongst the indigenous population against both migrants and government policies related to the handling of migration crisis etc. all point to ill treatment and discomfort amongst masses of migrants. If migration to Europe continues in an uncontrolled way, such tendencies would surely lead to the rise of social tensions and ultimately to radicalization.

Radicalization in this case is not limited to migrants, but also gains momentum amongst the indigenous Christian (secular) population. Far right parties that are intolerant towards masses of migrants are gaining public support. Such political changes in European countries affect the whole spectrum of handling the migration crisis including managing the fate of those migrants who are already citizens of European states. Such tendencies lay the foundations of social explosions and outbreaks of violence between the migrants and the indigenous population. The more social tensions build up, the more violence takes place, the more difficult it will be to reverse the negative tendencies.

Secret Pact between Germany and Turkey? Deliberate Betrayal of Europe Aimed at the Elimination of Nation States?

Politicians have made a big of huff around the issue of an alleged secret pact between Germany and Turkey in order to take up to 500,000 migrants from Turkey and settle them in Europe, forcing quotas on all EU countries, including those that do not agree with a mandatory quota system. The alleged existence of the pact is surrounded by secrecy – if true – it would prove
the truly undemocratic nature of the handling the migration crisis by great powers in Europe, in this case Germany and those on her side. It is unrealistic to blame Turkey for striking this deal with Germany, for it is a country where the overwhelming majority of people are Muslims.

However, the existence of the pact and its secrecy is clearly not the point, since facilitation of a legal migrant flow to Europe is becoming an official EU policy that is not secret at all. It is also obvious, that once up to 500,000 migrants from Turkey settle in Europe it would not end the migration crisis.

“This is betrayal, ladies and gentlemen! Europe has been betrayed! And if we do not stand up for it, this Europe will be taken away from us.” [35] So declared Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán while condemning European leaders who have opened up the continent to waves of mostly Muslim Middle Eastern migrants.

It was not the first time Orbán had inveighed against migration, which threatens to upend European culture. And it further underlined the chasm separating politically correct Western Europe and what many would call a more culturally correct Eastern Europe.

Speaking to his countrymen, Orbán further warned, “Ladies and gentlemen, what we face is nothing less than the challenge of finding ourselves at the gateway to the implementation of a deliberate conceptual project, which could be described as left-wing and which seeks to marginalize the nation states of Europe. Where this project has failed to overcome Christianity and the identity of the nation state – and the values and responsibility springing from it – in conventional political struggle, it will strive to eliminate it on ethnic grounds.” [35]

Orbán apparently was referring to the collectivist, open-borders, European Union mentality that seeks to replace nationalism with internationalism. And immigration facilitates this agenda. If countries can be so balkanized that there’s no longer “a people” but rather just a disparate collection of ‘peoples’, there then will be little sense of nationhood and hence little resistance to a loss of sovereignty and dissolution of borders.” [35]

There are several problems with this concept of marginalizing nation states. The concept of encouraging facilitated migrant inflow to Europe, thereby legalizing migration is very difficult to justify. Hungarian prime minister, Viktor Orbán summarized it as follows: “It’s absurd [...] when the Germans say they will spend billions on providing for the new arrivals instead of giving the money to the countries around the crisis zone, where the [migrants] should be stopped in the first place. It would be better for everyone. They would not come here. It would cost less. And our approach couldn’t be called into question morally either.” [36]

Another problem with this concept is that once nation states are marginalized in Europe as a result of a massive Muslim migrant inflow and a forced quota system to settle migrants in all EU countries, the migrant flow will not stop. The marginalization of nation states could be viewed as a stage of handling the migration crisis in Europe, but not the end state.

We can argue that those EU leaders playing with fire when encouraging an ever more massive Muslim migrant inflow are not short-sighted and they will change policies once nation states in the EU are eliminated, but this is naïve. The ever growing Muslim population in the EU will find the way to be represented by political parties, pro-Muslim leaders who will encourage new waves of Muslim immigration to Europe. Why? Because the encouraged migrants are their “brothers” and an ever growing percentage of Muslim population is the ultimate guarantee for the transformation of Christian (secular) European societies to Muslim culture. This is a vicious circle.
Even if European politicians might wish to stop the uncontrolled inflow of Muslim migrants to Europe, once their goals to eliminate nation states within the EU are accomplished, it might well be too late.

Once it would be too late to save Europe from the transformation to a Muslim society, democracy will fail as well. Since there is no truly democratic country in the Muslim world, it is hopelessly naïve to assume that once a Muslim majority is achieved in Europe, democracy could prevail. *If this happens, marking the end of European culture and way of life it would be the biggest policy failure Western civilization has ever committed in history.*

**Why NATO *de facto* does not Defend Europe, and is not Even Seriously Involved in Handling the Humanitarian Aspect of the Migration Crisis Affecting Europe?**

On 11th February, 2016, news emerged from the NATO defense ministry that “NATO ships are being deployed to the Aegean Sea to deter people-smugglers taking migrants from Turkey to Greece.”[37] NATO deploys 5 (!) ships altogether, 3 of them “urgently” (!) Do we really think, that 5 ships are an adequate answer when tackling the migration crisis affecting Europe? Do we really think that this would “change history”?

The same BBC article that provides the news that “NATO Chief Jens Stoltenberg said the mission would not be about “stopping or pushing back refugee boats” also stating that NATO wants to *deter* (!) human traffickers. What deterrence is that? It makes the whole effort truly ridiculous: even if those 5 ships might “disturb” the illegal migration flow, we make it clear officially, that the mission of NATO ships is not about “stopping or pushing back refugee boats”. [37]

This is ultimate impotence. We deploy an obviously inadequate amount of ships to do something, to collect information, to monitor migration flow etc. and we make it clear that we do not want to stop or to push back refugees. Meanwhile, we equate true refugees with economic migrants, which might be “politically correct” but is also unfair if we take the needs of true refugees seriously. We wonder what the NATO secretary general, Stoltenberg, would say if a NATO ally with the weakest navy in the Alliance would stand up at the end of the ministerial announcing that their country would send twice as many warships to the same area at sea to tackle the migration crisis since they take the security situation – that includes the security of the migrants – seriously, unlike NATO.

The reason such an approach in tackling the migration crisis affecting Europe in NATO is clearly not the lack of capabilities or financial resources, but lack of political will to interpret the migration crisis as a crisis. NATO talks about “urgency” when deploying those 3 ships yet it has nothing to do with tackling the migration flow to Europe at all, but about deceiving the *European indigenous population* frustrated by EU policies of handling the migration crisis.

What if we play the game entirely “politically correctly”? What if NATO is seriously concerned about the security and welfare of migrants, attempting to enter Europe? Is it the adequate response from NATO? Most probably not.

If NATO is truly concerned about the safety of the migrants coming from the South through the sea, the Alliance should have sent a huge fleet of warships and a significant

---

3 Such numbers are mostly omitted in main stream Western mass media and even in official reports addressed to the Hungarian Ministry of Defense.
amount of reconnaissance aircraft, also intensifying satellite surveillance to make sure that migrants would sail safely to enter Europe legally. That would be an effort comparable to what NATO is capable of doing. Since it is not done, the question arises whether the Alliance is “politically correct”. No, it is not, not even by its own terms.

Possible Scenarios of Handling the Migration Crisis Affecting Europe

There are two extremist scenarios when tackling the migration crisis affecting Europe. One extremist “solution” is to allow uncontrolled migration to Europe, leaving our borders wide open. In this case the growing migration pressure will provide an ever increasing amount of migrants, most of them entering Europe in hope of a better life. A new Muslim majority will become a reality and the migration process will most likely be far from over. European living standards, social security systems would collapse. European civilization and way of life would cease to exist.

If migration inflow to Europe is not simply “uncontrolled”, but deliberately encouraged and facilitated, that is an even more extremist way of tackling the migration crisis, bringing the very same or similar results as discussed in the previous paragraph.

The other extremist scenario is a creation of “fortress Europe” with tight border control equaling to a new “iron curtain” that prevents all forms of migration including true asylum seekers. This scenario might be considered inhumane, but ensures the survival of European culture and way of life.

There are countless possibilities between the two extremes. True asylum seekers could be adopted, economic migrants could be refused. Depending on the definition of true asylum seekers, a limited amount of migrant inflow could provide a balance, when European culture and way of life is unharmed, and the speed of assimilation of migrants is in balance with migrant inflow.

An intermediate scenario could be that some countries in Europe close their borders and do not allow the migrants to enter and settle. Others might be unwilling or unable to close their borders allowing a migrant flow through their country. If the migrant flow continues, a growing number of migrants would find themselves in various countries in Europe, along the closed borders. This could easily lead to a humanitarian disaster and collapse of societies. Such a scenario is building up in the Balkans, if some countries, such as Austria keep their promises and close their borders.

Recommendations for European Policy Makers

European policy makers have to make choices. No matter what policies they might support, they should clarify the reasons why they support certain policies while denying others.

References to human rights of the migrants are nice, but the interests of the majority, indigenous European populations should not be sacrificed for the benefit for an unlimited migrant population, that could soon be the new majority in Europe, if unlimited migration flow would further continue. Especially, if no limitations of the migration flow would encourage further tens or even hundreds of millions of migrants to enter Europe in a hope of a wealthier life.
If those politicians who support unlimited Muslim immigration to Europe believe, that it would solve the labor force problems of an aging Europe, they are wrong. There is unemployment amongst the indigenous European population in the EU that proves that migrant flow would make their chances to find a decent job even worse.

If European politicians, who support an unlimited migrant flow to Europe hope that they can lower wages of indigenous Europeans, who are considered to be a “too expensive” labor force, they are wrong again. Lowering wages means lower production costs but also lower purchasing power that together – since the masses of average employees consume the majority of goods – would be a disastrous tendency. Europe cannot truly compete with China or India where labor costs are truly low. That would be a reversal of anything left of the welfare states in Europe and the indigenous population will eventually rise up against such tendencies.

We also need to note, that technological development that tends to utilize ever more intelligent technologies, and will thus make the contribution of poorly skilled employees useless. The integration of a skilled workforce, such as engineers or medical doctors, could be relatively easy in Europe. Unfortunately, the bulk of the migrant population who are at best poorly educated in European terms, would become a burden to our economies. That sad reality would force masses of Muslim migrants into ghettos, unemployment, poverty, crime and ultimately terrorism. This is exactly the opposite of what de-radicalization might mean. This is the European cultural and economic trap that we create for ourselves and we have become the ultimate victims of our own policies. Such tendencies will surely overwhelm European social security systems far before Muslim migrants become a majority in Europe.

The bottom line is that if European politicians expect greater profits from an unlimited migration flow to Europe, they are wrong and short-sighted.

The solution to the migration crisis affecting Europe also demands foreign policy changes in the Middle East, North Africa and Afghanistan. “Here is the real solution to the refugee problem: stop meddling in the affairs of other countries. Embrace the prosperity that comes with a peaceful foreign policy, not the poverty that goes with running an empire.” [1]

Conclusions

- Western interventions in the Middle East, North Africa and Afghanistan resulted in wars, lasting chaos and instability. Interventionism – rather than conflict prevention – led to Islamist radicalization, rise of terrorism and increased migration pressure on Europe.
- European integration of Muslim migrant populations has mostly failed over the past several decades.
- Literal and rigorous interpretation of the Quran creates a firm basis for Islamic fundamentalist violence, including terrorism.
- Current handling of the new migration wave in 2015 proved European lack of understanding of the graveness of the problem, weakness, incapability to raise and answer fundamental questions, lack of unity of policies and efforts.
- Since the migration pressure on Europe will most likely increase and will be a long-term challenge, unchanged policies of handling the migration crisis and failures of de-radicalization and reintegration of Muslim migrants will lead to disastrous consequences including the endangering of the European way of life as a whole.
• Russia paid a high price in losses of human lives and destruction at the initial phase of the Chechnya crisis, but installing the Kadyrov dictatorship resulted in a remarkably successfully settlement.

• Russia has a great chance to militarily succeed against ISIS and other terrorist organizations in Syria. The successful Russian war efforts combined with the reinstallation of the Assad regime will likely bring peace and stability to the war torn country.

• Western and Russian military interventions – as a broad interpretation of de-radicalization – are quite similar in their nature. However, Western export of democracy is exactly the opposite of Russian installation of dictatorships.

• Russian de-radicalization efforts in Syria and possibly in Iraq and Libya have a great chance to ease the migration pressure on Europe.

• Unchanged Western policies in the Middle East, North Africa and Afghanistan have had a great chance to contribute to an ever more severe migration crisis and Muslim radicalization hitting Europe since 2015.

• While Western democracy export is bound to fail in Muslim countries, Russian installation of “home grown” dictatorships loyal to Moscow have great chances to succeed.

• Since there are no truly democratic countries in the Muslim world, Russian installation of “home grown” dictatorships is the logical answer.

• For similar reasons we cannot expect “political correctness” towards indigenous population, when Muslims might become a majority in Europe. “Political correctness” is strictly a Western intervention that works in Western environments, in addition to Japan.

• The rise of ISIS is the most obvious and disastrous policy failure of the Western export of democracy to the Muslim world.

• ISIS poses the biggest security threat not only in the Middle East, but against Europe and Russia as well.

• The Western world – especially the US – are not doing their best to eradicate ISIS.

• The interpretation of the migration crisis effecting Europe as an early stage of Jihad is a shocking discovery, even if the majority of Muslims migrants might not have such a firm plan at this time.

• The uncontrolled migration flow to Europe is harmful not only for the indigenous European population, culture and way of life but also for the majority of the migrants themselves.
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Annexes

Annex 1. The Bamiyan Buddhas before and after destruction by the Taliban.
Annex 2. NG maps.
Source: Institute for the Study of War.
Some major historic sites destroyed by ISIS until mid-August 2015.

Annex 3. The view of the 1400 years old St. Eliah’s monastery in Mosul prior to destruction by ISIS.
Annex 4. The 1400 years old St. Eliah’s monastery in Mosul before and after destruction by ISIS.
Annex 5. The Temple of Baal Shamin at Palmyra when destroyed by ISIS.

Annex 6. Iconoclasm: Catholic Altar Piece.4

4 “Altar piece in St. Martin’s Cathedral, Utrecht, attacked in the Protestant iconoclasm in 1572. This retable became visible again after restoration in 1919 removed the false wall placed in front of it.” Source: www.boundless.com/art-history/textbooks/boundless-art-history-textbook/northern-europe-and-the-iberian-peninsula-in-the-1500s-ce-26/the-reformation-163/the-reformation-625-5818/ (Downloaded: 04 04 2016)