



AGGRESSIVE SECULARISM, RADICAL ISLAM,



AND THE FIGHT FOR OUR FUTURE



# MICHAEL YOUSSEF

# MICHAEL YOUSSEF



AGGRESSIVE SECULARISM, RADICAL ISLAM,



### AND THE FIGHT FOR OUR FUTURE





The nonfiction imprint of Tyndale House Publishers, Inc. Visit Tyndale online at www.tyndale.com.

Visit Tyndale Momentum online at www.tyndalemomentum.com.

Visit Michael Youssef at www.ltw.org.

*TYNDALE, Tyndale Momentum*, and Tyndale's quill logo are registered trademarks of Tyndale House Publishers, Inc. The Tyndale Momentum logo is a trademark of Tyndale House Publishers, Inc. Tyndale Momentum is the nonfiction imprint of Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., Carol Stream, Illinois.

The Hidden Enemy: Aggressive Secularism, Radical Islam, and the Fight for Our Future

Copyright © 2018 by Michael Youssef

Cover photograph of Statue of Liberty copyright © naphtalina/Getty Images. All rights reserved.

Cover illustration of Isis flag by Almandillo/WikimediaCommons/CC BY SA4.0. All rights reserved.

Author photograph by Michael Schwarz, copyright © 2012. All rights reserved.

Designed by Libby Dykstra

Published in association with Don Gates, The Gates Group, www.gatesliterary.com.

All Scripture quotations, unless otherwise indicated, are taken from the Holy Bible, *New International Version*,<sup>®</sup> *NIV*.<sup>®</sup> Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984, 2011 by Biblica, Inc.<sup>®</sup> Used by permission. All rights reserved worldwide.

Scripture quotations marked KJV are taken from the Holy Bible, King James Version.

Scripture quotations marked NLT are taken from the *Holy Bible*, New Living Translation, copyright © 1996, 2004, 2015 by Tyndale House Foundation. Used by permission of Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., Carol Stream, Illinois 60188. All rights reserved.

For information about special discounts for bulk purchases, please contact Tyndale House Publishers at csresponse@tyndale.com, or call 1-800-323-9400.

#### Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Youssef, Michael, author.

- Title: The hidden enemy : aggressive secularism, radical Islam, and the fight for our future / Michael Youssef.
- Description: Carol Stream, Illinois : Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 2018. | Includes bibliographical references.
- Identifiers: LCCN 2017049076 ISBN 9781496431455 (hc) | ISBN 9781496431462 (sc)
- Subjects: LCSH: Christianity—United States. | Christianity and other religions—Islam. | Islam—Relations—Christianity. | Secularism.
- Classification: LCC BR526 .Y69 2018 | DDC 211/.6—dc23 LC record available at https://lccn .loc.gov/2017049076

Printed in the United States of America

24	23	22	21	20	19	18
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

### CONTENTS

Foreword vii

Introduction ix

Chapter 1	THE TRUTH ABOUT OUR FUTURE 1
Chapter 2	THE TRUTH BE HANGED 19
Chapter 3	WHAT AMERICA IS—AND ISN'T 39
Chapter 4	SECULARISM: THE ENEMY WITHIN 55
Chapter 5	FINDING THE TRUTH IN A POST-TRUTH WORLD 73
Chapter 6	WILL POLITICAL ISLAM DESTROY WESTERN CIVILIZATION? 103
Chapter 7	ILLUSION AND DELUSION—OR TRUTH? 129
Chapter 8	IS GOD'S JUDGMENT INEVITABLE? 155
Chapter 9	ACTION AGENDA: YOU CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE 177
	Failance The Even reliet and the Terreriet 105

Epilogue: The Evangelist and the Terrorist 195 Notes 199

### FOREWORD

THERE'S NO OTHER WAY TO PUT IT, REALLY. The moral fabric of America has been fraying for a long time—since the sixties at least. But can anyone doubt that this process has accelerated recently, that it is no longer fraying but actually tearing apart? Can we doubt that the bitter seeds that have been sown over the decades are finally coming to their ugly fruition?

Even the most fundamental things that once held us together as a culture and as a nation—free speech, for example—are struggling for life. College campuses, which were the bastion of inquiry and important centers of civil debate, have become hotbeds of fascist intolerance, so much so that speakers are being thrown off campuses simply for holding views that student mobs consider unacceptable. The Internet has become a particularly depressing maelstrom of nastiness, where actual conversation seems absolutely impossible. And of course and alas, our streets have become filled with violence. We might even bitterly conclude that the only free speech we are willing to recognize at this point is vandalism.

But let's not go that far quite yet. This book and its author give

me hope. My friend Michael Youssef has been a champion of the American political experiment for a long time, so now more than ever, it is important that we heed his voice on this subject. He and I are both passionate about the foundational documents and the founding fathers, and we share a desire to make others passionate about them too.

In this, his latest book, Dr. Youssef doesn't offer a simplistic explanation of what's happening in our day. He was born in Egypt and well knows what it is like to live under a regime that doesn't value liberty or free speech. As you will come to understand, Dr. Youssef sees two enemies of America that are wittingly and unwittingly tearing apart our republic. Namely, he identifies a new type of aggressive secularism that is opening the door for radical Islam. Both are hidden in plain sight, and both are intent on destroying American freedoms.

If you're asking yourself, as I did, what aggressive secularism and radical Islam have in common, then you need to read *The Hidden Enemy*. It's eye-opening and it's vital. If we all understand what they have in common, as Dr. Youssef explains in this book, we can together begin being a part of the solution. I hope you'll join me.

> Eric Metaxas October 2017 New York City

## INTRODUCTION

**OUR CIVILIZATION** is under assault from without—and from within.

We face an *external* threat from radical, political Islam. The enemy without wants to sweep away Western civilization and impose a global caliphate.

We face an *internal* threat from a coalition of secular humanists, atheists, and leftists. The enemy within wants to erase the Judeo-Christian values our Western culture was founded on, replacing them with false dogmas of secularism, sexual liberation, hedonism, and moral relativism.

The enemy without and the enemy within have almost nothing in common. Radical, political Islam seeks to impose a theocracy that, according to strict Islamic law, calls for the oppression of women and the execution of homosexuals. The secular left is fanatical about church-state separation, feminism, and gay and transgender rights.

The enemy without and the enemy within could not be more opposed to each other. You'd think they'd constantly be at each other's throats. Yet the secular left defends and supports Islamism,

and the two groups join forces to attack our Christian faith, Judeo-Christian values, Western culture, and the nation of Israel.

Often, the alliance between these groups goes largely unnoticed. Not long ago, however, representatives from the two groups publicly marched in solidarity. Like many leftist protest events, the Women's March on January 21, 2017, demanded reproductive rights (unrestricted abortions), LGBTQ rights, and wide-open borders—the usual progressive agenda. The march featured the standard collection of leftist sponsors: Planned Parenthood, the AFL–CIO, the National Center for Lesbian Rights, MoveOn.org, and more.

Oddly, however, the march organizers chose as co-chair an Islamist, Linda Sarsour, whom the *New York Times* dubbed the "Brooklyn homegirl in a hijab" in a flattering 2015 profile.<sup>1</sup> She's a darling of the left, whom President Obama honored as a "champion of change"—yet she advocates Sharia law in America. Her sales pitch: "You'll know when you're living under Sharia law if suddenly all your loans and credit cards become interest-free. Sounds nice, doesn't it?"<sup>2</sup> Sarsour neglects to mention that Sharia is incompatible with democracy, human rights, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, equality for women, LGBTQ rights, and other causes liberals claim to support.

The progressive left's fawning adoration of Ms. Sarsour is a vivid demonstration of the strange alliance between these two ideologically opposed groups. But this is far from an isolated phenomenon, as you'll see in these pages. The secular left and fanatical Islam have made a devil's bargain. Their mutual goal: the overthrow of Western culture and Judeo-Christian values.

How do we confront these enemies—the enemy within and the enemy without? Should we form a political action committee;

INTRODUCTION

hire a lobbying firm in Washington, DC; hold a protest march and flex our political muscle? Should we try to beat the Islamists and the secular left at their own game?

No. As God's Word tells us, there is only one way to win: We must "be strong in the Lord and in his mighty power" (Ephesians 6:10, NLT). We must never forget that Jesus taught us to love our adversaries, pray for them, and do good to them (Luke 6:27-28). The battle against Islamic and secular extremism is not one we can win with weapons of hate. The battle for truth can be won only by the power of Christlike love. Without His love, we're just clanging gongs and cymbals—making a lot of noise while accomplishing nothing (1 Corinthians 13:1).

But the enemy without and the enemy within are only *two of the three deadly threats* to the future of our children and grand-children. There's also *the hidden enemy*.

In fact, the greatest threat we face comes from this third adversary, one that hides from view. We don't want to admit that this threat exists, because then we'll have to deal with it. We'll have to struggle with it every day—vigilantly and prayerfully.

Later in the book, the identity of this hidden enemy will become clear. First, though, I want to help you understand the grave threat we face from our two very visible ideological opponents. Turn the page with me. Let me show you how to achieve a true and lasting victory over the enemy without, the enemy within, and ultimately—yes—the hidden enemy.

## THE TRUTH ABOUT OUR FUTURE

I WAS BORN INTO the Coptic Christian community in Egypt during a time of great social change.

In 1952, just four years after my birth, a group of nationalist military leaders launched a coup d'état, forcing Egypt's king Farouk to flee into exile. The revolutionary government abolished the monarchy, established a republic, and soon ended the British occupation of Egypt (which had begun in 1882). The leaders of the revolution brought both Islamic and socialist dogma into the new Egyptian government—the first time in history, to my knowledge, that you find socialism married to Islam.

Colonel Gamal Abdel Nasser proclaimed himself chairman of the Revolutionary Command Council and prime minister of the Republic in February 1954. Two years later, he was elected president. He became, in effect, the dictator of an Islamist-socialist military regime. Islamism and socialism are both totalitarian political systems that recognize no limits to the authority of the state. Both seek to control every aspect of public and private life.

So it should have come as no surprise when Nasser filled leadership positions in the government, corporations, and banks with army generals. By 1956, he began nationalizing all foreign commercial holdings, beginning with the Anglo-French-owned Suez Canal. He then nationalized foreign banks, including Barclays Bank, where two of my older brothers worked. He also nationalized private Egyptian companies and land holdings, placing large landowners under house arrest.

The small oil distributorship where my father worked was soon taken over by the state. I vividly recall the day my father came home from work, sat us down, and explained that he was out of a job. He had arrived at the office to find army officers standing guard. They told him the company was now the property of the state, and they sent my father and his associates home.

Another consequence of the Islamic-socialist takeover: The lives of Coptic Christians became much more difficult. The Copts' fortunes had risen and fallen over the centuries, but by the early 1900s, Christians and Muslims had been treated equally. Though Islam had been Egypt's dominant religion for more than a millennium, Christianity's roots in Egypt were much deeper. In fact, the Christian faith had thrived in Egypt from the first century on. According to Acts 2:10, Egyptian Jews were at the first Pentecost in Jerusalem, where they witnessed the coming of the Holy Spirit and heard Peter preach. After deciding to follow Christ, they returned to Alexandria and began spreading their new faith. Mark the Evangelist (the writer of the Gospel of Mark) arrived there around AD 49 and became the first bishop of Alexandria. By the second century, Christianity was the majority religion in Egypt, and Alexandria became the leading center of Christian theology for more than two hundred years.

Fast forward to the mid-600s, when Muslim hordes invaded Egypt from Arabia. After gaining control, those early Islamists offered the Christian majority population three alternatives: convert to Islam, die by the sword, or pay the *jizya* tax and accept their status as *dhimmi* (non-Muslim citizens of the Islamic state). Wealthy Egyptians could afford to pay the 15 to 25 percent jizya tax. But most of the Coptic Christians were too poor to pay. Not wanting to die by the sword, many pretended to convert to Islam. They outwardly practiced the Muslim religion while inwardly trying to maintain their Christian faith. Believing one thing while practicing another proved too difficult for many of these conquered Christians. The harsh Islamic religion scorched the gospel out of their hearts, like the seeds that fell on stony ground in the Lord's parable of the sower. That's why a majority of Egyptians are Muslims today.

Despite their long presence in Egypt, Christians became second-class citizens after the revolution. They could no longer be heads of banks, corporations, universities, or local governments. Highly educated Christians were relegated to minimum-wage jobs, and less-qualified Muslims were favored for career advancement.

The Nasser regime encouraged an atmosphere of hostility toward Christians. Muslims began harassing Christians without cause. When I was at school or just walking down the street, I was often mocked, insulted, and sometimes beaten by young Muslims who knew I came from a Christian family.

Not all Muslims were hostile to me. I had some very good friends at school who came from moderate, enlightened Muslim homes. (Note: Even now, most Muslims do not fall into the extreme Islamist camp, but these voices of reason are largely muted in our world today.) It was primarily the working-class

3

and illiterate Muslims who made life difficult for me and other Christians. Some parts of town were militant Muslim strongholds, and I didn't dare enter those neighborhoods alone, especially at night.

President Nasser clamped down on churches and Christian organizations. He revived old Ottoman-era laws restricting the rights of the dhimmi (Christians and Jews). For example, no new church could be built without the permission of the head of state. Also, no evangelism or missionary work was permitted outside church walls. These laws are still enforced today.

Nasser increased the number of paid and unpaid informants to the point that you never knew who might be a government spy. In businesses, in schools, and on the street, everyone was afraid to say anything critical of the government. Even at home, people spoke only in whispers, fearing an informant might overhear. The government employed student informants to report on their classmates. My parents warned me to be extremely careful about anything I said at school.

As a young man, I went to libraries and checked out books on American freedom and American ideals. I was fascinated, even mesmerized, by the freedoms Americans enjoyed. I was especially drawn to ideas such as freedom of speech and freedom of religion. At the same time, I worried that someone at the library might report to the government the kinds of books I was checking out. Yet I couldn't stop reading and dreaming of America.

### WHY I CHERISH FREEDOM

In 1977, I realized my dream and moved to the United States; in 1984, I achieved my goal of becoming a citizen. My early years

living under a socialist dictatorship, immersed in a hostile Muslim culture, gave me a perspective on our American freedoms that many native-born Americans don't have. In my heart, I was an American long before I became a citizen. I had yearned to be an American years before I ever reached these shores.

After arriving here, I was dismayed to see how many Americans had so little regard for their own history and the blessings of freedom they enjoyed. People who had lived in America all their lives didn't understand what a privilege it was to live here and to be free to speak their minds, to vote, and to openly share their faith. Too many Americans took freedom for granted. Having grown up under Islamo-socialist totalitarianism, that's something I'll never do.

Why do so many people around the world dream of coming to America? Why don't people dream of finding a better life in Venezuela? Or Iran? Or North Korea? Or Saudi Arabia? Because there is no freedom in those countries, nor economic opportunity, the great by-product of freedom. America attracts immigrants because America offers liberty.

One foundational American freedom is the ability to speak the truth without fear of punishment or arrest. At one time, that freedom was a fact of American life, as fixed and unassailable as Mount Rushmore. Today, that freedom is under assault as never before. There is a real possibility we may lose that freedom altogether. Some examples:

*Example 1:* Former Georgetown University law professor and gay rights activist Chai Feldblum helped draft federal legislation on sexual orientation. She is guided by the notion that whenever gay rights come in conflict with First Amendment religious liberty, the First Amendment must give way. She once told an interviewer,

"I'm having a hard time coming up with any case in which religious liberty should win."<sup>1</sup>

*Example 2:* After the deadly December 2, 2015, mass shooting by two Islamists at the Inland Regional Center in San Bernardino, California (fourteen dead, twenty-two wounded), many Christians offered their thoughts and prayers on social media. The secular left responded with a scathing backlash.

Arthur Delaney and Sam Stein, writing for the *Huffington Post*, said, "Every time multiple people have been gunned down in a mass shooting, all these officials can seemingly do is rush to offer their useless thoughts and prayers."<sup>2</sup> *Washington Post* columnist Gene Weingarten tweeted, "Dear 'thoughts and prayers' people: Please shut up and slink away. You are the problem, and everyone knows it."<sup>3</sup> *Daily Kos* founder Markos Moulitsas tweeted, "How many dead people did those thoughts and prayers bring back to the life?" Journalist Andrew Husband went even further, posting an ugly, obscene comment directed at those who pray after a tragedy.<sup>4</sup> Clearly, we have turned a corner in our culture if offers of prayer are met with howls of derision and hostility.

*Example 3:* During the 2016 Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia, the gay activist group Equality Forum held an event to celebrate the Supreme Court decision imposing recognition of same-sex marriage on all fifty states. The organizers also discussed future plans for advancing the gay agenda. One participant, Gautam Raghavan of the Gill Foundation, made it clear that they believe "gay rights" should always supersede the First Amendment: "I want to be careful that we don't say there is a kind of balance between equality [i.e., gay rights] and religious freedom."<sup>5</sup> Other issues discussed at the event included plans to impose transgender bathroom laws nationwide, promote gay sex education in public schools, and withdraw Title IX funding from religious schools that oppose the gay agenda. So expect the gay-rights assault on First Amendment freedom to intensify.<sup>6</sup>

*Example 4:* Professor Mark Tushnet teaches constitutional law at Harvard Law School. A few months after the death of conservative Supreme Court justice Antonin Scalia, Tushnet wrote a blog post declaring victory over conservatives: "The culture wars are over; they lost, we won. . . . For liberals, the question now is how to deal with the losers in the culture wars. That's mostly a question of tactics. My own judgment is that taking a hard line ('You lost, live with it') is better than trying to accommodate the losers. . . . (And taking a hard line seemed to work reasonably well in Germany and Japan after 1945.)"<sup>7</sup>

I could list many more examples—of Christian bakers, florists, and photographers being forced by the government to violate their conscience and provide services to same-sex weddings; of Christian businesses being forced to pay for abortion-inducing drugs for their employees; of Christian parents being told by school districts that they have no right to homeschool their children (most recently in the San Benito High School District in California in 2016).

The First Amendment guarantees our right to speak God's truth—but our First Amendment freedoms are under a sustained and determined assault by the secular left. We live in a world that rejects the very notion of verifiable truth. The pundits and social critics of our age have, in fact, declared the death of objective truth. Following the 2016 election, *Washington Post* columnist Amy B. Wang observed,

It's official: Truth is dead. Facts are passé. . . .

Oxford Dictionaries has selected "post-truth" as 2016's international word of the year, after the contentious "Brexit" referendum and an equally divisive U.S. presidential election caused usage of the adjective to skyrocket, according to the Oxford University Press.

The dictionary defines "post-truth" as "relating to or denoting circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief."<sup>8</sup>

Truth no longer matters to many of the people around us. Secularists elevate subjective opinion over objective truth. Facts have been replaced by emotions. Those who stand firm for God's truth are widely mocked and condemned. Yet God still calls you and me to take a stand for His truth in a world that despises truth.

Journalists used to try, at least, to present the news fairly and objectively. Old-school journalist Ted Koppel, who hosted ABC's *Nightline* for twenty-five years, decried the loss of factual, unbiased reporting in an op-ed he wrote for the *Washington Post* in 2010. He lamented the death of "a long-gone era of television journalism, when the networks considered the collection and dissemination of substantive and unbiased news to be a public trust." He criticized MSNBC anchor-commentator Keith Olbermann, who "draws more than 1 million like-minded viewers to his program every night precisely because he is avowedly, unabashedly and monotonously partisan. . . . While I can appreciate the financial logic of drowning television viewers in a flood of opinions designed to confirm [networks'] own biases, the trend is not good for the republic."<sup>9</sup> Olbermann fired back the next day, blaming journalists like Koppel for "worshiping before the false god of utter objectivity. . . . The kind of television journalism he eulogizes, failed this country because when truth was needed, all we got were facts most of which were lies anyway. The journalism failed, and those who practiced it failed, and Mr. Koppel failed."<sup>10</sup>

Koppel stood his ground, defining objective reporting as giving people "enough information that you can make intelligent decisions of your own."<sup>11</sup> He went on to warn that intensely partisan cable news shows and talk radio programs were dividing America into hostile partisan camps.

Yet even Ted Koppel could not have foreseen how bitterly divided America would be today. A deep ideological rift separates the American people because both sides are being fed a steady diet of venomous emotions, rage and hate, character assassination, extreme opinions, advocacy journalism, and violent images—all mislabeled as "news." Many reporters don't care about the truth any more, and neither do most news consumers. We just want programs that confirm our biases.

Likewise, many of our public universities are no longer devoted to objective truth and learning. Many have become factories for brainwashing students in "politically correct" ideas. Students are not trained to be wise and well-informed but are simply indoctrinated into the party line. They graduate knowing little about the classics, the humanities, economics, or history. But they know who their political and ideological enemies are.

The erosion of a respect for truth has been going on for decades. In 1987, activist Jesse Jackson—who was running for the Democratic presidential nomination—joined student protesters at Stanford University as they chanted, "Hey, hey, ho, ho, Western

Civ has got to go!" And the Stanford administration yielded to the demands of the activists, dropping the Western Civilization requirement from their catalog. Homer, Plato, Augustine, and Thomas Aquinas disappeared from the list of required texts. Students at one of the greatest universities in the world were cut off from their history, their culture, and their heritage of great thinking and truth.<sup>12</sup>

In recent years, the attack on truth in general—and biblical truth in particular—has accelerated. Most heartbreaking of all, some so-called "evangelical" leaders are tossing biblical truth overboard, stripping Scripture of its authority and replacing objective truth with so-called "narrative." Certain leaders no longer view the Bible as God's inspired and authoritative Word but as a collection of comforting and instructive stories.

One formerly evangelical leader complains that orthodox, conservative Christianity has "shown a pervasive disdain for other religions of the world," whose members we should view "not as enemies but as beloved neighbors, and whenever possible, as dialogue partners and even collaborators."<sup>13</sup>

Although Jesus was a master at listening and asking questions to get to people's real needs, He never compromised the truth. He never said, "Collaborating with other religions will set you free." He said, "If you hold to my teaching, you are really my disciples. *Then you will know the truth, and the truth will set you free*" (John 8:31-32, emphasis mine). Truth comes from the words of Jesus, and only His truth will set us free.

Yes, we should love Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists, atheists, and people of all religions and worldviews. We must reach out to them with the good news of Jesus Christ, empathizing with them and

THE TRUTH ABOUT OUR FUTURE

listening to their concerns and needs. But we can never become partners or collaborators with falsehood.

In a post-truth world, embracing all belief systems as equal may sound like an open-minded, openhearted idea. But Jesus was intolerant of falsehood. That's why He declared, "I am the way and the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father *except through me*" (John 14:6, emphasis mine).

I should note, by the way, that the same author who says Christians should "collaborate" with other religions also wrote that Jesus, in John 14:6, didn't really mean what He seems to say. The Lord's claim that "no one comes to the Father except through me" doesn't really mean that Jesus is the only way to God and heaven, according to this author. In other words, two thousand years of biblical scholarship have been wrong, and John 14:6 has been waiting all these centuries for this author to arrive on the scene and tell us what Jesus *really* meant.

The author mischaracterizes the evangelical interpretation of John 14:6, describing it as a way to "exclude the outsiders" by using "mental markers or belief markers" about Jesus and suggests that evangelicals believe that "God will reject everyone except people who share [our] doctrinal viewpoints" about Jesus.<sup>14</sup> That's a straw-man argument because that is *not* what evangelicals believe. John 14:6 does not call people to mentally accept a "doctrinal viewpoint" about Jesus. In that verse, *Jesus calls us to a relationship with Himself*. That is how John 14:6 has been understood since the first century AD, and that verse needs no radical reinterpretation for the twenty-first century.

When I see speakers and authors working so hard to force God's Word to say what it clearly does *not* say, I hear the apostle Paul whispering in my ear, "The Spirit clearly says that in later

11

times some will abandon the faith and follow deceiving spirits" (1 Timothy 4:1). In Jesus' high priestly prayer before going to the cross, he prayed, "Sanctify them by the truth; your word is truth" (John 17:17). All too often, however, we have polluted God's truth with borrowings from the false religions and philosophies of our culture. No one is sanctified by adulterated "truth."

If we as individuals reject or distort God's truth, we rob the truth of its power to set us free. The result: We become morally and spiritually enslaved. And when an entire culture rejects God's truth? That culture opens itself up to bondage. We are already seeing this process of cultural enslavement taking place in post-Christian Western nations like Great Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, and the Scandinavian countries. In some communities Islamic Sharia law is moving into the void left by the collapse of biblical Christianity.

In Great Britain, for example, an Islamic firebrand named Abu Izzadeen has been leading a campaign to impose Sharia law across the nation. Following his release from prison for funding terrorism in 2011, Izzadeen proclaimed himself "director for Waltham Forest Muslims" (Waltham Forest is a major borough in East London) and began organizing support for his campaign to impose Sharia on the entire borough. His organization's yellow leaflets have been posted to lampposts and shop windows, proclaiming, "You are entering a Sharia-controlled zone. Islamic rules enforced. No alcohol. No gambling. No music or concerts. No porn or prostitution. No drugs or smoking. Sharia—a better society."<sup>15</sup>

I won't argue that we'd be worse off in a society without gambling, porn, prostitution, and drugs. But a society without music? A society without freedom? A society ruled by fear? A society in which women have no rights and are treated as chattel slaves? A society in which "Islamic rules" are enforced with medieval brutality by Sharia tribunals? And there are already about eightyfive Sharia councils dispensing Quranic "justice" across Great Britain.<sup>16</sup>

American Islamist groups are currently trying to establish Sharia courts in the United States. Many misguided Americans, primarily from the post-truth left, support Islamism and the importation of Sharia to America, despite Sharia's legacy of punishing lawbreakers by flogging, amputation, and stoning. Please understand: *Islamist* is not a synonym for *Islamic*. Islamism is radical, activist, political Islam, the movement that seeks to impose Islamic principles and Sharia law on public and political life. Many on the left think that conservative objections to importing Sharia courts into America are paranoid—"Those mean conservatives just want to squash the rights of the poor, marginalized Muslims."

Why do liberals and progressives support Islamists—the most anti-progressive culture on the planet, a culture that oppresses women and executes homosexuals? How do we explain the irrational behavior of the post-truth left?

I think it comes down to a concept called *underdogma*, a term coined by columnist Michael Prell. Underdogma is a way of perceiving reality that divides the world into two camps—the strong and the weak, the powerful and the powerless, the overdog and the underdog. Underdogma, says Prell, is the "reflexive opposition to the more powerful overdog, and automatic support for the less powerful underdog."<sup>17</sup>

In his book *Underdogma*, Prell cites two statements by then-Senator Barack Obama during Supreme Court confirmation proceedings. When John Roberts was nominated as the US Supreme

Court's chief justice, Senator Obama expressed his view that "the role of justice is to favor the 'weak' over the 'strong.'" And Senator Obama complained that nominee Samuel Alito "consistently sides on behalf of the powerful against the powerless."<sup>18</sup> To Senator Obama, the role of the judicial system is not to dispense justice impartially according to the law and the Constitution, but to show favoritism to the underdog. This bias toward the underdog is pervasive throughout the post-truth left.

People who view the world through a lens of underdogma do not arrive at their views on the basis of logic and facts. They are led by emotion. A 2007 study, published in the scientific journal *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, showed how underdogma sways people's thinking.

Professor Joseph Vandello of the University of South Florida asked test subjects to read a one-page essay about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict from the perspective of each side. Test subjects were divided into two groups. Group A was shown a map depicting Israel as geographically large with Palestinian land as small. Group B was shown a map in which little Israel was surrounded by larger Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and so forth. The two groups were asked to identify the underdog in the conflict.

Seventy percent of Group A identified the Palestinians as the underdogs, and 53 percent said they sided with the Palestinians. Sixty-two percent of Group B identified the Israelis as the underdogs, and almost 77 percent sided with Israel. Both groups were provided with identical facts, but different maps—and the maps influenced their sympathies.<sup>19</sup>

It's not enough to ask, "Who is the underdog in this conflict?" We need to ask who is right and who is wrong, who is just and who is unjust. When deciding whether to support Israel or the Palestinians, we should ask ourselves two questions: 1. If Israel's enemies dropped their weapons today, what would happen? (Answer: Peace would break out.) 2. If Israel dropped its weapons today, what would happen? (Answer: War would break out.)

The Palestinians are weak and poor—but that doesn't make the annihilation of Israel a just cause. We need to base our views on principles of truth and justice—not on underdogma. Similarly, we need to make decisions about whether to import Sharia courts into America based on truth and justice—not underdogma. If we do not take a stand for God's truth in our post-truth culture, we will find ourselves enslaved in our own land.

The Israelites, long before the Babylonian Exile, practiced the same approach to truth that many practice today. They didn't believe God's ways were sufficient any longer. They wanted to import the "truth" of the Canaanites, Amorites, Philistines, Assyrians, and other pagan cultures. Israel paid a heavy price military defeat, the destruction of their nation, and the exile of their people—for ignoring God's warnings against mingling pagan practices with their laws and worship.

God continues to warn us not to tamper with the truth of His gospel. Decades ago, the late Dr. Francis A. Schaeffer predicted that the evangelical church would be seduced into spiritual adultery, and that all of Western civilization would pay the price:

A large segment of the evangelical world has become seduced by the world spirit of this present age. And more than this, we can expect the future to be a further disaster if the evangelical world does not take a stand for biblical truth and morality in the full spectrum of life. *For the evangelical accommodation to the world of our age represents* 

*the removal of the last barrier against the breakdown of our culture.* And with the final removal of this barrier will come social chaos and the rise of authoritarianism in some form to restore social order.<sup>20</sup>

Because of our failure to stand for God's truth, Schaeffer warned, the world would sink into chaos, the people would panic—and they would surrender their liberties to an authoritarian government.

I believe the events Dr. Schaeffer envisioned are already taking shape. America is fracturing into warring camps of left versus right, of haves versus have-nots, of blacks versus browns versus whites. There is a growing backlash against income inequality the concentration of more and more wealth in fewer and fewer hands. In American cities, peaceful protest marches are turning into bloody riots—and police are often standing back and abandoning neighborhoods to the mobs.

America is \$20 trillion in debt and running annual deficits of about half a trillion dollars. Just the interest on the national debt is approaching the amount we spend every year on national defense—which could leave us unable to defend ourselves against foreign enemies. What do you think will happen to our society if the government can no longer issue checks for Social Security, welfare benefits, medical benefits, and the federal payroll?

For several years, Pentagon planners have been partnering with social scientists in academia to study matters of US security, including the possibility of the collapse of American society and large-scale civil disorder within our borders. The Pentagon's multimillion dollar Minerva Research Initiative has quietly been working with universities around the country, seeking to understand how to contain the "social contagion" of mass panic and restore order in the midst of social upheaval and collapse.<sup>21</sup>

In 2016, two independent researchers—Matthew MacWilliams of the University of Massachusetts Amherst and Marc Hetherington of Vanderbilt University in Tennessee—determined that there was a growing desire for authoritarianism in the American electorate. According to journalist Amanda Taub, the researchers found that frightened voters, worried about social disintegration in America, were looking "for strong leaders who promise to take whatever action necessary to protect them."<sup>22</sup>

I hate the thought of America being reduced to such a state. When I lived under a dictatorship in Egypt, I saw how everyone, from journalists to pastors to students, had to obey the whims of the dictator—or face the consequences. The land of my birth was a police state where your neighbors might turn you in to the authorities if you voiced a minor criticism of the government or Islam. I thought I had left such oppressive practices behind when I emigrated to America. But in recent years, I've seen stirrings of the same authoritarianism in America that I once feared in Egypt.

Is it too late for Western civilization to rediscover the great truths on which it was founded? Is it too late for the church to regain its voice and return to its biblical roots?

No-not quite, not yet.

But we must be aware of the forces arrayed against us. Islamic extremism is coming at us from one direction, seeking to destroy the Christian faith and Western values. Secular fundamentalism is coming at us from the opposite direction, with the same goal of destruction. These are the enemies without and the enemies within. Collision is imminent. If we are to survive, we need to do more than simply brace for impact.

In the pages that follow, I will present a clear and practical action agenda for renewal and revival, rooted in the eternal truth of God's Word. You and I *can*—and *must*—become warriors for God's truth in a culture that is increasingly hostile to the truth. We must rediscover what it means to be the people of God's truth in a post-truth world.