

# Hanson defies critics, exposes radical Islam dilemma

 churchandstate.com.au/hanson-defies-critics-exposes-radical-islam-dilemma

Dave Pellowe



[Watch on YouTube](#)

18 Feb, 2026 | , |



“Even Barnaby is not defending Pauline on her ridiculous statement that there are no good Muslims. One Nation is not the answer.”

I consider Matt Canavan a friend, but I don't think he's being very sincere with his characterisation of Pauline Hanson's comments.

It comes as no surprise that Senator Pauline Hanson isn't the most articulate, polished or rehearsed of all politicians, and that's what we like about her. Sometimes she misspeaks and stumbles.

So what did she really mean? Did she clarify herself? And most importantly, is it what we all think — that zero Muslim immigration would be great for Australia? At least until that false religion and imperialist ideology is less than 1% represented in Australia.

I actually can't think of a more anti-Christian, anti-Western, anti-Australian culture than Islam.

Let's listen to Pauline Hanson in her own words:

"We can either go down one path and we will reap the rewards of our tough stance against Islam and the radicalisation that we will be facing, or if we open up the borders and allow more into the country, we are going to suffer. Future generations will, as other countries have, like France and Denmark and England and all these other countries and Canada — all these who thought, 'Oh well, we will welcome them.'

I tell you what, I've got no time for radical Islam. Their religion concerns me because what it says in the Koran — they hate Westerners. And that's what it's all about. You say, 'Oh well, there's good Muslims out there.' Well, I'm sorry. How can you tell me there are good Muslims? If jihad is ever called — and people must understand this — go and research, go and understand about this — and the ones that will suffer are those Jews did when they were murdered and slaughtered. That's what we've got to realise could happen."

Exactly right.

I've got the transcript, and I'm going to go through the things that she said very clearly, because I think she's made her meaning and intent very clear. We don't even need to ask her for clarification. We just need to look at the context of the conversation and the phrase in her own paragraphs of meaning.

The conversation is all about the Liberal Party's idea that there are multiple origin nations which have incompatible values with Australia and who, therefore, are undesirable. They're not trying to identify the individuals, but saying, look, these cultures altogether have incompatible values with Australia, and therefore we need to ban immigration from those nations.

The first thing Pauline says, clueing into the Liberal Party context, is:

"We can either go down one path and we will reap the rewards of our tough stance against Islam and the radicalisation that we will be facing, or if we open up the borders and allow more into the country, we're going to suffer. Future generations will, as other countries have, like France and Denmark and England and all these other countries and Canada — all the ones who thought, 'Oh well, we'll welcome them.'"

She's hit the nail on the head here. The whole culture is the problem. When you invite them in en masse and try to weed out the bad Muslims, the radical Muslims, you fail. It's failed every single time. We've seen it fail.

There's absolutely no reason to clutch pearls here because we've seen the failure of trying to pick out the individuals from a very bad ideology.

Pauline says:

"I tell you what, I've got no time for radical Islam."

She uses the words that we all want her to say. But I think we actually want her to say “Islam”, not just “radical Islam”, but all of “Islam”.

Let’s replace the word radical with authentic or fundamental. The more fundamental, authentic or radical the Muslim, the more that Muslim will adhere to the teachings of Muhammad, the Koran, the hadith and Muhammad’s life example.

The more radical, authentic or fundamentalist a Christian, the more a Christian will adhere to the teachings and life example of Jesus and the disciples.

Who do you think Western nations modelled our laws and our values on — Muhammad or Jesus?

So in Australia, a radical Christian looks like an ideal citizen because this is consistent with Australian values. In communist China, a radical Christian is a huge problem for the government. They love dictatorship. They love authoritarianism, which is why there are huge crackdowns, why the Church is driven underground in China.

That’s why the grievance industry and this hate speech legislation is so dangerous — because it essentially criminalises disagreeing with the government. The government is increasingly daring to moralise and religionise basic things like sanctity of life and sanctity of marriage. Christians get classified as “hate speech” or “conversion therapists”.



However, what's more obviously true and has always been true is that an authentic or radical Muslim has no compatibility with Christian values or Australian values at all.

“I think we can agree that radical extremist Islam that doesn't support Australian values has no place here.”

Let's just tell the Truth about Islam. Islam hates Jesus. They say nice things in it, but it's a smokescreen. It's propaganda.

What the Koran says is that Jesus was not crucified, that the god they worship is the greatest of deceivers, and He was only tricking us all when Jesus was crucified — that He never actually died, let alone resurrected.

They actually contradict all of Christianity altogether.

The Apostle Paul said:

“If Christ is not crucified and resurrected, then our whole faith is in vain.”

That’s what Islam teaches — that Christianity is altogether wrong because we believe in Jesus as God, was crucified, died and resurrected for the redemption of our sins.

That grace and mercy is the foundation of our civilisation, and fundamental, Koran-believing Muslims contradict Christianity. They’re incompatible with our religion. They’re incompatible with our culture. They’re incompatible with our values.

Later on in the interview, Pauline agrees with Sharri, repeating Pauline’s earlier statement:

“I’ve got no time for radical Islam.”

Sharri says:

“I mean, there are a lot of moderate Muslims in Australia who are, as you put it, good Muslims. But I think we can agree that radical extremist Islam that doesn’t support Australian values has no place here.”

Pauline said:

“Yes, I agree with that.”

The language here is moderate Muslims — meaning not Muslims, meaning less Muslim, meaning not fully adherent, not fully authentic, not fully committed to the fundamental teachings, tenets and life example of Muhammad. They’ve been Westernised. They’ve been reformed. Fantastic.

That’s what Islam needs, because from beginning to end it’s false religion. It’s a pernicious ideology. It’s a political constitution, imperialist in nature and violent in origins.

That is incompatible. If you want to call that radical Islam, fine. We don’t like radical Islam, but it’s authentic Islam that’s the problem.

Pauline’s comment here that everybody’s clutching their pearls over is:

“You say, ‘Oh well, there’s good Muslims out there.’ Well, I’m sorry. How can you tell me there are good Muslims?”

What she’s saying is you can’t tell them from a visa application. You can’t pick them out of a photo array. You can’t guess them from an interview.

I just quoted for you that their false god is described as the greatest deceiver, or the best of trickers. If they’re imitating their god as authentic “radical” Muslims, they’re going to be very comfortable deceiving whatever interview is designed to keep “radical” Muslims out.

You can't tell the difference between a good Muslim and a bad Muslim until they get into significant numbers. Then, like the European nations which have been indiscriminate and undiscerning in their immigration policies, they find out far too late.

You can't tell the difference between a moderate Muslim and a radical Muslim.

Pauline Hanson has said exactly the conversation that should have happened after the Bondi massacre, and that is: the problem is not guns and the problem is not hate speech. The problem is indiscriminate immigration and multiculturalism gone to seed.

Good on you, Pauline, if that's what you mean. I'm with you. If you mean something else, please clarify.

Dear Liberals, please follow this cue. You can't tell the difference between a good Muslim and others.

Now let me say this. As a Christian, I love the person in front of me. I love the Muslim in front of me. I don't love them like my family. I don't love them like my nation. I love them as Image bearers of God who are deserving of equal dignity.

But that doesn't mean they're automatically entitled to the red carpet treatment and blank cheque permission to do and behave and say whatever they want in this nation.

Christianity is not open border policy.

Being discerning about the reality of the ideology adhered to by people following the Islamist ideology — that's Christian. The Bible is absolutely full of instruction and wisdom on how to look beneath the surface and judge rightly.

## WHAT DO YOU THINK? Add your comments below...

---

**Dave Pellowe** is the founder of Church And State, a nationwide movement equipping Christians to be public salt and light: redeeming the culture and advocating for righteousness in government. Dave teaches Christians how God's unchanging Word answers all the controversial questions. Specialising in what God says about complex ethical and social issues, Dave Pellowe is a guest speaker at churches, youth groups and Christian schools, TV, radio and podcast interviews and other secular and Christian forums where love of Truth and honest thinking are valued. [[more](#)]

.