

Occasional Thoughts 7

July 2016

A call for clarity from Imams. The current war in western society. Where are the apocalyptic Brexit events? The continuing denial of democracy. Theresa May. The media war hiding the build up to a hot war.

A call for clarity from Imams

Yet another horrific terrorist attack, now in Nice, being claimed by IS.¹ What is worse in this attack was the high number of children and teenagers crushed under the wheels of a truck, plus hundreds with life-changing injuries and mental scars.

That any religion could consider this a service to God demonstrates a satanic mindset on the basis of common decency alone, let alone any ethical or religious standard.

It is so horrific, including the driver swerving to crush more innocent people, that it is time that questions were asked of the religious leaders such fanatics claim to follow.²

Such bestial behaviour prompts the question, why would any sane person do such a thing? In the case of fundamentalist Islamic radicals the answer is Jihad.

Jihad

'Jihad' means struggle and the doctrine has many applications; it is claimed to mean the struggle for personal avoidance of sin in Muslims, for example. However, it is more often applied today in the sense of the struggle to defeat the unbelieving enemies of Islam, the kaffir,³ in a 'holy war' and this appears to be the prophet Muhammad's view in the Qur'an.

Historically, this violent sense of Jihad was the catalyst for the rapid warlike expansion of Islam in its early centuries so that it not only took over all of Christian North Africa, Turkey and the Middle East, plus parts of the pagan Orient, but it also came close to conquering all of Europe until stopped by Charles Martel⁴ at the Battle of Tours⁵ in 732.

A key prompt for Islamic terrorists to commit such actions in a suicide fashion is the Islamic doctrine of heaven. This promises all manner of pleasures in a 'paradise' (garden) where all a person's desires are fulfilled. There are all kinds of food, drink and servants in a

¹ Though the perpetrator's connections are unclear. Whether he had direct links to IS (suggested by a text message asking for weapons), it is clear that he was influenced by Islamic principles.

² Some have said that the perpetrator was not a Jihadi radical, but IS have claimed responsibility for the atrocity making it Jihad.

³ Arabic *kāfir* 'infidel'; from *kafara*, 'not believe'.

⁴ Charles Martel (c.688–741), Frankish ruler of the eastern part of the Frankish kingdom (essentially France) from 715 and the whole kingdom from 719, grandfather of Charlemagne. His rule marked the beginning of Carolingian power.

⁵ Tours a city in west central France, on the River Loire; population 133,400 at 1990.

beautiful landscape, such as rivers of pure milk. More questionable, but widely believed, are the 70 or 72 virgin servants that a martyr for Islam can claim and marry.⁶

So, an Islamic radical terrorist commits atrocities to struggle for the advance (not just defence) of Islam and for the rewards he will get in heaven.

Therefore, there are multiple questions for Imams (the religious teachers of Islam).

Q. 1: does Islam condone terrorist atrocities?

The first question is: does Islam, therefore, condone terrorist atrocities? Or, does Islam command servants of Allah to murder kaffir (unbelievers)?

There are multiple passages in the Qur'an which affirm this. What is the Imam's response?

Scholars identify over 109 verses in the Qur'an that call for violence or war with unbelievers. Beheadings are commanded in the Qur'an, as well as chopping off fingers and to kill infidels wherever they are hiding. Muslims that do not enjoin this Jihad are told they will go to hell. Unlike the Old Testament's texts on violence, which are restricted by context and history, the Qur'an's verses are open-ended and not restricted by historical context.⁷ There are very few verses about tolerance or peace.

Examples

Qur'an 2:191-193 – *'Kill them wherever you find them ... fight them until there is no more Fitnah (unbelief).'* [The context is not defensive war but offensive against those who resist Islam.]

Qur'an 2:216 – *'Fighting is prescribed for you ... which is good for you.'*

Qur'an 4:74 – *'Let those who fight in the way of Allah ... be he slain or be he victorious, on him we shall bestow a vast reward.'*

Qur'an 4:476 – *'Those who believe fight in the cause of Allah.'*

Qur'an 4:89 – *'Take not friends from their ranks (unbelievers) ... seize them and slay them wherever you find them.'*

Qur'an 4:95 – *'Allah has preferred ... those who strive hard and fight ... Unto each, Allah has promised good [Paradise].'* [Note that the whole passage criticises Muslims that do not fight saying that they are less worthy to Allah. It also confirms that 'Jihad' means violence.]

Qur'an 5:33 – *'The punishment of those who wage war against Allah and his messenger and strive to make mischief in the land is only this, they should be murdered or crucified or their hands and their feet should be cut off on opposite sides or they should be imprisoned ... and have grievous chastisement.'* [This shows that the extreme punishments of IS and Sunni Saudi Arabia are only following the basic teaching of the Qur'an.]

Qur'an 8:12 – *'I will cast terror into the hearts of those who disbelieve. Therefore strike off their heads and strike off every fingertip of them.'*

Qur'an 8:39 – *'Fight with them until there is no more Fitnah and religion is all for Allah.'*

⁶ This is not a direct teaching of the Qur'an.

⁷ The divine command for genocide of the Canaanites (as judgment for their great sins) was time specific. Christians are not commanded to do such things; indeed, Christ commanded that his followers love and bless their enemies. The apostles reiterated this.

Qur'an 8:67 – 'It is not for a Prophet that he should have prisoners of war until he had made a great slaughter in the land.'

Qur'an 8:65 – 'Oh Prophet, exhort the believers to fight.'

Qur'an 9:5 – 'Slay the idolaters wherever you find them, and take them captive and besiege them and lie in wait for them in every ambush.'

Qur'an 9:29 – 'Fight those who do not believe in Allah.'

Qur'an 9:123 – 'Oh you who believe fight those of the unbelievers who are near to you and let them find in you hardness.'

Qur'an 17:16 – 'When we wish to destroy a town ... we destroy it with utter destruction.'

Qur'an 25:52 – 'Therefore listen not to the unbelievers but strive against [lit. 'Jihad'] with the utmost strenuousness.'

Qur'an 33:60-62 – 'We verily shall urge thee on against them, then they will be your neighbours in it but a little while. Accursed, they will be seized wherever found and slain with a fierce slaughter.' ['Slaughter' is translated as 'merciless murder' or 'horrible murder' in some versions.]

Qur'an 47:3-4 – 'Those who disbelieve follow falsehood ... So when you meet those who disbelieve smite at their necks till when you have killed and wounded many of them ... Those who are killed in the Way of Allah, he will never let their deeds be lost.'

Qur'an 61:4 – 'Surely Allah loves those who fight in his cause.'

Hadith⁸ and commentaries

Sahih Bukhari⁹ 52:177 – 'Fight with the Jews, and the stone behind which a Jew will be hiding will say, 'Oh Muslim, there is a Jew hiding behind me, so kill him.'

Sahih Bukhari 52:256 – 'The prophet ... was asked whether it was permissible to attack the pagan warriors at night with the probability of exposing their women and children to danger. The prophet replied, "They are from them." [I.e. it is permissible to kill women and children in attacking pagans.]

Sahih Bukhari 52:220 – 'Allah's apostle said ... I have been made victorious with terror.'

Muslim 1:33 – 'The messenger of Allah said, "I have been commanded to fight against people till they testify that there is no god but Allah".'

Bukhari 8:387 – 'Allah's apostle said, "I have been ordered to fight the people till they say, 'None has the right to be worshipped but Allah' And if they say so, pray like our prayers, face our Qibla and slaughter as we slaughter, then their blood and property will be sacred to us and we will not interfere with them except legally".'

Bukhari 11:626 – '[Muhammad said] "I decided to order a man to lead the prayer and then take a flame to burn all those who had not left their houses for the prayer, burning them alive inside their homes".'

⁸ Hadith [Arabic, 'report' or 'narrative'] is a prophetic tradition describing the words and actions of the prophet Mohammed.

⁹ Sahih al-Bukhari is in the prophetic tradition ('hadith') of Sunni Islam.

Muslim¹⁰ 20:4696 – ‘The messenger of Allah said, “One who died but did not fight in the way of Allah nor did he express any desire for Jihad died the death of a hypocrite”.’

Tabari¹¹ 7:97 ‘The prophet declared, “Kill any Jew who falls under your power”.’

Tabari 9:69 – ‘[Muhammad] *Killing unbelievers is a small matter to us.*’

Ibn Ishaq¹² / Hisham¹³ 484 – ‘Allah desires killing them [the enemy] to manifest the religion.’

Ibn Ishaq / Hisham 990 – ‘Cutting off someone’s head while shouting “Ahhahu Akbar” is an Islamic tradition that began with Muhammad.’

Ibn Ishaq / Hisham 992 – ‘Fight everyone in the way of Allah and kill those who disbelieve in Allah.’ [Muhammad’s instructions to his men.]

Thus we see that the Qur’an, and other sacred works and commentaries, commands: holy war until the earth is subdued; murder of individuals and even neighbours; violence against unbelievers; honour killings (Qur’an 18:65-81);¹⁴ beheadings; oppression of other religions; destruction of un-submissive towns; and much more.

Without a doubt, terrorist atrocities are commended by the Qur’an. What is the Imam’s response?

Q. 2 Is Islam a violent religion in its expression?

The second question is related: is Islam a violent religion in comparison to other religions?

Well the texts just referred to prove that it is. However, history can also solve this question for us. Islam is the most bloody and violent religion in the whole world. Its history of violence is without peer.

Jihad means that there is a continual war to compel the whole world to embrace Islam or die, or to live under humiliating restrictions as ‘dhimmi’.¹⁵ What the radical Islamists have stated is what Islam teaches. Radicals are not exaggerating the teachings of Islam.

Historians confirm that Islam is the greatest killer of all time, even worse than Communism, which killed in excess of 50 million. Islam destroyed the Christian states in North Africa, Turkey and the Middle East and then wiped out the Zoroastrians in Persia followed by many Hindus in Afghanistan and India. The approximate list of deaths is as follows:

- 60 million Christians killed in the initial Jihadic conquest of Europe and the Levant.
- 80 million Hindus killed from 1000 to 1525.
- 10 million Buddhists killed.

¹⁰ Sahih Muslim, one of the six major collections of the hadith in Sunni Islam.

¹¹ Abu Jafar Muhammad ibn Jarir al-Tabari was a prominent Persian scholar of the Qur’an.

¹² Muhammad ibn Ishaq ibn Yasar ibn Khiyar was an Arab historian and biographer of the prophet Mohammad.

¹³ Hisham ibn Abd al-Malik was the 10th Umayyad caliph who ruled from 724-743.

¹⁴ That is the murder of family members that bring shame to Allah.

¹⁵ Non-Muslim citizens of an Islamic state. These had rights as citizens but had certain restrictions and had to pay the jizya tax. They had less political freedom than Muslims but did have equality of property and contract.

- In Africa alone over 120 million Christians and animists were killed through the last 1400 years.

Islam's military and political activities routinely include mass beheadings and throat cuttings in public places. Campaigns waged against Jews, Christians, Zoroastrians, Buddhists and Hindus for centuries included mass beheadings. Christians who submitted to Muslim rule in Spain in 711 revolted in 713; Toledo was then pillaged and all the Christian nobles had their throats cut. In India the Mughal founder Babur (1483-1530; praised as a tolerant ruler) ordered the beheading of all the captives who surrendered during a Jihad campaign; a tower of skulls was erected in the camp.

The modern decapitations that are evidenced in the actions of IS, are not historically novel, and neither are they unusual. There have been beheadings in recent times in Muslim attacks in Indonesia, the Philippines, and Nigeria. In Kashmir Hindu priests and unveiled women have been beheaded.

Since Muslims are commanded by the Qur'an to expand their territory to embrace the whole world, violent invasion of other lands is a characteristic of Islam. Note:

Saifur Rahman, *'The Sealed Nectar'*, p227-228 – *'Embrace Islam ... If you accept Islam you will remain in command of your country; but if you refuse my call, you've got to remember that all of your possessions are perishable. My horsemen will appropriate your land, and my prophethood will assume preponderance over your kingship.'* [A letter from Mohammed.]

Massacres in history

Without any doubt, the text of the Qur'an commands violence in clear terms but history proves that Islam has been the most oppressive and violent force in human civilisation. Many of its leaders (such as Tamerlane) have been butchers while there have been multiple massacres. For example: Banu Qurayza massacre (627); Cordoba massacre of Jews (1011); Granada massacre of Jews (1066); Fez massacre of Jews 1033; sack of Constantinople (1453); the Beslan massacre (2004); and the Sudan genocide (1983 onwards). Even Salah-a-din,¹⁶ the respected and supposedly honourable opponent of Richard the Lionheart in the Crusades, committed massacres and tarnished his name.

Muhammad

Muhammad was a military leader who besieged towns, massacred the men, raped the women and enslaved the children. He often rejected offers of surrender and even killed captives. To inspire followers to wage war when they did not feel it was morally acceptable, he promised them slaves and booty and threatened them with hell if they refused.

When the Qurayza Jews remained neutral in the siege of Medina, and killed no one from either side, Muhammad beheaded every male member of the tribe and every woman and child was enslaved, while he raped one of the women.

Islam is most certainly not a religion of peace.

Q. 3: Are there rewards for violent martyrs?

The third question is: is it true that martyrs for Islam will receive the rewards in paradise that many claim?

¹⁶ Saladin (1137–93), sultan of Egypt and Syria 1174–93; Arabic name Salah-ad-Din Yusuf ibn-Ayyub. Saladin reconquered Jerusalem from the Christians in 1187, but he was defeated by Richard the Lionheart at Arsuf (1191). He earned a reputation not only for military skill but also for honesty and chivalry.

Qur'an 4:95 – 'Allah has preferred ... those who strive hard and fight ... Unto each, Allah has promised good [Paradise].'

Qur'an 48:17 – 'Whoso obeys Allah and his messenger, he will make him enter gardens underneath which rivers flow [i.e. Paradise]. [We have earlier seen that obeying Allah includes fighting unbelievers.]

Qur'an 61:10-12 – ' You strive hard and fight for the cause of Allah and his messenger ... He will forgive you your sins and admit you into gardens under which rivers flow and pleasant dwelling in gardens of 'Adn [Eden].'

Bukhari¹⁷ 52:73 – 'Allah's apostle said, "Know that Paradise is under the shades of swords."'

Muslim 20:4645 – 'He [Muhammad] said, "There is another act which elevates the position of a man in Paradise to a grade one hundred [higher], and the elevation between one grade and the other is equal to the height of heaven from the earth. He [Abu Sa'id] said, "What is that act?" he replied, "Jihad in the way of Allah."'

Without a doubt, those who fight and war for Allah will be greatly rewarded, according to Islamic teaching and scripture. No wonder young idealistic Jihadis are ready to commit suicide or die in a terrorist attack. It is following basic teachings of Mohammed.

Conclusion

If the theological answers to these three questions is 'Yes', then Imams, politicians and media reporters need to stop harping on about Islam being a peaceful, tolerant religion and simply accept that it teaches violence. There is nothing radical or fundamentalist about this, these questions get to the root of what Islam is, both in its scripture, its history and its current practices. In fact, you can find Islamist sermons on YouTube openly affirming that ordinary Islam commands killing kaffirs, and especially Gay people, which the Qur'an commands to throw off a cliff.¹⁸

What we need is some honesty.

What about Christian wars?

Now someone may interject and say, 'What about the wars started by Christians?'

Well, I must first ask that you tell me what war was started by a genuine, born again Christian. I doubt anyone can find one.

While it is true that Oliver Cromwell was a Christian and did wage war, his part in the civil war (which he did not start) was in defence of the law. His part in other wars, such as Ireland, was in defence of the realm and a necessity for a national leader. He did not initiate these; neither was his severity different from that accepted at the time.

There were wars in Reformation times that did involve Christians, such as Zwingli (as chaplain); but no Reformer started a war and others involved were acting in self-defence or in defence of their country or in aid of an ally to end a war (such as Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden). Calvin did not start any wars and neither did he kill Servetus.

Regarding the Crusades, the idea that these were generated by Christians is just nonsense. These were political in part and opportunistic in the main. No Crusade leader was a born-

¹⁷ Sahih al-Bukari is in the prophetic tradition ('hadith') of Sunni Islam.

¹⁸ Hence some have been thrown off tall buildings in recent years.

again believer; in fact many were there for military opportunity and glory (such as Richard the Lionheart).

Having said that, the cause of the Crusades was the military activity of Islam to overthrow countries that had long been Christian centres (such as Turkey, the Middle East and North Africa). These had fallen to violent actions by Islamists whereby millions of Christians were killed and women and children sold into slavery.

Furthermore, the number of military campaigns waged in the Crusades is a tiny, tiny fraction of the battles waged by Islam, so that they pale into virtual insignificance.

Overall conclusion

With all respect, my questions to Imams remain open. How can moderates condemn violent atrocities when it is part and parcel of Islam?

I ask Imams to admit what is simple truth; Mohammed and the Qur'an, as well as other scared literature and commentaries, all command violence to unbelievers, beheading of those who resist, raping of unbelieving women and support terrorist attacks to advance the territorial expansion of Islam.

What is blamed on radicalised fundamentalist Jihadists, is nothing but essential Quranic teaching. It is Islam.

Sources

- Andrew G Boston; FrontPageMagazine.com, 'The sacred Muslim practice of Beheading', 13 May 2004.
- Bill Warner: Political Islam.
- Oxford Encyclopaedia.
- Oxford Dictionary.
- The Religion of Peace (TROP): What makes Islam so different?
- The Qur'an.

The current war in western society

Acquiescence of western leaders to Islamic terrorism

Following on from my discourse about violence in Islam, we need to discuss the current acquiescence of western leaders to this phenomenon and the failure of both media and social commentators (apart from the alternative media) to denounce this properly, resulting in the politically correct acceptance of Islamic terrorism as 'normal'.¹⁹

Before you gasp that I say this, French Prime Minister Manuel Valls, in the light of the recent Nice atrocity, affirmed that the French must accept that Islamic terrorism is now a normal way of life in France to be accepted.²⁰ Why?

Valls went on to say, '*There is no legal basis for arresting the European Jihadists or banning them, from leaving or entering France*'. No wonder he was later booed and called a 'murderer'

¹⁹ I acknowledge a partial debt to Paul Joseph Watson in this piece. 'Nice Terror attack: what they're not telling you', YouTube, 15 July 2016.

²⁰ 'Social media furious over PM's, "France will have to live with terrorism" comment.' 15 July 2016.

at a public memorial event in Nice. Even Nicholas Sarkozy (centre left) criticised the French government for being too soft on terrorists.

The acceleration of terrorism

Why has France suffered a terrorist attack every few weeks for 18 months? Why has France suffered more people dying of terrorist attacks in the last two years than in the last 100? [In fact, there have been 1268 terrorist attacks in 50 countries in 2016 so far (July).]

The reason is the spineless capitulation to Islamic attacks and even an agreement with certain IS objectives by the politically correct left.

When Valls makes comments like he has, IS knows that it is winning its battle to have a caliphate in Europe. It redoubles its attacks since there is evidence of political leaders being ground down and submitting to terrorism. Thus France has had repeated attacks.

Polls show that significant proportions of migrants from the Middle East to Europe support IS; for example, 21% of Syrians, 13% of Tunisians or 8% of Turks.

Furthermore, Muslim support for suicide bombing within European populations is quite high:

Country	The whole Muslim population	18-29 year old Muslims
France	35%	42%
Spain	25%	29%
UK	24%	35%
Germany	13%	22%

Almost half of young French Muslims favour suicide bombings!

The problems being caused by Islamic migration are becoming so serious that a French security chief has warned that it could spark civil war in France – just what IS wants (and just what the global elite wants also).

In Germany the intelligence services have already foiled a migrant-based bomb plot in Dusseldorf while the mass rapes in Cologne and Hamburg are well known; other rapes receive scant attention. No one mentions that Mohammed supported the raping of unbelievers. Also note common headlines such as: *'Suspected Istanbul mastermind was a refugee protected by the EU'*. *'Russia tried to extricate ISIS terrorist on two separate occasions'*.

As I write this piece, two more terrorist attacks have occurred in France and Germany in the last few hours.

In the latter case the suspect, who attacked people on a train with an axe and a knife, had an IS flag in his possession and IS released a video of his prior threats. He also shouted 'Allahu akbar' during his attacks but the initial news report made no mention of Islam or Jihad or IS. In fact they stressed that there were no signs of a direct link to Jihad!!!. He was an Afghan asylum seeker.

The French case involved a Muslim man who attacked a mother and her three daughters (aged between 8-14) with knives while they were eating breakfast because they were scantily dressed (shorts and T-shirts). The eight-year old girl is in critical condition. Just

how sickening must these attacks be before Muslims wake up? Again the press refused to criticise or even associate Islam. Local prosecutor Raphael Balland said, *'The motive of the attack is very unclear. No religious connotation word has been pronounced'*.

In contradistinction, Japan has not experienced attacks by Islamist extremists because it has a low proportion of Muslim migrants.

Complicity of the left

The left wing is protecting radical action against Islamist terrorists by protecting their human rights. Just look at the vehement castigation directed against Trump for suggesting that proper controls be erected at US border points and proper vetting of US Muslims begin. What is wrong with taking some action to cope with the multiple Islamist based terrorist attacks? Is that not better than Obama's inaction?

Democrat (left) Obama doesn't dare use the term *'Islamic terrorism'*. He has even given speeches criticising those who slander the name of the prophet of Islam by accusing Islam of violent teachings (which is true). Why? Where is the defence of those killed in numerous Islamic terrorist atrocities?

Democrat (left) presidential candidate Hillary Clinton has tweeted, *'Let's be clear: Islam is not our adversary. Muslims are peaceful and tolerant people and have nothing whatsoever to do with terrorism'*.²¹

In Britain recently, the new Labour (left) mayor of London, Sadiq Khan, shared platforms in the mayoral election campaign with radical Islamists. When this was pointed out by his Tory (right) rival, Zac Goldsmith, the latter's political career was ruined in days.

After the Nice attack, Channel 4 news sparked controversy by having a report on the attack presented by a female journalist wearing a hijab. The focus became Muslim freedom of expression rather the grief for the dead or anger against the perpetrator.

Anyone who criticises Islam or Muslims for the violent basis of their religion are pilloried, harassed or even imprisoned on the basis of racism.

For example, a German comedian who made fun of Turkey's Muslim President Erdogan was imprisoned after Erdogan complained to Angela Merkel. This is a scandal.

We have seen headlines such as, *'Cops threaten Dutchman for opposing Govt. mass migration plans'*. Opposing mass migration leads to slanders of racism; such charges then become the basis of prosecutions.

While the left politically correct enthusiasts spend their time protecting the human rights of known Jihadis in their country, not enough is done to enhance the security of the public.

Many on the left have cosied-up to radical Islamists in London who share a hatred for the rich, austerity measures, bankers, globalists and Zionism. In fact the manifesto of IS avers that it will recruit western leftists that share many of their goals. There are increasing links between left activists and anarchists who oppose globalism and Zionism, especially in Italy, with Jihadis. Muslim radicals are moving ever closer to left wingers, and even Neo-Nazis, because they share so many goals. This situation is an explosion waiting to happen.

²¹ Tweet 19 November 2015, 9:57am.

Complicity of the media

The media, in the light of the Nice attack, failed to use the words 'Muslim' or 'Islam', despite it being a claimed Islamic terrorist attack, and instead blamed the truck used. Headlines appeared such as, '*Truck attack on French crowd*' (New York Times). Or, '*Truck rams crowd; 84 dead in Nice*' (CNN). '*Children feared killed in Nice as truck attacks family event*' (CBC News). Why is the media scared to use the 'M' or 'I' word ('Muslim' or 'Islam')? Why stupidly project responsibility to an inanimate object?

Social media continually protects the rights of Jihadis and even IS. Facebook removed posts that, '*condemn Muslims and their death cult religion*'. Facebook even took down an image that poked fun at IS.²²

In one stupid move by the Press in the UK, an article actually told terrorists how to get the most devastating effect – by exploding the 1400 tons of explosives in a WWII wrecked ship near the Isle of Sheppey. There is no security on this vessel, the masts of which stick out above the water, and if it exploded it would be the biggest non-nuclear explosion in human history outside of war and would create massive floods in Kent. Why even publicise such information as a gift to terrorists?

The historic elite strategy

All this is just a part of the long-term strategy of the global elite, which I have delineated several times.

Since the late 1800s it was an elite strategy to have a third world war (following the first two that secured its former plans) that would develop between Islamic forces from the east and Christian civilisations in the west. This would be the final war before a new totalitarian empire would emerge from the ashes.

Part of the strategy included plans to dilute and mongrelise Christian Nations, especially in Europe and America, to destroy the concept of nationhood and sovereignty and to produce a homogenised mongrel population more easy to control than nationalists. There would also be a radical Islamic Fifth Column centred in these nations. These plans are already well underway now.

This has been fulfilled in the drastic migration policies of the EU. Angela Merkel even ignored her own parliament and illegally introduced over a million Muslim migrants into Germany that immediately began raping white women (as planned). Remember that raping unbelieving women is an accepted aspect of the Qur'an and follows Muhammad's own actions, as at Medina.

The mass infiltration of Islamic migrants into the west, hidden under the guise of humanitarianism, is all part of the elite's plans to ruin national purity and cultural idioms, and also introduce social discord as migrants depress the wages of the poor unskilled workers everywhere they go. Remember that this was planned and documented decades ago; it has been no secret.

Eventually anger at what is going on will make a religious war more likely. The west through NATO did its best to facilitate this war by initiating al-Qaeda and IS, and then arming them, funding them and resourcing them.²³ Only the actions of Syria's Assad and Russia's Putin have stopped this from its fulfilment.

²² Huffington Post, Steven Hopkind, 18 August 2015.

²³ For details of this see previous papers, such as *Depths of Deception* and other occasional thoughts.

Meanwhile, according to the French PM, crushed bodies of children on a Riviera seafront esplanade is *'normal'* and to *'be accepted'*.

Trump may be many unpleasant things, but he is correct that something has to be done to better prevent Jihadist terrorists from fleeing west with migrant refugees. When Nigel Farage made this point he was viciously castigated as a racist. But it is now the case that there are centres in France and Belgium (especially Brussels) that are headquarters and resourcing communes for IS. This has been well known for a long time and nothing is being done. Sadly more terrorist attacks in both these countries are inevitable.

Conclusion

We have seen that appeasement does not work; IS just takes advantage of weak leadership, as we have seen in France. Multiculturalism is not a humanitarian policy but the strategy of the elite to dilute nationalism and mongrelise states, and it has proved to be a social failure. The Brexit vote alone shows the public momentum against this. We are seeing Islamic ghettos increasing in number and influence all over Europe. European Islamic terrorism is now rampant. What is to be done?

Tell the truth and inform the public with accurate information.

I can't see this happening any day soon from the establishment. Yet the public need to know the truth about Islam, the truth about Islamic ghettos and radicalisation centres; and the truth about European weakness in the face of terrorism.

At the very least the truth about the teachings of the Qur'an, while the history of Islamic invasions and massacres should be admitted and openly dealt with. Why is there constant reference to the Crusades, alongside national faux guilt, when the cause of the Crusades was Islamic invasion, massacres, genocide, slavery and cruelty?

Expose political correctness

The phoney humanitarianism that results in weakness in the face of terrorism needs to be exposed. The lie about racist slanders needs to be exposed so that people can be freed to be active in pre-empting attacks and reporting suspicious activities. People should not fear prosecution for reporting suspicions.

End the EU's open doors policy and mass migration

Again, I can't see this happening, as it is a foundational elite strategy. Yet the Brexit vote shows that the people en masse can make things happen. Uncontrolled migration was at the heart of many votes for exiting the EU.

Retain English identity in social infrastructure.

Don't pander to migrants who wish to settle in the UK. The fact that English kids cannot get places in schools where 30 languages are spoken, and none of them English, is a disgrace. If people wish to live here then they must learn English, just as British expats overseas have to learn the local language.

All schools should teach in English alone. This principle served previous migrations well and enabled Commonwealth influxes to settle into the community. If Pakistanis, Indians, Nepalese, Africans and Caribbeans were able to integrate effectively and become British within a generation, then Eastern Europeans, Syrians, Libyans, Iraqis and Afghanis can do the same. In fact I know of many such folk that have managed this. Why are we pandering to multiculturalism and multilingualism in social services and schools at huge cost? British benefits and services should be on the basis of being British. Overseas immigrants can quickly acclimatise to British traditions and language if they want to. In fact, the immigrants that do best are those that assimilate.

Deport Jihadis and threats to security

Since large numbers of UK Muslim Jihadis have expressed sympathy with IS and approve of suicide bombing, we already have a very big problem. This needs to be tackled hard.

When a genuine threat to security is proven in the British courts, then the immigrant involved must be deported to his place of origin immediately and not held up by the European Courts of Justice. If it is a British natural, then he must be dealt with according to the law.

No radicalised Jihadi should be awarded protected status.

Furthermore, those teachers of Islam that are proved to be hate preachers that radicalise and spawn terrorists should be deported immediately.

Aside

Before anyone accuses me of racism, I have no beef against individual Muslims but make the point about what Islam teaches and what is going on today. In fact I have secular Muslim relatives whom I love and who are decent people; – but these do not ardently follow the Qur'an.

In fact I have found that the secular Muslims I have met have been more ethical than many British young people. These include Iranians, Afghanis, Turks and Iraqis and it is because they hold firmly to long held social traditions which many British youngsters have rejected as a result of elite propaganda in schools.²⁴

Where are the apocalyptic Brexit events?

I am tired of politicians and reporters banging on about the lies told by the Brexiteers that have left voters wondering if they voted correctly. Over and over again the exit camp is being berated by the media for lying, in a relentless propaganda crusade.

Well has everyone forgot the massive lies told by the remain camp?

What about EU President Donald Tusk's claim that Brexit would mean the end of western civilisation? What about the recession that would immediately ensue on a Brexit vote? What about George Osborne's claim that an immediate emergency budget would be required that would necessitate reducing benefits, reducing spending on the NHS and raising taxes? What about the claims that foreign investment would stop, that interest rates would need to be cut, that the FTSE 100 index would crash and that a financial catastrophe would hit the land? We could go on and on.

In fact what happened was:

- Philip Hammond (the new Chancellor of the Exchequer) has affirmed that no emergency budget is necessary and that the Autumn statement will proceed as normal.
- The Bank of England did not cut interest rates in July.
- The FTSE 100 index a few days (July) ago rose to its highest level in 11 months.
- Firms like Siemens (which had affirmed that inward investment would be cut) have stated that they have changed their mind and investment will continue as normal.

²⁴ Such as respect for parents, respect for the old, honesty and hard work.

- The pound fell and rose, and fell and rose, and then rose; but that is just normal responses to uncertainty. A falling pound is good for exports anyway.
- ARM, the British company whose technology is in far more computer chips than Intel, has been taken over by a large Japanese corporation that provides a major boost of inward investment and shot the share price up 43%.
- 12 countries, including former Commonwealth countries, are lining up to make a free trade deal with us.
- America has not ceased trading with us.
- The world didn't end, war didn't break out and the earth didn't open up.

Instead of focusing upon Brexit lies (whatever they are; most of the claims are misunderstandings by commentators and not lies), why not focus upon proven factual lies from the remain camp?

What is wicked is that many firms have put up their prices on the basis of Brexit when no change has been required. This is just wicked profiteering.

We are also paying the EU Commission for our representative when we have none.

The sooner we are properly out (that is yet to happen and may not occur) the sooner we can begin ordering our economy and policies according to our own sovereign decisions and the quicker Britain will prosper. The foreign nations that are lining up to do trade deals cannot do so while we are still in the EU; we quickly need to free ourselves from the despotic clutches of the EU commission.

This uncertainty until Brexit is consummated will no doubt affect the economy. It will not be exiting the EU that causes this but the uncertainty in the meantime.

The continuing denial of democracy

Legal challenge to the referendum

A legal challenge against the referendum will be heard by the High Court in October, two judges have decided.

Just how can anyone mount a legal challenge against a legal democratic plebiscite? What possible argument could be sustained against a majority vote in a legal referendum?

Furthermore, this action is being mounted by a mere handful of people, chiefly one Gina Miller, an investment manager in London, plus a London hairdresser and a few others.

While a referendum has no legal power to make a change, it is a democratic statement of advice to the government, which would be foolish to ignore it. In fact, if the PM should overturn the referendum there will be rioting in the streets and parliament will be finished in its current form. The country already believes that parliament has failed the people and is not representative. If it reneged on a PM's promise (*'Brexit means Brexit and we will make a success of it'*, Theresa May) as well as a referendum, no one would trust parliament ever again and support of the current system would be dramatically affected.

Sturgeon's rabid crusade

Meanwhile Nicola Sturgeon continues with her undemocratic and treasonable actions. The latest suggestion is that Scotland could stay within the EU and remain part of the UK; a

question of having your cake and eating it methinks. How much public money is going to be wasted on lawyers trying to extricate legal sense out of this unprecedented conundrum is anyone's guess.

Sturgeon continues to threaten that if Theresa May triggers Article 50, she will launch an independence referendum. Meanwhile polls suggest that a significant proportion in her own party is queasy about the EU. A series of polls have suggested that a large minority (about a third) of SNP voters are Eurosceptic.²⁵ Thus SNP voters are the largest bloc in favour of leaving the EU in Scotland.

Sturgeon does not even have a majority in Holyrood, being two seats short.

How can this minor politician continue to threaten the whole of the UK with a veto against leaving the EU?

Labour chaos

Meanwhile, the Labour Party is still in turmoil with anti-democratic rebels still causing chaos with no care about what they are doing.

Angela Eagle has been shown to be despicable in her actions sparking a civil war. She stabbed Corbyn in the back, despite being in the Shadow Cabinet and praising him for changing the party. She ignored normal party procedures for mounting a leadership challenge and did so at a time of national crisis. She then went on a rampage denouncing his leadership at every turn, despite knowing that 60% of the party had voted for him and despite the need to provide government opposition. Then when she faced a vote of no confidence from her own constituency party membership, because she had categorically acted against their wishes, she ignored it completely and pressed on.

Thankfully, now the leadership contest is formally established, she is way behind both Corbyn and Owen Smith with little hope of winning.

As the virtual ink dries on the virtual paper, Eagle has just announced that she is dropping out of the leadership contest. Thankfully she managed to get something right. Perhaps the Labour Party can soon get its house in order and be an effective challenge to government.

The Labour problem is with the simple fact that the Westminster Labour MPs are completely out of step with the Labour Party membership, which has become politically energised.

Most of the Labour MPs are Blairites, many of whom were in power with Blair and who (like Angela Eagle) voted for the Iraq War. Corbyn represents a new thrust (actually a historical socialist thrust) which is in tune with the left electorate. This puts him at odds with the Westminster champagne socialists but adored by the membership.

It appears that everyone, even his enemies, admire Corbyn for his values, his new left vision and his integrity; his problem is not so much leadership as management. It appears that he is a poor administrator but a good visionary and communicator.

This is a simple problem to fix if the party had any sense. Appoint a good strategic general manager to run the day-to-day party administration and put into effect Corbyn's vision. Simple! In fact Blair had something similar with Alistair Campbell, even though Campbell was supposed to be merely a PA advisor.

²⁵ The Guardian, Severin Carrell, 'Eurosceptic SNP voters ...' 12 May 2016.

The constant moan of the, frankly, centre-right Labour MPs is that Corbyn is not electable. This shows the deviation from democratic politics. These Blairites could support a man with no morals, and who was a constant liar, because he made a good show of being a presentable leader; but they cannot support a less presentable man of good integrity.

Yet the changes in the membership reveals that that is exactly what the membership wants. Dismayed by years of Labour betrayal of socialist values in a lust for power, the membership wants a return to socialist values (even if it means staying out of government), maintained with integrity. In fact, a good opposition with national support can actually deeply affect politics even without being in government. Just look at UKIP's achievement in gaining Brexit despite only having one member of Parliament.

This clamour by Labour MPs for a presentable, electable leader is rather sickening. It's bad enough that they pretended to be socialists through all the years Blair put through Thatcherite policies; now they show that they care nothing about vision, socialism and integrity as long as they can get into power.

Some of these centre-right Labour MPs have also been in talks with Tories and LibDems, plotting against Corbyn. This is disgraceful.

I know nothing about Owen Smith, except that he was in the media (a BBC producer) and then, for ten years, was a lobbyist for the globalist corporation Pfizer (which does not bode well), and he may have integrity and socialist values; but in Corbyn at least Labour has these already. Since Smith is untested regarding leadership and effectiveness in the Commons, it seems, at least superficially, that Labour MPs prefer a man who is attractive, relatively young, well dressed and has no beard. Corbyn is the opposite of these things.

Gone are the days when a wiser, older man with a beard was considered the best person to consult on social action.

Theresa May

Before I get asked what I think of the new PM I will make a few pre-emptive comments.

Firstly, women in positions of power, either in the church or in the social realm, is not a Biblical principle. In fact, whenever OT Israel had a powerful queen the country fell into ruin and idolatry (Jezebel, Athaliah²⁶). Having a queen call the shots was seen as a sign of God's judgment.

This is not popular, nor politically correct, but it is the fact of the matter.

Could Theresa May be a sign of God's judgment? Quite possibly since so much evil has been done to the country in the last 6 years.

Having said that, even a wrong choice of leader can still lead to good if that leader obeys God and follows his principles. God respects those national leaders who obey his laws.

²⁶ Athaliah 'whom God afflicts'. The daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, and the wife of Jehoram, king of Judah (2 Kg 8:18). On the death of her husband and of her son Ahaziah, she resolved to seat herself on the vacant throne. She slew all Ahaziah's children except Joash, the youngest. After a reign of six years she was put to death in an insurrection (2 Kg 11:20; 2 Ch 21:6, 22:10-12, 23:15).

Wise moves

The first thing about Theresa May is that she has been waiting patiently and quietly in the background biding her time. She wisely kept out of the Remain fear factory parade and let the heavy-hitting men all fall on their own swords. Point one to her.²⁷

Then, having become PM and faced with a Brexit decision, she wisely fully accepted that vote and declared that she would see the challenge through and pull Britain out of the EU. Second point to her.

While a pro-Brexit PM would have been preferable, since this is the biggest challenge to any leader since the war, a good PM overseeing pro-Brexit negotiators can still do a good job. What is certain is that Theresa May has far more guts than David Cameron who simply walked away from the challenge of such a hard job (he openly admitted this).

Then there was the cabinet re-shuffle, or ‘night of the long-knives’.

Very bravely she put a sword through the heart of the Westminster Eton chaps huddle and sacked very senior Tory figures, such as George Osborne, and his sycophant Michael Gove, and Oliver Letwin. This was simply courageous and not an easy thing to do. Such powerful types have previously brought down leaders like Margaret Thatcher.

She also saw through very weak, untalented, toady types like Anna Soubry and Nicky Morgan and sacked them too.

This tells us a great deal about her character; for instance, that she is not impressed by flattery and words but by actions.

Actions

One of the things that will characterise David Cameron in history, the great chancer, is the complete lack of any planning for a possible Brexit vote. This shows his hubris in believing that he would win but also his lack of pragmatic sense in failing to make even the barest preparations for the possibility of losing. Even a Tory-led select committee has thoroughly criticised the then government for failing to make any plans.

Theresa May has acted very quickly and very efficiently to alleviate this.

She created a new ministry led by David Davies to deal solely with Brexit negotiations. She also formed a new International Trade Ministry led by Liam Fox, which will be important in securing Britain’s advantage in the Brexit negotiations. Then she put Boris Johnson into the Foreign Secretary’s job so that the three key players in dealing with the implications of Brexit are all Brexiteers.

That she did this so soon was efficient and took the civil service by surprise, which has no offices and staff to enable two of ministries jobs yet. This shows how serious she is about getting things moving.

Then she very quickly went on a visit to Angela Merkel to make introductions and establish close contacts and reassure the EU that Brexit does not mean severing ties with our trading partner. This was very wise and it was not lost on Merkel how quickly Theresa May did this.

²⁷ Note the contrast with Labour. Corbyn did exactly the same thing and yet was castigated for it.

In fact so much has happened in a week that it is hard to grasp how much Theresa May has done. This is the opposite of Cameron who said much and delivered next to nothing except suffering for the 98%.

Character

It seems that she is a hands on, get the job done personality; indeed I understand that her department staff are thoroughly loyal to her. She also avoids the MP's bars, drinking parties and buddy huddles, preferring to work hard and go home. She shuns the closeted friendly advisors and the plotting strategists behind the scenes.

This makes her very different from Cameron indeed, who was just the opposite.

Finally, she did well to stay in the Home Secretary's job for six years, a graveyard for politicians.

However, as Home Secretary she did not actually accomplish much. She certainly provoked the police force, but that was necessary. Her weakest link is that she failed to get migration levels down; though her hands were tied by EU regulations; but that is what she must now do to satisfy the population.

If she is true to her word she really does want to make a better Britain and make the Tories a one-nation party; though this has all been said before. Yet she did make a speech early in her political career at the Tory conference where she called her own party, 'The Nasty Party'.

She certainly cannot do any worse than David Cameron who was an elite lackey who put a brave face on multiple barefaced lies. I think he lied more than Tony Blair, and that's saying something. Cameron was adept at looking honest while stabbing the nation in the back. In fact his only triumph after six years in power was Gay marriage. That tells you something. Cameron was a political opportunist and short-term strategist, which is what finally destroyed him as he backed the wrong runner. As a result of his short-termism and obsequious crawling to the bankers and corporatists, the country is now in one heck of a mess.

Theresa May has also inferred that she will reverse, or at least ameliorate, Osborne's austerity budgets. Osborne had already put off his failed deficit eradication to a later time-period anyway. She has indicated that Britain needs investment and infrastructure projects, which is very true. She can't do any worse than Osborne, whose failed ideology doubled the national debt in four years. She also wants to see better employment instead of short-term zero-hours contracts. Whether all this is deliverable remains to be seen.

So, she is an uncertainty but seems to have strength of character and could do a good job – if she is not shut down by senior Tory back-benchers plotting against her. It is true that she has made some questionable Commons voting choices, such as being against workers rights, but that is normal Tory policy and not unexpected.

Since she is an unknown leadership quantity, it behoves Christians to pray that God will use her to good and to establishing peace so that the Gospel can run unhindered. If the evil influence of the EU is now going to be restricted, such as its propagandising of education

or its over-regulation, the church may have a better opportunity to preach the Gospel in the future, instead of facing being persecuted, as the EU planned.²⁸

The media war hiding the build up to a hot war

I have long mentioned the threats to a world war caused by the USA, beginning in one or more of three areas: the Middle East, the Ukraine and the South China Sea. The war in the media involves no explanation of the huge American mobilisation of military bases, navy fleets, troops, weapons and strategic planners in these areas, and especially in Ukraine and the China Sea. Instead the media focuses attention on America's opponents in these areas.

The US mobilisation is building a semi-circle around both Russia and China, such as enhancing bases in Guam, The Marianas, Australia, Thailand, South Korea and Japan; trillions are being expended over several years. In addition there are war games and training exercises, such as involving Australia, in close proximity to Chinese interests. This poses a very serious threat to the security of Russia and China. The American actions in Syria, threatening Iran, have already proved disastrous. Meanwhile presidential hopeful, Hilary Clinton, has threatened to 'Nuke' Iran.

Despite this serious provocation of global giants by this military build up, none of the mainstream media outlets have made any comment whatsoever and most people have no idea that the biggest military mobilisation since Hitler prepared for the invasion of Russia in WWII is going on at all.

Yet the media constantly harps on about the threat of Putin and how evil he is in the Ukraine, despite it being a former USSR country and despite the fact that the coup and current Ukraine government was completely set up by the CIA as a NATO Gladio B operation. Likewise China is continually castigated about its claim to the disputed islands near The Philippines and its build up of military bases in The Paracels and Spratleys for example. Yet China is responding to the constant threat made by US naval actions in its waters, equivalent to China moving a major naval fleet off the coast of California. No wonder China is concerned about its defence.

This is all part and parcel of the false face of America, as a liberal, freedom-loving nation, when it is the most wicked manipulator of the political courses of over 50 nations, sometimes by invasion, other times by staged coups and puppet governments. This falseness is supremely manifested in Barak Obama who said he would end nuclear weapons and then he spent more on them than any president in history. Despite receiving the Nobel Peace Prize, he continues to kill generations of civilians by drone attacks; the most recent killing over 50 innocent people in Somalia.

Now the elite cannot let Donald Trump gain the presidency since he is not controlled by them yet and since he has stated that he will not go to war with either Russia or China but would do deals. Since the elite plan is war, the worst thing that can happen is that Hillary Clinton becomes a hawk president and, despite her criminal past, secures the Oval Office. Russia, China and Iran would be in her sights but all of these nations could give America a very serious fight on their own, let alone in an alliance. An alliance would mean world war – which is an elite strategy.

²⁸ The EU long ago formally described evangelical Christianity as a cult. Various EU based laws targeted Christian freedoms.

Even Iran, despite being much smaller than Russia or China, and having suffered damaging economic losses from years of sanctions, has a very efficient airforce and a large army. If Hillary Clinton attacked Iran (as she has said she will), and if Syria and Russia aided Iran with tactical support, America would be hard pressed to gain the advantage. If ex-pat Iranians flooded back to Iran to give military support (as many expect), America could actually lose. Remember that Vietnamese villagers with AK 47s humiliatingly defeated America with a huge arsenal of weaponry and equipment, let alone an airforce of F4 Phantom warplanes.

All of this shows how stupid geo-politics, dominated by the American elite, is. Yet no one on the BBC ever discusses it. I wonder why?

Scripture quotations are from The New King James Version
© Thomas Nelson 1982

