

# The use of the term 'Far-Right' to demonise critics of cultural Marxists

## Introduction

This paper is written by someone who is apolitical; I am neither left nor right-wing; in fact I abhor political parties of all sorts for their corruption. In terms of policies, I support some that are seen as left-wing<sup>1</sup> and some that are the province of the right-wing;<sup>2</sup> but I am not a centrist either. I look at the facts and oppose that which is evil and support that which is righteous, according to the word of God, not man.

Over time the political scene changes; cultural aspirations alter, and political parties morph to the left and the right.<sup>3</sup> Through these vicissitudes the strategies of the global elite in real control do not change. They favour this, then that, political party but the aim is always to get their policies supported and their goals realised. This is why nothing changes, whomever is in power.<sup>4</sup>

In the 1960-1970s the elite establishment was more right-wing. Capitalists and traditional conservatives were in charge and criminal ventures like the Vietnam War dominated the headlines and created a huge left-wing political activism. The Hippies of the mid-60s to early-70s were opposed to the 'establishment', which they conceived of as traditional, conservative, right-wing and reactionary. The world saw demonstrations and protests against the establishment and the most powerful cultural attacks were from left-wing satirists and comedians. Note the incisive ridiculing of the judicial emancipation of Jeremy Thorpe (on a conspiracy to murder charge) by Peter Cook for an example, or the biting wit of *That Was The Week That Was*.

But as things change, today the establishment is left-wing or even further left. Cultural Marxists dominate the education system. Socialists and neo-Liberals dominate the media and especially the BBC. Social Justice Warriors dominate social media and cultural conversation. The police continually act like the protectors of left-wing group mind-thought, arresting contrary voices and shutting down free speech.<sup>5</sup> Everywhere leftist voices shout at us about Gay rights, LGBT freedoms, Gender fluidity, Third Wave Feminism, and such like. Traditional family values no longer have a significant voice in society. The Christian foundations that laid British society are not just silenced but are under constant attack.

The normal watchmen in society, the political commentators, satirists and comics, have let us down; in fact they are now the biggest champions of cultural Marxism, group mind-

---

<sup>1</sup> I support nationalising the utilities and the railway system, regulating banks and progressive tax.

<sup>2</sup> I support small, decentralised government, traditional ethics, low tax, and the free market.

<sup>3</sup> Note the Labour Party, which was right of centre under Tony Blair and far left of centre under Jeremy Corbyn.

<sup>4</sup> Note American politics where Foreign Policy has been determined by the elite (lobbied by Zionists in the main) to further its goals whatever political party was in power. Thus constant illegal, stupid wars that did not benefit America at all and cost trillions of dollars.

<sup>5</sup> Yet again this week an open-air Christian preacher in London was arrested for hate crimes.

think, new-speak and conformity to leftist ideas.<sup>6</sup> Their prime targets are nationalists, populists, conservatives and anyone slightly right of centre.

As a result of the domination of society by Socialist ideas, and especially the conditioning of all people under the age of 40 by Marxist dominated schools and colleges, the most degrading term of criticism today is being 'Far-Right' (or 'Alt-Right; in America, which is violent Far-Right). This is usually followed by 'racist', 'White Supremacist' and 'chauvinist'. The immediate comparison is then drawn to Nazism; the times that ordinary folk today are called 'Nazis' is beyond counting.

This situation necessitates some comment and also a warning since my readers could easily be called such names for holding traditional Christian views.

## **All political terms are relative**

Castigating someone using political terms is beset with problems unless used very carefully. The fact is that most labels of this sort are relative; there are scales of variation within each designation; few people are easily identified and even political movements can be hard to pin down in one word. UK Conservatives can hold left-wing views and New Labour held some right-wing views.

Descriptive words can also have variations of meaning in different countries. Conservatives in one country could be the opposite of conservatives in another. Conservatism usually means holding to traditional social values and political institutions. Where a society values a tradition of equality and progressivism (e.g. Sweden) the conservative position is left-wing. In a society where the tradition is a rigid, authoritarian hierarchy (e.g. USA) conservatism is right-wing. In the USA the intensity of 'conservatism' varies from one state to another; for example California is left-wing, in social terms.

### **Simplified definitions<sup>7</sup>**

#### *Authoritarian*

Enforcing strict obedience to authority, especially that of the state, at the expense of personal freedom.

#### *Totalitarian*

A system of government that is centralised and dictatorial and requires complete subservience to the state.

#### *Fascism*

A totalitarian and nationalistic system of government and social organisation. Historically applied to claimed right-wing governments but now generally applied.

#### *Nazism*

The historical application was to a member of the National Socialist German Workers' Party. Since then it has been applied to systems that are fascist, dictatorial, totalitarian and extremely nationalistic, and usually racist.

---

<sup>6</sup> With a few exceptions, such as Peter Hitchens or Melanie Philips; and the YouTubers accused of being Far-Right.

<sup>7</sup> Based on the Oxford Dictionary but with additions from myself.

*Conservative*

Averse to change or innovation and holding to traditional attitudes and values, typically in relation to politics or religion.

*Reactionary*

Opposing political or social progress or reform. Often applied to Conservatives.

*Right-wing*

The conservative or reactionary section of a political party or system.

*Left-wing*

The radical, reforming, or socialist section of a political party or system. Socialists often describe this as 'progressive'.

*Progressive*

Favouring or implementing social reform or new liberal ideas.

*Socialism*

A political and economic theory of social organisation which advocates that the means of production, distribution, and exchange should be owned or regulated by the community as a whole. Extremists see Socialism as the preparation for Communism. Many Socialist experiments were initiated by revolution or coups.

*Social Democracy*

A socialist system of government achieved by democratic means. Socialism-lite.

*Marxism*

The political and economic theories of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, later developed by their followers to form the basis for the theory and practice of Communism.

*Cultural Marxism*

The domination of the centres of culture (e.g. education) by Socialists and Communists in order to slowly change society from within. It promotes new traditions and values, often based on irrationality, usually through establishing new causes within society (e.g. LGBT rights). The champions of these causes are often described by opponents as 'Social Justice Warriors' or the 'regressive left' and their policies tend towards authoritarianism. A characteristic of cultural Marxists is that their underlying irrationality leads to weakness in debates resulting in name-calling and abuse.

## **Nazism was originally left-wing**

The folly of many left-wing activists and commentators is often noticed in their lack of education. Calling someone like Jacob Rees Mogg a Nazi is not only inappropriate it is a simple error. Rees Mogg is a traditional, free-market, capitalist, Conservative, and as such could not be further from Nazism if he tried.

The clue regarding Nazism is in the term itself; it is short for the 'National Socialist Workers' Party' of Germany<sup>8</sup> in the 1930s. Note, 'Socialist'; Nazis were Socialists but with an emphasis on German nationalism, as opposed to the prevailing International Communism of the period.

---

<sup>8</sup> *Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei.*

Hitler was very influenced by Socialist ideas, note: '*We are Socialists. We are the enemies of today's capitalist system of exploitation*'.<sup>9</sup> German Fascism was not right-wing but was Socialist, nationalistic totalitarianism. The Socialism was evidenced in the centralised bureaucratic control of society in great detail; it was just much better organised than Soviet centralisation. [See appendix one.]

One should also remember that all the great political genocides in the last 100 years were performed by Socialists and not by right-wingers. These include the Nazi holocaust (not just of Jews), the 50+ million killed by Stalin and his henchmen (many of whom were Jews, including Genrich Yagoda who killed 10 million Ukrainian Kulaks), and Chairman Mao's genocide of over 50 million. Pol Pot killed over a million.<sup>10</sup>

Identifying right-wing politicians with genocide, which is often done, is tenuous at best.

Using emotive derisive terms against opponents is always risky, but if it is based upon simple lies then it actually works against the users. It simply makes abusive people look stupid.

## **Victims of the wrong use of 'Far-Right'**

The use of 'Far-Right', by media commentators in particular, is directed at many people who flatly deny being Far-Right.

### **Tommy Robinson**

Real name Stephen Yaxley-Lennon, is the prime favourite of this appellation. He is the current bogeyman of British politics, constantly demonised and slandered. He denies being Far-Right and if you examine his statements he appears to be primarily a nationalist, perhaps slightly right of centre. His single-handed (long before the media) exposure of the Muslim grooming and rapist gangs in the north of England has led to attacks of being racist.

### **Paul Joseph Watson**

This famous YouTube political and cultural commentator suffers vitriol from the Left because he constantly exposes the hypocrisy, lies, slander, and errors of Socialist opponents. He is more of a Libertarian, right of centre commentator. His articulate and intelligent exposés result in vilification because his opponents cannot dismiss his arguments rationally.

### **Carl Benjamin**

Another YouTuber better known as 'Sargon of Akkad'. He describes himself as a traditional Liberal. His casual style of explaining things demonstrates a moderate, intelligent character, not extremism.

### **Gerard Batten**

The current leader of UKIP and an EU MEP, who has single-handedly rescued the party from the pit it had descended into back into a growing, thriving opposition. For focusing attention on to the evils of the EU and the disaster of the Tory Brexit process he is labelled as Far-Right. For his exposure of the evils of Islam and the iniquity of Islamic grooming

---

<sup>9</sup> Hitler, speech in 1927.

<sup>10</sup> The only genocides that were not committed by Socialists in the last 100 years were committed by Muslims, such as the Armenian genocide by Turks.

gangs he is labelled as racist. In reality he is more of a traditional Eurosceptic Conservative.

### **Donald Trump**

Donald Trump is certainly a nationalist and a traditional American conservative, but he is not Far-Right. In fact, if anything, he has been too weak to defend national interests against the power of the Socialist global elite, and the Zionist lobby in particular, which has resulted in him dropping more bombs abroad than Obama did; at the last count it was a bomb every 12 minutes.

Because he uses a lot of nationalistic rhetoric he easily and un-apologetically offends Democrats in the US, and especially the mainstream media cultural Marxists. Trump delights in pricking the bubble of Socialist 'group-think' in speeches, but does not actually do anything that seriously goes beyond previous Republicans.

As for being a racist, it is noteworthy that Trump has garnered the support of more Blacks than Obama did in his second-term and is gaining the support of huge numbers of Hispanics.

Like most American presidents his policies are a mixture of left and right-wing ideas.

### **Viktor Orban**

Prime Minister of Hungary. Orban is another nationalist. In fact, nationalism is spreading everywhere in the west in opposition to the rampant globalism that dominated society in the last 20 years; note the *Gilets Jaunes* constant protests in France for example (which the media is under-reporting). In fact, the mainstream media is not reporting significant anti-globalist protest movements in many European countries, including Sweden. When it does report it downplays its significance.<sup>11</sup>

Unlike unpopular Socialists like Macron, Orban is set to become the longest serving and most popular PM in Hungarian history. He is a social conservative and nationalist and his fight against the EU has secured popular support. He is not Far-Right.

## **The use against the ERG**

The ERG is the *European Research Group* within the Tory Party whose chief spokesman is Jacob Rees Mogg MP. Because it is a Brexit favouring group it is earmarked for constant attack by the media, which accuses it of being 'Far-Right' and 'extremist'. Even the Chancellor has called it 'extremist'. James Naughtie equated it with the National Front on the BBC *Today* programme.

This is extremely odd, foolish and unusual. The reason I say this is that the ERG are merely following the official statements of the Prime Minister in multiple speeches, before and after the last General Election.

Theresa May constantly affirmed that, '*Brexit means Brexit*' and '*No deal is better than a bad deal*'. This was widely understood by the electorate, who voted her into power. Furthermore, both main political parties at the last election stood on a manifesto of getting us out of the EU and honouring the referendum (85% of the electorate vote). The populace

---

<sup>11</sup> Such as the successful UKIP rally in London that massively dwarfed an opposition Socialist counter-protest (several thousands). The media claimed that the counter-protest (of a few hundred) was bigger. Video footage proved that the media blatantly lied.

was clear, Labour and Conservatives stood on platform of Brexit and democracy; thus 85% of the electorate gave them their vote.

The ERG follows this democratic line and yet are called 'Far-Right extremists'. Yet the PM, most of the Tories, the Independent Group and the Labour Party have reneged on their promises at the last election and have become anti-Brexit. At the very best they favour a soft Brexit and making the country worse off than it was as a full member.<sup>12</sup>

The extremists are the Brexit-denying MPs in Parliament who are dishonouring the public vote in the referendum and in the General Election.

This is the pitiful level at which political commentators and the media have sunk to. Because the whole establishment and the mainstream media are, almost to a man, Remainers, everyone who voices the opinion of 85% of the country, discovered by two democratic processes, are now Far-Right.

This is how the establishment tries to condition people. It hopes that if it says something loud enough and long enough people will just accept it to be true. Fortunately, the people are not that stupid on this issue and public anger is mounting due to frustration of its will. The membership of UKIP has soared in recent weeks and it is rebuilding its public support that was lost. The new Brexit Party formed by Nigel Farage gained 100,000 members in a few days making it just short of the Conservative membership that has taken decades to grow. These two parties alone could crush the Tories and Labour in a general election today, so angry are the electorate at being betrayed.

When people hear that commentators label MPs that voice the public opinion as being Far-Right, they are justly offended as it being a slur on them. There is nothing Far-Right in seeking to exit a fascist, protectionist organisation like the EU; it is simply common sense.

## What is real Far-Right?

People using this term are often mistaken. In reality they have in mind a place on the political spectrum that tends towards authoritarianism. Really they are implying Fascism, which in the past was associated with extreme (supposed) right-wing governments like that of Mussolini, against whom the term was first used widely.<sup>13</sup>

It is technically seen as authoritarianism connected with nationalism and can apply to either the left or the right. So Fascism could really be equivalent to nationalistic totalitarianism. In this sense it is correct to apply the term 'fascism' to both Mussolini's government in Italy (1922-1943) and Hitler's government in Germany. Franco's government in Spain was also described as 'fascist'.

Fascism also tends to include a belief in the supremacy of one national or ethnic group, a contempt for democracy, an insistence on obedience to a powerful leader, and a strong demagogic approach [sic. Oxford Dict.].

So, we can summarise that fascism is evidenced by:

---

<sup>12</sup> May's Withdrawal Agreement has a triple-lock to keep us under EU laws and costs.

<sup>13</sup> Mussolini created the 'Fascist Revolutionary Party' in 1915 and then the 'National Fascist Party' in 1921. Previously Fascism was represented by the political group known as 'Fasci' ('league'; originally a confused group of different political opinions). Since Mussolini's death, 'fascism' has been used to describe totalitarian governments and systems.

- Authoritarianism tending towards totalitarianism.
- Contempt for democracy and democratic processes.
- Extreme nationalism leading to the condemnation of other races.
- Obedient and passionate submission to a strong leader.

Far-Right, while often leading towards fascism, has to be more nuanced. It is politics that are extreme right-wing, tending towards extreme nationalism and authoritarianism. It is often expressed in xenophobia, chauvinism, racism, anti-Socialism and reactionary policies. All these depend on definitions but Far-Right politics would tend towards oppression and violence towards claimed inferior groups. Such are not fascist if they support democratic principles and the rule of law.

So, Trump is neither Far-Right nor fascist. He does not have authoritarian power but is subject to the checks and balances of Congress and the Supreme Court. His policies on immigration and the wall are not based on racism but on national security, job security and law. In fact Blacks and Hispanics have done much better under Trump than under Obama. He is not xenophobic, having personally reached out to Putin and Kim Jung-Un more than any other president. Outbreaks of violence in America in recent months have mostly been initiated by Socialist movements, such as Antifa, Black Lives Matter and Feminist groups, not by state oppression initiated by Trump.

White supremacist groups could be labelled correctly as Far-Right, such as the Ku Klux Klan (though this movement was founded by Democrats). In the US Far-Right groups believe in extreme nationalism, segregation, oppose mixed marriages, treat minorities as lesser people groups, and are often chauvinists regarding women. You could call American Far-Right folk as 'hate-groups'. UK supposed Far-Right groups are not as extreme and chiefly oppose immigration policies.

In this context labelling Rees Mogg as Far-Right, which is often done, is ludicrous.

## **Christian characteristics targeted as 'Far-Right'**

Anyone advocating Christian principles today is easily targeted as Far-Right. As such it is common that Christians are locked up by the police, prosecuted and fined for simply holding Biblical values. Thus Christians have been prosecuted for preaching the Gospel, denying homosexuals a room in a hotel, or refusing to bake a cake containing homosexual slogans. Instead of simply accepting such as a different opinion, the Socialist establishment identifies them as beyond the pale and offenders against prevailing Socialist morality.

This prevailing morality is offended by the following:

### **Belief in God**

Submission to deity is seen to carry implications of conservatism and denial of progress.

### **Biblical doctrines**

Submission to the Bible as the source of the truth of God's will. Since the Bible forbids or condemns many policies of the extreme left (e.g. promoting homosexuality) the Bible is seen as objectionable and right-wing.

**Absolute moral values**

The belief that human ethical standards derive from the absolutes of God's will. The idea that there are a set of fixed standards of universal human morality that must be obeyed. Modern leftist pragmatism, atheism and situation-ethics deny this.

**Traditional societal ethics**

'Old-fashioned' family values and standards that have stood the test of time as being vital for the proper functioning of society. These include marriage being of a male and a female. A key plank of the original Socialism of Marx, which later became Communism, is the destruction of the family and the eradication of private property in order to destabilise society to enable collective rule (which always leads to totalitarianism).

**Denial of the LGBT agenda**

Since this is a leading Socialist and Marxist policy, opponents are targeted as Far-Right.

**Denial of easy abortion**

Christians see a foetus as a living person in embryo; it is a human being needing nurture. To kill this person is murder. This is seen today as Far Right. In America, Left Wing states are now killing babies even after they are born if they are not wanted.

**Nationalism**

Christians believe that God established the nations, set their boundaries and even gave the races their own languages. Thus the elite, that is trying to destroy nations to create a homogenised federal superstate, labels Christians as Far-Right.

**Brexit**

Socialists target Democrats that believe in exiting the EU without a deal as Far-Right.

## Conclusion

All of the above rest completely upon accurate definitions. There are scales of intensity of all of them. On top of that some political movements obscure the boundaries, such as Nazism.

Labelling people Far-Right is dangerous territory. In the case of Tommy Robinson, it has led to universal hatred, threats to his family, damage to his business, constant vitriol and castigation, police persecution, government persecution (including three months in solitary confinement under threat of death for something mainstream media journalists do every day without punishment). Many falsely outed as Far-Right have had death threats.

There are ordinary conservative commentators on social media, many female, who are standing up for liberty, free speech and Brexit, who have been labelled Far-Right and have subsequently been verbally, socially, and even physically, abused and attacked. The aim is to scare people off from speaking out.

The attacks on Christianity by the Marxist globalists are well documented. Killing off the family, for example, is a central platform of Marxism. Feminism, LGBT issues, Gay issues and gender fluidity are all to ruin normal family life. So when Christian conservatives speak out for truth they are frequently labelled as Far-Right by people who do not know what they are talking about. In the worst examples the police have arrested Christians for Far-Right hate speech or actions (like refusing to bake a cake). The Socialist EU has formally labelled Evangelicals as a cult.

So, you need to be aware because you may be targeted as a Far-Right extremist, just because you affirm traditional Christian principles and the Lordship of Christ. The current Socialist global elite cannot cope with alternative views.

## Appendix one

### Hitler's Socialism

#### **A mix of views**

Debates have raged regarding whether Hitler was left or right-wing.<sup>14</sup> What all agree on is that he was strongly nationalistic. However, his formal position from the beginning was outwardly Socialist and the enemy of capitalist exploiters, such as bankers and big business (who were largely Jews). Thus he preached class warfare to restore equality against corrupt capitalists. He called for nationalisation of education, health care, transport and major industries and demanded state control of everything. He denounced Christians as right-wing fanatics (while affirming Christianity). These are typical Socialist agendas.

Yet Nazism also had many right-wing characteristics and was certainly fascist, which was then associated with right-wing politics. Indeed, Hitler admired Mussolini and his reformations in Italy. He also supported the existing class-based society and never supported workers owning the means of production. Hitler upheld private property, traditions, individual entrepreneurship and economic competition, plus he disapproved of trade unions; all seemingly right-wing views. In 1930 Hitler dismissed Otto Strasser from the party for supporting a trade union strike, Hitler accused him of supporting democracy and liberalism.

Hitler was socially conservative but also a social-Darwinist. He was ultra-nationalistic and anti-egalitarian (yet his rhetoric was often egalitarian); essentially totalitarian. But above all Hitler was a nationalist and put the affairs of the state above all else, especially capitalists. Thus he appeared to be Socialist but gave the impression to observers that he did not hold deep views on it and he was ignorant about economics.

Hitler opposed Social Democracy and hated Communism. He replaced 'class' as the enemy with race and instead of a dictatorship of the proletariat he substituted a dictatorship of the party leader (though Communist countries also did the latter).

#### **Hitler's record**

The Depression that led to Nazism left 6 million Germans unemployed. Hitler's first task was full employment. He achieved this by initiating infrastructure projects such as new autobahns. Thus Hitler created jobs by government schemes; pretty Socialist. He developed fitness projects and rewarded workers that increased production. He established childcare centres so that mothers could work. Newly weds received a loan from the government to help set up a home. College tuition was subsidised. Free health care was set up, paid for by the government. To pay for this taxes rose to 80% of income. These Socialist programmes transformed German society from the mess of the Weimar Republic, which had left Germans starving and poor.

Hitler, at the same time, denounced the rich capitalists that had ruined society. This is also very socialistic. He seized the guns belonging to the public, and especially Jews. Hitler was pro-choice regarding abortion (especially for non-Aryans), which was very similar to the American Planned Parenthood of today.

---

<sup>14</sup> For example Dinesh D'Souza, 'The Big Lie: Exposing the Nazi roots of the American left'; supporting Hitler's Socialism. Ian Kershaw, 'Hitler: A biography'; Richard Evans, 'The Coming of the Third Reich', maintain he was right-wing.

In reality Nazism sought to unite both the left and the right-wing into nationalistic solidarity under totalitarian rule. To do this it borrowed Socialist rhetoric when it saw fit and re-invented Socialism to its own desires.

### **Summary**

- Hitler favoured big government.
- Hitler established state control of pretty much everything.
- Hitler dismissed democracy.
- He was anti-capitalist.
- He supported the workers in his speeches.
- Hitler's secret police monitored thought-control.
- Political dissidents were crushed
- Free-speech was not allowed.

All these factors point towards Socialism and mimic Soviet government.

- Hitler hated Social Democracy and Communism.
- Hitler's prime focus was nationalism and race, not class.
- He was a social conservative.
- There was no redistribution of land or wealth.
- Industrialists as well as workers were favoured.
- He was anti-civil rights for minorities.

These are more right-wing.

The real centre of focus was national renewal, social rejuvenation, populism and racism.

### **Mussolini**

Mussolini's Blackshirts originally started as his followers in the Socialist party, which he led, that was connected to Lenin. His Fascist Movement was based upon the principles of the Charbonnerie Movement, a revolutionary Socialist Illuminati sect that developed out of the Jacobin movement.

Mussolini had a huge influence in America in the 1930s where his policies became more benign due to the existing focus on liberty in US culture. Though portrayed in textbooks as right-wing, in fact Mussolini started as a Socialist, like Hitler.

### **Conclusion**

The difficulty is with what actually happens rather than what one preaches. In this Hitler was no different from Communist dictators. Hitler emphasised production rather than workers rights; as did Stalin. Hitler replaced trade unions with the party-controlled German Labour Front, much like the Soviet system. The nation became a party-run police state, not a workers' government; but so did the USSR. Government was rigid and hierarchical, even militaristic, but so was Soviet Russia's.

So, the conclusion has to be that Hitler co-opted the name of Socialism, the rhetoric of Socialism and some of the principles of Socialism. He also created a police-state that was similar to Stalin's. It is therefore accurate to identify Nazism as a type of Socialism. However, above all Hitler was a severe nationalist whose focus was on ridding the nation of non-Aryans and enhancing the support for Germans in a new age.

So Hitler was not a Communist, not a Social Democrat, and not a liberal. This is certain. Hitler was focused on nationalism more than anything else; this also is certain. However, Hitler used Socialism as a basis for his rhetoric and policies, certainly in the early 1930s, but this was pragmatic rather than idealistic. His final strategies were a blend of left and right-wing ideas merged into totalitarianism. Yet despite everything, it is still reasonable to identify Hitler as a 'confused' Socialist, certainly up to the mid-30s. The party was certainly to be identified as Socialist by its name. However, Nazism by 1939 was rather a unique mixture of ideas centring on nationalistic fascism.

Hitler's early social reforms and industrial programmes certainly point towards Socialism, as does the very name of the Nazi party. It would be a great stretch to call this right-wing. After 1934 the focus was more totalitarian and racist, which some may affirm to be right-wing.

## Appendix Two

### The New Zealand Massacre

As I was concluding this paper I learned of the mass shooting of Muslim worshippers at Friday Salat in Christchurch, New Zealand. It goes without saying that this is a terrible tragedy that must be condemned.

What is interesting is that it shows the absolute bias of the western mainstream media. This story overwhelmingly dominated the news, almost to the exclusion of anything else.

The gunman, Brenton Tarrant, was constantly portrayed as a ‘*white supremacist*’. We saw statements such as, ‘*Trump-supporting white supremacist*’.<sup>15</sup> Thus the right-wing in general was immediately castigated. Article after article, day after day, began to appear denouncing right-wing politics.

#### Establishing some facts

##### *The gunman is left-wing*

The shooter did not identify himself as a white-supremacist but as an ‘eco-fascist’. He was also a supporter of Communist China,<sup>16</sup> so he is a Communist and not Far-Right. Being an eco-fascist and a Communist supporter, both, identifies him as extreme left-wing.

He stated that he certainly did not support Donald Trump.<sup>17</sup> He also stated that he was influenced by Candace Owens, a black woman; so he is not a white supremacist either (though his comments are probably ironic). He did say that he agreed with Oswald Mosley, the British fascist. Tarrant’s main concern was mass immigration.

To obscure this the media started to censor his diary-manifesto and hide the truth and even began blaming legal gun-owners in the US that had nothing to do with this. The big internet companies were active in removing the gunman’s 74-page manifesto. A message saying ‘Forbidden’ now appears if you try to access it – denial of free speech, free enquiry and affirmation of censorship yet again. Web sites that analysed the shooter were also shut down within days.

##### *The victims*

Not all the victims were brown; there were white Muslims in the mosque; indeed there are often white converts to Islam in mosques.

##### *Muslim terror*

When Muslims commit terrorist offences they are regularly not identified as Muslims; indeed everything possible is done to obscure this fact. Immediately a white man commits a terrorist attack he is identified and labelled as right-wing.

##### *The mosque in question preaches hate*

This mosque has invited radical Islamists to preach jihadi terror attacks, such as a sheikh from Indonesia. Two jihadi terrorists were radicalised at this mosque and were later killed by US forces in Yemen.

---

<sup>15</sup> Mail Online, Diane Apen-Sadler, 15 March 2019.

<sup>16</sup> ‘The nation with the closest political and social values to my own is the People’s Republic of China.’ The Epoch Times, Jack Phillips, ‘New Zealand mosque shooter’s manifesto...’, 15 March 2019.

<sup>17</sup> Regarding support of Trump, ‘As a policy maker and leader? Dear God no.’

## What this press coverage ignores

### *Massacres of Muslims by Muslims*

It remains a fact that the vast majority of attacks on Muslims are perpetrated by rival Muslims. For decades this has been the case. For a major example of this see the Syrian conflict where Syrian Alawite and Shi'ite Muslims were attacked by Sunni Muslims from various nations.

When a Muslim terrorist attacks and massacres other Muslims in southeast Asia, the western press pays no attention whatsoever. It happens regularly.

### *Numbers of Muslim terrorist attacks*

At this time in March 2019 there have been 453 Islamic terror attacks in 31 different countries this year alone. These killed 1,956 people and injured over 2,000.<sup>18</sup> This has received little (if any) mention in the western media; in fact over 95% of Muslim attacks go without any mention, usually because they affect Third World nations. Only days later a jihadi murdered people in Israel; the media ignored the matter.

Why is there such a huge explosion of media attention, day after day, when a crazy white person commits a similar crime? Why is there a call to ban legal guns when there is no such call after Muslim attacks?

Why is the media silent on the fact that Islam is a ruthless warmongering religion that killed over 700 million people in its period of expansion and continues to kill every day? Why does the media ignore the commands of Muhammad to kill and behead non-Muslims? Yet when a white man reacts to this data and kills Muslims (I do not condone this in any way) there is a worldwide media extravaganza and propaganda against right-wing people.

### *Continual massacres of Christians*

The western media also completely ignores the constant persecution of Christians around the world by Muslims, Hindus, Communists and Buddhists. However, the majority of attacks and other forms of persecution (demolishing homes, destroying churches, beatings, torture, rapes, imprisonments etc.) are by Muslims. In 2018 alone 4,305 Christians were murdered by Muslims.<sup>19</sup>

White supremacy isn't the problem. A Christian living in a majority Muslim nation is 143 times more likely to be killed by a Muslim than a Muslim is likely to be killed in a non-Muslim country.<sup>20</sup>

### Some examples

- In 2018 there were 132 persecution incidents in Uttar Pradesh, India. In India as a whole there were 325 incidents of persecution against Christians. One example was the beheading of a father of five in Odisha. [India has 64 million Christians, about 2% of the population.]
- In the last three weeks in Nigeria over 120 Christians have been killed by gunfire or machetes by Islamic jihadists. Since February over 300 Nigerian Christians in seven villages have been killed by Muslim Fulani [nomadic Muslims] militants. Many others were maimed with machetes or raped. This is becoming commonplace in Nigeria, mostly by Fulani militia groups.

---

<sup>18</sup> TheReligionofPeace.com

<sup>19</sup> OpenDoorUSA

<sup>20</sup> Religious Freedom Report.

- Twenty people were killed and 100 injured in the Philippines when a cathedral was bombed on 27 January 2019.
- A mass grave was discovered in December 2018 filled with 34 Ethiopian Christians killed by ISIS in Libya in 2015.
- More than 40 Christians were killed in a militia attack on a church in Alindao, Central African Republic. 20,000 displaced people sheltering in an adjacent compound had to flee in November 2018.
- Seven Christians were killed and 19 injured in a bus shooting in Egypt on 2 November 2018.
- Fulani tribesmen attacked two Christian communities in Plateau State Nigeria killing 27 and burning many homes and churches in October 2018. In June, 50 Christians were killed and in August a pastor, his wife and three children were burnt alive. In February 2018, 75 Christians were killed by Fulani attacks in Plateau State.
- Al Shabaab jihadists stopped a bus in Kenya and murdered all the Christian on board in September 2018, including a young boy. In 2014, 29 Christians were killed travelling on a bus in Mandera County, Kenya, by Al Shabaab. Kenya is 80% Christian and 10% Muslim.
- In 2013, 75 Christians were killed by Muslim suicide bombers in Pakistan.

If time were available, I could multiply such accounts ad infinitum. Christians are being beaten, killed, kidnapped, tortured and murdered on a daily basis somewhere in the world; sometimes close to British tourists. A decade ago, some Coptic Christians were crucified in Egypt while British tourists happily photographed Egyptian monuments not far away.

But none of this is worthy of the attention of the mainstream media. This is because the establishment is anti-Christian and bent on a corrupt elite programme geared towards world domination, which requires the destruction of 'Christian' nations. Also note that the elite seek to remove all legal guns from public ownership to prevent any rebellion against their complete take-over of society. This tragedy immediately led to government calls for banning legal guns.

Any terrorist action is anathema and my sympathies go to the bereaved in New Zealand. However, this tragedy amplifies the fact that you must check the facts and question whenever 'Far-Right' activists are mentioned in the news. More often than not the people concerned are not Far-Right at all.

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

**Paul Fahy Copyright © 2019**  
**Understanding Ministries**  
<http://www.understanding-ministries.com>