

CHAPTER 16

WISE PEOPLE UNDERSTAND THE REAL NATURE OF ISLAM

Then Zebah and Zalmunna said, “Rise yourself and fall upon us, for as the man is, so is his strength.” And Gideon arose and killed Zebah and Zalmunna, and he took the crescent ornaments that were on the necks of their camels.

Judges 8:21 (ESV)

And the weight of the golden earrings that he requested was 1,700 shekels of gold, besides the crescent ornaments and the pendants and the purple garments worn by the kings of Midian, and besides the collars that were around the necks of their camels.

Judges 8:26 (ESV)

In that day the Lord will take away the finery of the anklets, the headbands, and the crescents;
Isaiah 3:18 (ESV)

¹ *O God, do not keep silence;
do not hold your peace or be still, O God!*
² *For behold, your enemies make an uproar;
those who hate you have raised their heads.*
³ *They lay crafty plans against your people;
they consult together against your treasured ones.*
⁴ *They say, “Come, let us wipe them out as a nation;
let the name of Israel be remembered no more!”*
⁵ *For they conspire with one accord;
against you they make a covenant*
⁶ *the tents of Edom and the Ishmaelites,
Moab and the Hagrites,*
⁷ *Gebal and Ammon and Amalek,
Philistia with the inhabitants of Tyre;*
⁸ *Asshur also has joined them;
they are the strong arm of the children of Lot.*
Psalm 83:1-8 (ESV)

¹ *An oracle concerning Damascus.
Behold, Damascus will cease to be a city
and will become a heap of ruins.*
² *The cities of Aroer are deserted;
they will be for flocks,
which will lie down, and none will make them afraid.*
Isaiah 17:1-2 (ESV)

The West’s spineless naivety about Islam and wilful refusal to see it for the evil that it is

You might ask what a person’s view of Islam has got to do with whether they are wise. My answer is that the actions of Muslim terrorists, pursuant to what the Koran calls the *Jihad*, or “holy war”, are by far the biggest threat to peace, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion, in the world today. I am also increasingly coming to the view that Islam will be the religion of the antichrist, whose coming is spoken of in the Bible. Therefore, whether you can see all of that, such that you know the real truth about Islam, is a key issue in determining whether you are wise or naïve.

I would go further and say that whether you are willing to *tell the truth* about Islam, even if you can see it, is an indicator of whether you are a fool, or even wicked. This is nothing new. The Jihad has been raging for nearly 1400 years, ever since Mohammed started it in the early seventh century AD. From then on Islam has, *mainly by violence*, conquered first Arabia and then 56 other nations. Therefore, there are now 57 countries in the world that are ruled by Islam, plus many more that are heading that way, with rapidly growing Muslim populations.

That relentless process of takeover is also partly due to *massive immigration* by Muslims, including bogus '*refugees*', combined also with a disproportionately high birth rate amongst Muslims in comparison to westerners. This demographic aspect of the takeover also has a name, the "*Hijra*". That is what Mohammed said should be done, *in addition to Jihad*, to cause Muslims to become the majority in one nation after another, by sheer population growth, until the native population is eventually overwhelmed and submits to living under Sharia law.

However, no matter what happens, liberal westerners continue to think that Islam is being falsely accused and that only a "*tiny minority*" of Muslims support the Jihad. We therefore need to think carefully about Islam and decide who is right and who is wrong, what is true and what is false. Either the liberal view of Islam is correct, or mine is, but one thing is certain - they cannot both be right. Therefore, we need to find the real facts, examine the evidence open-mindedly, and come to a clear decision.

These huge questions as to what Islam really is, what its objectives are, what its followers are doing, whether it poses a threat to us, and what we should do about it, are of crucial importance. Therefore, any person who does not arrive at the right conclusions on such issues cannot be wise. That is all the more true of anybody who gives these questions no thought and thus comes to no conclusions at all. Therefore, determining the real nature of Islam is no minor matter and you cannot excuse yourself from the duty to reflect on it and to make up your mind.

However, your judgment must be based on fact, not on wishful thinking, politicians' lies, or media propaganda. I say that because, right across the western world, feeble politicians, aided by a corrupt media, maintain the fiction of Muslims as *victims*, and of Islam being a great '*religion of peace*'. Such absurd things were not said in the past, when leaders told the truth, and the press reported it. For example, William Gladstone, a tremendous scholar, and our greatest Prime Minister of the nineteenth century, understood Islam very accurately and was not afraid to tell the truth about it:

"The Koran is an accursed book. So long as there is this book there will be no peace in the world."
William Ewart Gladstone
(Prime Minister of the United Kingdom
four times between 1868 and 1894)

The origins of Islam are in pagan idolatry and the occult

An interesting passage in Judges chapter 8 refers to '*crescent ornaments*' worn by the Midianites, who were part of what we now call the Arab race. They worshiped the Arabic moon god, whose emblem was the crescent moon. This is highly significant because the Arabs were still worshiping the moon god many centuries later, in AD 610, when Mohammed invented Islam. He merged together parts of Judaism and Christianity, plus the Arabic moon god, whom he elevated to become what is now called Allah. He also kept the symbol of the crescent moon, some of which Gideon had confiscated from the Midianites, nearly 2000 years earlier:

Then Zebah and Zalmunna said, "Rise yourself and fall upon us, for as the man is, so is his strength." And Gideon arose and killed Zebah and Zalmunna, and he took the crescent ornaments that were on the necks of their camels.

Judges 8:21 (ESV)

And the weight of the golden earrings that he requested was 1,700 shekels of gold, besides the crescent ornaments and the pendants and the purple garments worn by the kings of Midian, and besides the collars that were around the necks of their camels.

Judges 8:26 (ESV)

Let us be clear - Allah is *not* an alternative name for the God of the Bible, as so many misguided liberal Christians are wrongly taught. It is actually the name of the very same moon god whom the Arabs worshiped when they were pagans, long before Mohammed founded Islam. Thus, anyone who worships Allah is not merely worshiping God by an alternative name. They are worshiping *a false, pagan god*, and that needs to be said, loudly and publicly, no matter how politically incorrect it may be.

Therefore, Islam is not “*one of the three great Abrahamic faiths*”, to quote that awful politically correct phrase. It is, in fact, a false religion and there is nothing good or admirable about it. Moreover, the symbols within Islam, in particular the crescent moon, are based on the *occult*, not the Bible. One day all such occult symbols and objects are going to be destroyed, when Jesus returns. The prophet Isaiah refers to that time:

In that day the Lord will take away the finery of the anklets, the headbands, and the crescents;
Isaiah 3:18 (ESV)

The Sabbeans in Arabia also worshiped the same moon god, ‘Allah’, who was believed to be married to the sun goddess. They set up an idol devoted to Allah at the Kabah in Mecca, along with 359 other pagan gods whom the Arabs also worshiped. They had, therefore, already begun the practice of praying towards Mecca, where those occultic idols were located, long before Mohammed established Islam, between AD 610 and 632. All he did was get rid of the other 359 Arabic idols and false gods and promote the equally false moon god, Allah, to first place, as the one and only god.

However, that does not mean that he is the God of the Bible, as we are constantly, but wrongly, told. Allah always was, *and still is*, the Arabic moon god and has nothing whatsoever to do with the real God of the Bible. Indeed, he is the very opposite, in every respect, especially in terms of his character and nature. The Bible shows God to be full of love, mercy, grace and kindness, but the Koran reveals Allah to be vicious and cold-hearted, without a shred of love or grace towards anyone, not even his followers.

The true nature of Islam – a list of its main features and practices

There is not space, even in this whole book, let alone this chapter, to set out a thorough account of the history and ideology of Islam and of its corrupt, perverted and violent activities. However, even if we restrict our examination of Islam to the most basic facts, and then apply the plainest, most obvious logic to those facts, the conclusions are inescapable. One is obliged to accept that *Islam itself, i.e. true Islam*, as distinct from the actions of a supposedly unrepresentative minority of its adherents, is all of the following things:

- a) a false religion which is contrary to, and inconsistent with, the Gospel.
- b) evil and Satanic in origin, created as a result of Mohammed’s encounters with a demon, probably Satan himself, who spoke to him and gave him all the doctrines of Islam.
- c) violent by its very nature, i.e. when the Koran is *correctly understood*, not only when it is supposedly ‘*misunderstood*’, as is constantly claimed by western liberals.
- d) repressive of and contemptuous towards all women, even Muslim women. They see females as mere property and as having no value, dignity or freedom, to such an extent that it is literally alright to rape them. That is exactly what is being done now on a vast scale, even in Europe, not only in Muslim countries which operate under Sharia law.

- e) contemptuous towards non-Muslims, whom they call '*infidels*' or '*kuffirs*', seeing us as the equivalent of dogs, and thus sub-human.
- f) repressive of freedom of speech, and freedom of religion, and determined to deny these freedoms to all of us.
- g) committed to *imposing Islam by force of arms*, so as to win control of every nation, until the *entire world* has either been killed or compelled to become Muslim. The conquering of non-Islamic nations is referred to as *Jihad* and is not merely the aim of some fanatical and unrepresentative minority. It is a *core objective* of Islam itself, i.e. *true Islam*, as set out in the Koran and as modelled by Mohammed himself. Therefore, we must never honour him by calling him "*the prophet Mohammed*", or even "*the Prophet*", as the servile and cowardly BBC does. He was *not* a prophet and should not be spoken of as if he was.
- h) committed to the use of *deception*, "*taqiyya*", as a means of promoting Islam, supporting the Jihad, and undermining infidels. The Koran teaches that it is *entirely alright to lie to infidels* in order to deceive them into compliance, or to make them complacent prior to attacking them. When liberals believe what Muslims say about the supposed peacefulness of Islam etc, they have no idea that such lies are, *in themselves*, a central part of Islam. They are used as a deliberate tool of war, which explains why so many Muslims are dishonest, as I frequently found when I was a police officer. Telling lies is an *integral part of Muslim culture* and spills over into every part of their lives, not just the pursuit of Jihad.
- i) committed to imposing a status of *servile slavery*, known as "*dhimmitude*", upon all infidels who are not killed in the Jihad. Islam is willing to permit such infidels to live, but *only provided they pay money* to the Muslims who rule over them. So, non-Muslims are taxed, for example by pressurising companies into paying vast sums to have *halal* certificates and logos for their products. This is being done now in the West, even where Muslims are in a minority. They also bring about the same effect by *claiming state benefits* and often maximise those claims by falsification and deception (*taqiyya*).
- j) For all these reasons, a high percentage of Muslims claim state benefits, and on a permanent basis, not just occasionally. Indeed, only this week, as I was writing this, it was said that 60% of the Muslims in Europe are claiming welfare benefits. Indeed, even the politically correct German government has said that they expect up to 75% of the migrants who are flooding into Germany to be claiming benefits for many years and possibly *for their whole lives*.
- k) If they do have jobs, many Muslims will try not to pay income taxes. Or they avoid work altogether, have huge families, and claim state benefits for them. Many Muslims are effectively unemployable, due to their anti-social attitudes, and could not get jobs, even if they wanted them, as they are taught that it is *the role of infidels to subsidise them*, either by being taxed as *dhimmis*, or by funding welfare benefits. Therefore, the larger the Muslim population becomes, the greater is the financial burden on the non-Muslim taxpayers, until it becomes overwhelming. Ultimately it will cripple any western economy, as we are now finding.

Extracts from the Koran itself which show that it is western liberals who 'misunderstand' Islam, not the Jihadists

These features of Islam are *not* merely the practices of some unrepresentative minority who "*misunderstand the real nature of Islam*". That is what a few Muslims say, but it is a lie, as they well know. It is only said to disguise what Islam is really about, to create complacency in the West, and to reduce our opposition to Islam. Yet these lies are willingly embraced by gullible liberals who even see it as a badge of honour to prove they are not '*Islamophobic*' and are not promoting '*stereotypes*' which portray Islam in a negative light.

Rather than ask you to take my word for it, let's look firstly at a number of passages from the Koran which spell out exactly what Mohammed's teachings were on waging a "holy" war and on slaying, beheading, maiming, crucifying, burning, boiling and generally terrorising infidels. Some people will only be able to believe these things if they see, with their own eyes, *extracts from the Koran itself*. Let's look therefore at just a sample of them to prove that I am not making this up and that it is *the jihadists who are the real Muslims*, not the so-called moderates:

- Koran 2:191* "Slay the unbelievers wherever you find them."
- Koran 3:15* "Soon shall we cast terror into the hearts of the unbelievers"
- Koran 3:28* "Muslims must not take the infidels as friends."
- Koran 3:85* "Any religion other than Islam is not acceptable."
- Koran 4:74* "Whoso fighteth in the way of Allah, be he slain or be he victorious, on him We shall bestow a vast reward."
- Koran 5:33* "Maim and crucify the infidels if they criticise Islam."
- Koran 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."
- Koran 8:60* "Muslims must muster all weapons to terrorise the infidels"
- Koran 8:65* "The unbelievers are stupid: urge the Muslims to fight them."
- Koran 9:29* "Fight those who believe not in Allah nor the Last Day, nor hold forbidden which hath been forbidden by Allah and His Messenger, nor acknowledge the religion of Truth, (even if they are) of the People of the Book, until they pay Jizya with willing submission, and feel themselves subdued."
- Koran 9:30* "The Jews and Christians are perverts, fight them."
- Koran 9:123* "Make war on the infidels living in your neighbourhood"
- Koran 22:19* "Punish the unbelievers with garments of fire, hooked iron rods, boiling water, melt their skin and bellies"
- Koran 25:52* "Therefore listen not to unbelievers, but strive against them with the utmost strenuousness...."
- Koran 47:3-4* "Those who disbelieve follow falsehood, while those who believe follow the truth from their Lord... So, when you meet (in fighting Jihad in Allah's Cause), those who disbelieve smite at their necks till when you have killed and wounded many of them, then bind a bond firmly on them, (i.e. take them as captives)... If it had been Allah's Will, He Himself could certainly have punished them (without you). But (He lets you fight), in order to test you, some with others. But those who are killed in the Way of Allah, He will never let their deeds be lost."
- Koran 48:29* "Muhammad is the messenger of Allah. And those with him are hard (ruthless) against the disbelievers and merciful among themselves."
- Koran 61:4* "Surely Allah loves those who fight in His cause."

Koran 61:10-12 "O You who believe! Shall I guide you to a commerce that will save you from a painful torment. That you believe in Allah and His Messenger (Muhammad), and that you strive hard and fight in the Cause of Allah with your wealth and your lives, that will be better for you, if you but know! (If you do so) He will forgive you your sins, and admit you into Gardens under which rivers flow, and pleasant dwelling in Gardens of 'Adn- Eternity ['Adn(Edn) Paradise], that is indeed the great success."

Further extracts which come from the Hadith and Sira

The Koran, from which I have been quoting, is supposedly what the angel Gabriel revealed to Mohammed between AD 610 and 632. However, the *hadith* are meant to be the sayings of Mohammed, or reports of what he did, which were recorded and written by his followers. In addition, there is the *sira* (or *sirah* according to some) which is Mohammed's life story or biography.

So, I will quote from each of these as well, to further demonstrate how barbaric Mohammed was. Above all, it will prove that the Jihad, and the rapes, paedophilia and deception displayed by Muslims today, represent real Islam and are not a corruption of it, or a departure from it. I will just quote a few sample extracts:

Sahih Bukhari (52:177) Allah's Apostle said, "The Hour will not be established until you fight with the Jews, and the stone behind which a Jew will be hiding will say, "O Muslim! There is a Jew hiding behind me, so kill him."

Sahih Muslim (1:30) "The Messenger of Allah said: I have been commanded to fight against people so long as they do not declare that there is no god but Allah."

Sahih 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, that Muhammad is the messenger of Allah

Sahih 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."

Sahih Muslim (1:149) "Abu Dharr reported: I said: Messenger of Allah, which of the deeds is the best? He (the Holy Prophet) replied: Belief in Allah and Jihad in His cause..."

Sahih Muslim (20:4645)"...He (the Messenger of Allah) did that and 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 the heaven from the earth. He (Abu Sa'id) said: What is that act? He replied: Jihad in the way of Allah! Jihad in the way of Allah!"

Sahih Bukhari 2:35 "The person who participates in (Holy Battles) in Allah's cause and nothing compels him to do so except belief in Allah and His Apostle, will be recompensed by Allah either with a reward, or booty (if he survives) or will be admitted to Paradise (if he is killed)."

Tabari 9:69 "Killing Unbelievers is a small matter to us"

Ibn Ishaq/Hisham 990 "I leapt upon him and cut off his head and ran in the direction of the camp shouting 'Allah akbar' and my two companions did likewise".

Ibn Ishaq/Hisham 992 "Fight everyone in the way of Allah and kill those who disbelieve in Allah."

The truth about Mohammed himself, and how he *personally* murdered countless people and engaged in both paedophilia and rape

There is not space in this chapter to look in detail at the life of Mohammed. However, any account of the evil of Islam would not be complete without looking, at least briefly, at his own character and at the brutal and perverted things which *he himself did*, not only once or twice in uncharacteristic outbursts, but consistently. He was a murderous psychopath, and also a paedophile. At least he was if you consider having sex with a nine year old child to be paedophilia.

I say that last point entirely seriously, because opposition to paedophilia cannot be assumed today, as many liberals are seeking to change public opinion to make it lawful. Therefore, let's look briefly at some key events in Mohammed's life so you can decide for yourself whether he was a "*holy man*" and the founder of a "*great religion*" or a perverted sadist. It is necessary to form a view of him personally because, if one ever criticises Islam or its followers, one is told that the person or group to which one is referring are "*misrepresenting or misunderstanding Islam*".

You will hopefully agree that Mohammed had an accurate understanding of Islam, such that that excuse cannot be used with him. Therefore, if we conclude that he himself was a murderer, liar, rapist, sadist and paedophile then he was not an ideal person to found a major religion, or someone we should see as a role model. I shall therefore set out a series of facts about Mohammed. These would be viewed as controversial by Western liberals, who won't allow a word to be said against him.

However, Muslims themselves would not disagree with any of these facts. They know that all of these things are true *and they aren't ashamed of them*. For example, Muslims do not attempt to deny that Mohammed had full intercourse with a nine year old girl called Aisha. They also know that he 'married' her *when she was six and he was 53*, and that he consummated the 'marriage' when she was nine and still pre-pubescent. But many Muslims *see nothing wrong with that* and do the same themselves.

Likewise, they don't deny that he personally beheaded hundreds of people and ordered the killing of countless others. They see nothing wrong with any of that either, and approve of his actions, and of the Jihad which he began, even if they don't participate in it themselves. So, let's begin to look at what *Mohammed himself* did:

1. Mohammed received his 'revelation' about Islam when a demon physically attacked him in a cave at Hira in AD 610. These visitations continued until AD 632. He concluded in the end that this was an angel but in the beginning he believed, rightly, that it was a demon. However, even after he had changed his mind and decided that it was an angel, this is how he described the event:

"The angel caught me forcefully and pressed me so hard that I could not bear it anymore."
(*Bukhari 9:111*)

2. Mohammed initially thought that he was either insane, or that a demon was attacking him, and this is how he spoke of it, in his own words. He even considered committing suicide due to his mental distress. This episode is also significant in two further ways which distinguish him, and his 'visitor', from the genuine prophets or other figures in the Bible who met real angels:

- a) No character in the Bible ever thought, at any stage, that the angel who appeared to them was a demon. They *always* knew immediately that they were angels, whereas Mohammed's initial belief, which was correct, was that it was a demon

- b) No character in the Bible who met an angel ever wanted to commit suicide as a result, or even considered it. Yet Mohammed did, further demonstrating that it was a demon who assisted him in establishing Islam and producing the Koran. This is what he said himself:

“Woe is me, poet or possessed - Never shall the Quraysh say this of me! I will go to the top of the mountain and throw myself down that I may kill myself and gain rest.”
(Ibn Ishaq p.106)

3. Mohammed himself told his followers to rape captured women *in front of their husbands*. Therefore, even to this day, although the liberal Western media won't report it, the fact is that *rape is central to Islamic doctrine and culture*. That is why there are such chronic problems with rape in every country that has ever let Islam in, most notably Germany and Sweden, but also the UK. Sadly, the police in all those countries are zealously politically correct and try hard to hide these crimes, and not to disclose the religion of the rapists. The media also co-operate in that, which is remarkable, because it is not ordinarily in the nature of journalists to cover things up.

4. Accordingly, when Muslims rape women they are not acting contrary to the principles of Islam but doing exactly what the Koran *permits and encourages them to do*. And they are doing the very same as *Mohammed himself did* and told his followers to do. Consider this extract concerning raping women, even in front of their husbands, which Mohammed said *was alright if they were captives*:

“Some of the companions of the Apostle of Allah... Were reluctant to have intercourse with the female captives in the presence of their husbands who were unbelievers.....”

“So Allah, the Exalted, sent down the Quranic verse: “And all married women (are forbidden) unto you except those (captives) whom your right hands possess.”
(Sura 4:24, Abu Dawud 2150 and Muslim 3433)

5. In the final nine years of his life, Mohammed *himself* waged violent Jihad *65 times*. Therefore, it is not possible to pass it off as something which his over-enthusiastic followers did, contrary to his wishes, or even after his death. He did it himself, on an industrial scale. Thus, Jihad in general, and the beheading of prisoners in particular, was something which Mohammed personally engaged in, and on a frequent basis. It was central to Islam and to his own life.

6. Mohammed personally ordered his followers to carry out crucifixions, amputations, torture, enslavement, rape, beheadings and the gouging out of eyes. Therefore, when Muslim terrorists do all these things today, far from being 'extremists', who are departing from the true teaching of Islam, they are doing exactly what Mohammed himself did, and what he told his followers to do, on many occasions. Moreover, the Koran, Hadith and Sira confirm in writing that those are the very things which Muslims are *commanded* to do:

“They were caught and brought to him (the Holy Prophet). He commanded about them and (thus) their hands and feet were cut off and their eyes were gouged and then they were thrown in the sun until they died.”

(Sahih Muslim 4131)

“The punishment of those who wage war against Allah and His Messenger, and strive with might and main for mischief through the land is: execution, or crucifixion, or the cutting off of hands and feet from opposite sides.”

(Koran 5:33)

7. Mohammed *personally* beheaded between 600-900 Jews *in a single day*. Therefore, the beheading of non-Muslims cannot be portrayed as something exceptional or occasional. He did it on a massive scale and he must have enjoyed it, as one would expect of someone who is heavily demonised:

“Then the apostle went to the market of Medina and dug trenches in it. Then he sent for [The Banu Qurayza tribe] and struck off their heads in those trenches as they were brought out to him in batches..... There were 600 or 700 in all, though some put the figure as high as 800 or 900.

(Ibn Ishaq p464)

8. Mohammed himself ‘married’ a six year old girl called Aisha and had full penetrative sex with her when she reached the age of nine! However, even from their ‘wedding day’ onwards, when she was only six, Mohammed engaged in non-penetrative sex, which many Muslims still practise today with very young girls, *and even babies*, who are too small for full intercourse. They call this appalling practice ‘*thighing*’. I will leave it to your imagination as to what exactly it involves, as it is too disgusting to describe. This explains why so many Muslim men do the same things to little children today and why so many in the Muslim community see nothing wrong with paedophilia and even justify it openly:

“...the Prophet married her when she was six years old and he consummated his marriage when she was nine years old....

(Sahih Al-Bukhari 7:62-64 and 65, 88)

9. Mohammed was so obsessed with sex that he would visit his 11 wives and have intercourse with *all of them* in one night. That is not possible unless a man is demonised. This also helps to explain why so many Muslim men are addicted to sex and go completely out of control, raping women, girls, boys, and even men, due to being so fixated with sex. Indeed, their idea of heaven is that each man will be ‘given’ 72 virgins, with whom he can spend eternity in an endless orgy. How totally different they are from Christians, of any denomination.

At the risk of revolting you further, Mohammed would be seen at the mosque with semen stains on his clothing, which Aisha, one of his 11 wives, would wash off. I am sorry to be so gross, but it is necessary to state the grisly facts to show what kind of man he really was. It also shows that neither Mohammed, nor Aisha, nor his followers, were ashamed of these things, or saw anything wrong with them. Their brazenness explains why so many Muslims today feel no shame about sexual deviancy:

“The Prophet used to visit all his wives in a round, during the day and night and they were eleven in number”

(Bukhari 5:268)

“Aisha had said “I used to wash (semen) off the clothes of Allah’s Apostle and he would go for the prayers while water spots were still visible on them.”

(Bukhari 1:4; 232)

10. There are 109 verses in the Koran commanding Muslims to fight unbelievers until the whole world is under the domination of Islam, for example these:

“And fight them, until there is no more Fitnah (disbelief in Allah) and the religion will be for Allah alone.”

(Koran 8:38-39)

“Fight and slay the pagans wherever you find them, and seize them, beleaguer them, and lie in wait for them in every stratagem of war.”

(Koran 9:5)

“Verily, Allah has shown me the eastern and western part of the earth, and I saw the authority of my Ummah (nation) dominate all that I saw.”

(Sahih Muslim 2889)

11. Based on Mohammed's teachings, Muslims believe that *all* Jews must be killed before this world can come to an end. This is just one of the reasons why Muslims are so hostile to the Jews, and why they seek to attack them, as in the Arab-Israeli wars, all of which were started by the Arabs, never the Jews:

"The Last Day will not come about until Muslims fight the Jews, when the Jew will hide behind stones and trees. The stones and trees will say O Muslims, O Abdullah, there is a Jew behind me, come and kill him."

(Sahih Muslim 41:6981-6984, Bukhari 4:56: 791)

12. Muslims are held captive within Islam by fear, as death is threatened to anyone who leaves Islam for any reason. Moreover, this practice of capital punishment is done on the personal instructions of Mohammed himself. If it was not for this, millions of Muslims would abandon their religion, but they dare not do so. What does it tell you about Islam that this death threat is the only way to stop people leaving it?

"The Prophet said "if somebody (a Muslim) discards his religion, kill him."

(Bukhari 52:260 see also 84:57; 89:271 and Koran 4:89)

If we obey the Bible we will become a model citizen. If we obey the Koran we will become a Jihadist.

Obviously, not every Muslim does what the Koran instructs and personally engages in Jihad, or rape. I fully accept that. However, a small minority *do* and they become terrorists. By contrast, a Christian who takes the Bible literally will love others and become a model citizen, and if he is a so called 'extremist', then his 'extreme' adherence to the Bible will make him even more of a model citizen. However, a man who takes the Koran literally, and does exactly what it says, will become a Jihadist, a rapist and a paedophile. It is as simple as that, because those are the very things Mohammed did and that the Koran *commands his followers to do*. Thank God therefore that so many Muslims disobey the Koran. If they all obeyed it our situation would be utterly appalling.

Nevertheless, even if those who actively implement Islam, and take its doctrines seriously, are only a tiny minority in *relative* terms, they are still sufficiently numerous, in *absolute* terms, to threaten our security. At any rate, even as a small minority, and whether or not they represent 'real Islam', the jihadists have so far managed to conquer 57 nations, mostly in the Middle East, Asia and Africa. Thus, the so called 'radicals' or 'extremists' within Islam are hardly an irrelevant or ineffective sub-group.

If you want to be wise, therefore, you need an accurate knowledge of Islam, and of its history and aims. It is not the same as understanding the nature and aims of Buddhism or Mormonism. Admittedly, those are both false religions, and they are also Satanic in origin. But neither of them has any chance, or intention, of taking over the world, taking away our freedom, or destroying our societies through violence, as Islam does. In that regard, Islam is unique.

I actually describe it as 'Satan's masterpiece' because, of all the false religions that the Devil has ever founded, Islam is by far the most vicious. It is head and shoulders above all the others in its capacity to harm us. Therefore, if you are complacent about Islam, or even gullible enough to speak up in its support, because you believe the lies it tells about itself, or that the media tells on its behalf, you cannot be wise. It would make you naïve at best and, as we have seen, if you are naïve, then you aren't wise.

Accordingly, this is a subject about which we all need to wake up and become thoroughly well-informed. Once we understand Islam properly, based on truth, not deception or political correctness, then we need to speak out against it, openly and actively, and reject the rubbish we are told. One reason why naïve liberals believe these lies, and repeat them, is that they want to be accepted, by ensuring that

any opinion they express is PC and consistent with the prevailing world view, as expressed by the media and the liberal establishment.

Why politically correct people engage in ‘virtue signalling’ concerning Islam and other PC issues

Most of our generation are now so terrified of thinking or speaking differently from others that they will say the most incredible nonsense if that is what it takes to fit in. Another reason why people repeat lies about Islam, and other aspects of political correctness, is that they are engaging in ‘*virtue signalling*’. That is the practice of saying things to indicate to others that you are virtuous in some way, i.e. as the politically correct define virtue, not as God does.

So, in a misguided world, where holding PC views is seen as good, you can *signal* to others that you possess that virtue by mentioning a view that you hold, or claim to hold, or by denouncing the opposite view. It can be done directly or indirectly. So, by saying you despise Nigel Farage, or Tommy Robinson, neither of whom are racist, but are falsely alleged to be, then you can signal that you are not racist, or ‘Islamophobic’, or anything else they are (falsely) alleged to be.

Therefore, a ‘virtue signaller’ expresses support for Islam because, by doing so, he hopes to indicate to others how broad-minded and *sophisticated* he is. The thinking behind it is as follows:

- a) People who are ‘low-brow’ or unsophisticated are opposed to Islam.
- b) Therefore, by praising Islam, I will give the impression that I think at a deeper level than others and am sophisticated and ‘high-brow’.
- c) So, when a jihadist drives a lorry into pedestrians while shouting “*Allahu Akhbar*”, or murders people in a theatre, then, instead of condemning Islam, I will *sympathise with the Muslim community* and express my anxiety about how low-brow people might “*lash out against Muslims in retaliation*”.
- d) Then people will admire me for my largeness of mind and notice how much cleverer I am than those narrow-minded types.

A virtue-signaller’s thinking is reminiscent of the story of the Emperor who was deceived into buying a non-existent suit of clothes. A con man, posing as a tailor, told him that the garments were only visible to *the most intelligent and educated people*, with a proper appreciation of art and culture, but *invisible to anybody else*. When the Emperor went to try on his new clothes, which did not actually exist, he did not want to admit that he could not see anything, in case he might be considered unintelligent.

He spoke about the beauty of the design and the wonderful fabric and so did his courtiers, as they did not want to be seen as stupid either. Thus, a fortune was paid for the garments and everyone in the palace outdid each other in their superlatives. However, when the Emperor went out in public ‘wearing’ his new clothes, a small boy in the crowd saw him, stark naked, and shouted “*The Emperor’s got no clothes on*”.

The crowd looked at each other nervously, reluctant at first to admit that they couldn’t see any clothes either. But, one by one, they joined in with the boy’s laughter until eventually the whole crowd was laughing. This story applies perfectly to Islam, which is actually a religion of war, but is said to be “*a religion of peace*”. That is just as big a lie as saying the Emperor’s clothes look beautiful. However, as in that story, people are anxious not to be thought less of for being unable to see Islam’s wonderful qualities.

Therefore, they persist in saying that it is a religion of peace, even though all the evidence of their eyes and ears is plainly telling them that it is nothing of the sort. They don't want to admit that, for fear of being called 'right wing' or 'bigoted', or even a 'racist'. Deep down, they know it isn't true, but they would rather maintain an obvious lie than express an unpopular opinion.

They even go further and claim that Islam has produced all sorts of scientific and mathematical advances, especially in algebra. One hears that claim made all the time and yet it is a lie. Of course, *Arabs* have achieved many such things, in the centuries *before* Islam took over in Arabia, and even after that, where those Arabs were *not Muslim*, because it is important to remember that *not all Arabs are Muslim*.

However, Islam itself, and those who follow it, have never produced *any* significant advances in science, maths, or anything else. It is a myth, which is believed without question by naïve liberals, but which has no basis in reality. If it was even partially true, then the 57 nations currently ruled by Islam would not be the impoverished, undeveloped backwaters that they *all* are. The only exceptions are the Gulf States, which have oil. However, that oil had to be extracted *for them* by engineers *from the West* because, even now, the Arabs are incapable of extracting it for themselves.

Therefore, when a person bends over backwards to maintain the fiction that Islam is a religion of peace, despite the daily atrocities, and when the only people they consider to be dangerous are Islam's critics, it is usually due to virtue-signalling. They want to be admired for being able to see what lesser people cannot see, due to not having their sophistication. Such people are self-deceived, but they are also seeking to deceive you.

That said, they do the same with homosexuality, gay marriage, and all the other areas in which they claim moral superiority. For all these reasons people will say things which are plainly untrue, without feeling any unease, because they have another agenda. That has nothing to do with truth and is all about demonstrating that they have the right views, i.e. those of the liberal establishment. What is true or false is irrelevant to them. Their only aim is to impress others and not to be thought to be out of step with the metropolitan elite.

If you take their approach you will never end up believing the truth, as set out in the Bible, or even the plain facts of history. The craving to impress others, or to be accepted by them, will always lead you into error and deception. Therefore, if you want to be wise, think only of whether something is *true or false*, regardless of how many people will agree with you, or how pleased they will be with you for holding that view, or how angry they will be with you for rejecting it.

Most of the mainstream media imposes a news blackout on negative stories about Islam and any other things they don't want to report

You might wonder how all these things could be true of Mohammed, and how so many atrocities could be committed by Muslims, and yet the general population be so unaware. It is not that difficult to explain once you realise that most of the mainstream media is *covering up, and refusing to report*, any news which reflects badly on Islam. This is not just the policy of a few journalists here and there. It is the approach taken by most of the mainstream media, with a few honourable exceptions, such as The Times in the UK which first broke the story of the Muslim gangs in Rotherham due to the courage and diligence of their reporter, Andrew Norfolk, and his editor.

Apart from such noble exceptions, this wall of silence is happening in most of Western Europe and the English speaking world. Let me give just a few examples, although I could give more. Take firstly the major riots which took place in France, especially Paris, in February 2017, while I was writing this chapter. Muslim men, *and nobody other than Muslim men*, went onto the streets day after day, rioting, setting fire to cars, attacking policemen, and causing mayhem.

It was not just a small local punch up. It was a vicious, widespread, organised riot. Therefore, it was obviously newsworthy, and one would expect the mainstream media to cover it in detail. Instead, even after the fourteenth day of heavy rioting, barely a word had been said by newspapers, radio stations or TV channels anywhere. Consider the improbability of that arising coincidentally, with no guiding hand coordinating the multitude of media outlets, all over the Western world.

I went on Facebook after the fifth day of rioting to comment on the news blackout. It cannot have happened accidentally, whereby thousands of journalists decided, independently, that they didn't consider the riots to be newsworthy. On the contrary, they all knew the public would be extremely interested, which is why it is obvious that they must have been *instructed* to say nothing about it. Personal choices by individual journalists cannot have caused this. It was plainly imposed from above by the handful of billionaires who control the media.

Likewise, also in February 2017, an enormous march took place in Poland involving patriotic citizens who were concerned at the Islamification of Europe, especially France and Germany. They were making it known to their own government that they do not want Poland to be Islamified and that they therefore do not want any Muslim immigrants or refugees to be allowed in.

By any reasonable standard, that march was newsworthy, in view of the contentious subject matter and the vast numbers of people who took part. Yet, as with the Muslim riots in France, and the gang rapes in Germany and Sweden, very little was written or broadcast about the march by Western journalists. It was mainly on social media that it was seen, as private individuals tweeted and posted about it.

You might argue these events were accidentally overlooked. So, let's look now at a longer term crisis in the UK which has been ongoing for years, but which most of the mainstream media still ignores or camouflages. I refer to the 'grooming' gangs in towns and cities all over the UK, such as Rotherham, Birmingham, Rochdale, Oxford, Telford, *and many others*. In each of these places, *over many years*, with barely any opposition from police or social services, organised gangs of Muslim men groomed thousands of vulnerable girls for sex.

They were often girls in care homes, or from dysfunctional families. Therefore, many did not have parents keeping a close eye on them and were easier to prey upon. In *Rotherham alone* 1400 girls were repeatedly raped by gangs of Muslim men and passed around, like commodities to be traded. However, not all the girls had no families to stand up for them. Many had parents who went to the police and social services, reporting the rapes, and *pleading with them to take action*.

Despite those complaints, the police did almost nothing about it, for years. In many cases the police even tried to intimidate the concerned parents, threatening *them* with arrest, and warning them not to do anything which could be construed as 'Islamophobic' or as stirring up 'racial tension'. They were literally *protecting the rapists from the girls' parents*, rather than the other way around.

In fairness, many junior officers wanted to arrest the offenders, but were told by senior officers not to do so. That in itself proves the police knew of this, or such orders could not have been given. They chose not to act, because of the climate of political correctness in the police and their paranoia about being accused of 'racism' or 'Islamophobia'. There would have been career-ending consequences for any officer accused of those things and they knew that.

There was an equivalent scandal involving social workers at the homes where troubled girls were living under council care. They also knew what was going on, but turned a blind eye to it, so that *only a tiny number of them* did anything to help the girls. They too feared being branded as racist or Islamophobic which would, equally, have meant instant career death.

There was also silence from MPs, councillors, and council officers. Yet they would quickly raise any other issues affecting their constituents. They were only silent about Muslims. One honourable exception I know of, who did try to do something, was Ann Cryer MP from Keighley in Yorkshire. She

alerted others in the Labour Party but was ignored, and even dismissed as a racist. That compounds the guilt of Labour politicians because *she told them, and they still did nothing*.

One would imagine that once the *national* news media got to hear of the gang rapes they would see the silence of the *local* newspapers and radio and TV stations as being newsworthy in itself, and report on that. But they too said nothing about any of this until Andrew Norfolk, a reporter with the Times, broke the story of the Muslim grooming gangs in January 2012.

But it was only in 2017, decades after this scandal of grooming first began on a large scale, that the BBC belatedly joined in and produced a drama programme, *'Three Girls'*, plus a documentary, *'The Betrayed Girls'*. These tell some of the story of what happened. However, the BBC only did that *after we already knew what was happening*, thanks to Andrew Norfolk of the Times, plus individuals on social media, not due to the BBC.

Therefore, most of the media, both local and national, said nothing for years. It was not until the story eventually broke in a large way in 2012 that the police were forced to take some token action, very much against their will, and a few more Muslim men were arrested. But they were only a *tiny percentage* of the men who had been involved, and who *still are involved*, in grooming young girls. Most of the men who did it, and who still do it, were not even questioned, and the investigation was made as narrow as possible.

Even then, most of the mainstream media still maintained their wall of silence. They either did not report the arrests and convictions or, if they had no choice but to report them, they gave only the briefest of details and, above all, *made no mention of the fact that the men are Muslims!* That crucial fact is *always* left out, on the occasions when anything is said at all. The very most they do is to list the names of the offenders, which are all Muslim names, but only at the end of the article, where it is much less likely to be seen, never at the top, or as a headline.

The normal saying is that *"dog bites man"* is not news, but that *"man bites dog"* is. That maxim prevails in all cases except where the story contains some element that the media does not want us to hear about. So, to extend the adage, we can now say that *"man bites dog"* is news, but *"Muslim man bites dog"* would not be. Therefore, Muslims in particular, but also other groups, such as homosexuals and transgenders, cannot now be criticised publicly.

That is why so many people are silent, especially about Islam. Even if they do try to speak out, the mainstream media won't report their words and, increasingly, neither will social media companies such as Facebook and Twitter. They are becoming ever more PC and they aggressively delete posts and tweets, or even close down people's social media accounts, if they dare to criticise Islam. The maxim coined by Voltaire suggests, therefore, that we are now ruled by Islam because, more than any other thing, we are not allowed to criticise it:

"To learn who rules over you, simply find out who you are not allowed to criticise."

'Voltaire' (Francois-Marie Arouet)

Sir Winston Churchill's opinion of Islam from his book *'The River War'* of 1899 and also William Gladstone's even earlier comments

Let's now look at a longer quotation from Winston Churchill about the real nature of Islam. As a young man he served in the army in India, which then included what we now call Pakistan. He also fought against Muslims in Afghanistan, where he personally killed many of them in hand to hand fighting. During those years he studied Islam closely and also had extensive practical experience of it, based on living alongside Muslims, as well as fighting them.

So, he knew exactly what he was talking about and could be classed as an expert. Moreover, the things that Churchill was saying reflected what Islam was like in 1899, nearly *120 years ago*, thereby proving that the Jihad, and all the other violent features of Islam, are *nothing new*. At any rate, this is what was said about Islam by the greatest Englishman of all time, and certainly the greatest statesman of the twentieth century:

“How dreadful are the curses which Mohammedanism (Islam) lays on its votaries! Besides the fanatical frenzy, which is as dangerous in a man as hydrophobia (rabies) in a dog, there is this fearful, fatalistic apathy. The effects are apparent in many countries. Improvident habits, slovenly systems of commerce, and insecurity of property exist wherever the followers of the Prophet rule or live. A degraded sensualism deprives this life of its grace and refinement; the next of its dignity and sanctity. The fact that in Mohammedan law every woman must belong to some man as his absolute property – either as a child, a wife, or a concubine – must delay the final extinction of slavery until the faith of Islam has ceased to be a great power among men.

Individual Muslims may show splendid qualities. Thousands became the brave and loyal soldiers of the Queen: all know how to die: but the influence of the religion paralyses the social development of those who follow it. No stronger retrograde force exists in the world. Far from being moribund, Mohammedanism is a militant and proselytizing faith. It has already spread throughout Central Africa, raising fearless warriors at every step; and were it not that Christianity is sheltered in the strong arms of science, against which it has vainly struggled, the civilisation of modern Europe might fall, as fell the civilisation of ancient Rome.”

Winston Churchill

President Thomas Jefferson’s opinion of Islam and his determination to fight against it in the ‘Barbary wars’ of the late 18th and early 19th centuries

If you are American, then quotations from former British Prime Ministers might not be as persuasive as those of former Presidents. So, let’s look at some of those, from the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and especially Thomas Jefferson, the third President. Few people know that he was a fierce opponent of Islam, both before and after he became President. He saw it for what it really is and was determined to tell the truth about it, and to stand up to it, rather than give in to its violent and greedy demands.

The background to the story was the activities of Muslim pirates and slave traders who, between 1530 and 1780 kidnapped and enslaved perhaps 1.5 million Europeans and Americans. In one case, the entire population of Baltimore, a village in Ireland, were seized and taken into slavery by Muslim raiders called ‘*corsairs*’. They operated from ships and launched raids on defenceless civilians. As well as taking white slaves they took hostages and demanded ransom payments. They also operated as pirates, attacking merchant ships when they were far out at sea and vulnerable.

The only thing which kept these Muslim pirates at bay was the British Royal Navy which then ‘ruled the waves’ all over the world. However, when the Americans declared independence from us they no longer had Britain’s protection, which was a major problem, because America did not yet have a proper navy of its own. Therefore, during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, American merchant ships were especially vulnerable to Muslim pirates who mainly came from what we now call Algeria, Libya, Morocco and Tunisia.

All of these were part of the Ottoman Empire, ruled over by Turkey, and were called “*the Barbary States*”, from which comes the little-known phrase, “*the Barbary wars*”. It is little known for the simple reason that it is not politically correct to speak of it. Therefore, you won’t hear anything about these early problems faced by the United States. The war they fought is not taught in schools, or mentioned in the media, because it doesn’t suit the agenda of the liberal establishment to criticise Islam, or to refer to its long and consistent history of violence.

The liberal left prefers to tell itself that Islamic violence began in 2003, when President George W. Bush invaded Iraq as if, prior to that, there had been 1400 years of peace and quiet. In fact, these Muslim pirates were causing extreme problems 200 years ago and it was a real crisis for the early Americans. The young Thomas Jefferson, together with another future president, John Adams, who succeeded George Washington, went to London in 1785 to negotiate with the Libyan Ambassador, Al-Rahman, from Tripoli. When Jefferson and Adams protested at the actions of the pirates from the Barbary States, they were told by Al-Rahman:

“It was written in the Koran that all nations who should not have acknowledged their (the Muslims’) authority were sinners, that it was their right and duty to make war upon whoever they could find and to make slaves of all they could take as prisoners, and that every [Muslim] who should be slain in battle was sure to go to Paradise.”

Ambassador Al-Rahman had only one solution to offer, which was that the Americans should pay ‘protection money’ to the Barbary States, just as one would to the Mafia. So, the choice they were given was to live in ‘*dhimmitude*’, i.e. having the status of ‘*dhimmis*’, who have to pay to be allowed to live under Muslim rule. That would mean paying 10% of their annual budget to the Muslims or face ongoing piracy, hostage-taking and slavery. Jefferson made up his mind that if ever he was in a position to command American forces, he would wage war on the Barbary States rather than submit to such extortion.

The views of other American Presidents about Islam and how the fight against Islam even influenced the drafting of the American Constitution

The crisis caused by the Muslim pirates also had an impact on the whole of subsequent American history. It even featured in the debates that led to the drafting of the American Constitution in the years after that visit to London. Many of the delegates debating the draft Constitution argued that only a strong federal union could repel the threat of the Barbary States. So, the threat posed by Islam even influenced the setting up of a *federal* structure, rather than having 13 separate states, and provided some of the rationale for taking a federal approach.

It also had a major bearing on discussions of military matters and on the setting up of the United States Navy and the Marine Corps. Alexander Hamilton, another future president, said that without a “...*federal navy ... of respectable weight ... the genius of American merchants and navigators would be stifled and lost*”. Also, James Madison, yet another future president, argued that only a federal union could protect America’s shipping from “*the rapacious demands of pirates and barbarians*”, by which he meant the Muslims, as there were no others.

The threat posed by the Muslims in the 1780s also explains why the American Constitution, which only provides for an Army at two-yearly renewable intervals, puts no such limitation on the Navy. The army was seen as being for protection at home, on American soil, but the purpose of the Navy, in the minds of the ‘Founding Fathers’, was to go out and protect the nation from the scourge of Islam. So, even in the more obscure provisions of the Constitution, the threats posed by Islam lay behind these decisions and shaped the birth of America’s institutions.

However, even in the late eighteenth century, there were some Americans, and John Adams was one of them, who thought it was better to pay money to the Muslims than to fight them. Adams said that a war against the Barbary States would be “*too rugged for our people to bear*”. He then added a statement which has proved to be prophetic, and which is still true today, when he said, “*We ought not to fight them at all unless we determine to fight them forever*”.

The point about standing up to Islam is that there will never be any end to it until Jesus returns and destroys it, because Islam is committed to endless violence. Therefore, whether or not we choose to *join* that battle, and defend ourselves militarily, they will continue to attack us anyway, until we have

either been killed or conquered. So, it is not a question of us *starting* a war against Islam, as liberals wrongly believe George W. Bush did in 2003. The Jihad began in the early seventh century, when Mohammed started his campaign to take over the whole planet.

Therefore, the war has already been underway for 14 centuries, and it will continue unceasingly, regardless of whether we join in to defend ourselves. Jihadists require no provocation from us and are determined to fight us, and to take over our nations, whether we fight back or surrender. It makes absolutely no difference to them and they will never stop fighting us, either way. Therefore, the only questions we face are whether to fight back and, if so, how best to go about it, because they will never leave us alone to live in peace, whatever we do.

In the late eighteenth century, payments were initially made to the Barbary States, but their demands only increased, until they wanted 10% of the entire American budget. However, even if that had been paid, they would only have insisted on more. Then news came of appalling mistreatment of captured Americans in Algiers and Tripoli and American public opinion began to harden in favour of war rather than appeasement. It was at this point that the United States created a permanent Marine Corps, just before Thomas Jefferson became President.

The task of ordering war and sending those newly assembled Marines to fight back against the Muslims fell to Jefferson after he entered the White House in 1801. At last he was able to do what he had wanted to do ever since his meeting in 1785 with the arrogant Ambassador Al-Rahman who had brazenly told him what Islam was really about and what its true intentions were. So, Jefferson had long sought a pretext for war and it came in 1801 when Libyans from Tripoli seized two American ships. That set off a chain reaction of additional demands from the other Barbary States.

Jefferson's problem was the Constitution prevented him from declaring war, as that could only be done by Congress, the same restriction President F.D. Roosevelt faced in 1941, even after Pearl Harbor. Jefferson dealt with this subtly, by sending the US Navy to North Africa on 'patrol', with instructions to enforce existing treaties and punish any infractions of them. He did not inform Congress of his authorisation of this mission until after the fleet had already sailed and was too far away for Congress to recall it.

However, Jefferson was then 'helped' by the aggression of Yusuf Karamanli, the Pasha of Tripoli, who declared war on America in May 1801 to further his demand for more 'protection' money. That declaration of war enabled Jefferson to get around the restrictions of the Constitution and he responded with a heavy bombardment of Tripoli and of its navy, crippling one of their biggest ships. This led to Congress passing an enabling Act in 1802 which amounted to a declaration of war by America and provided for a permanent presence by the US Navy in the Mediterranean.

The other Barbary States made the mistake of under-estimating this fledgling nation, America, which would one day become a superpower, as Morocco then declared war and the rest of them increased their demands for money. There then followed what began as a disaster, but later turned into a triumph, when the Muslims in Tripoli captured the new American frigate, *Philadelphia*. In response to that, the American heroes, Edward Preble and Stephen Decatur, mounted a daring raid on Tripoli's harbour.

A force of US Marines boarded the captured ship and blew it up to prevent the pirates using it. They also inflicted heavy damage on the city's defences. When the news of this spread, the famous British Admiral, Lord Nelson, called the raid "*the most bold and daring act of the age*". This early American victory led to a song being written which is the anthem of the US Marines, even to this day, and which begins, "*From the halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli....*"

The origin and meaning of those famous words are now known only by a very few. However, the song bears vivid witness to the fact that Islam has been America's enemy from the very birth of the nation, and that it already was so before America became Islam's enemy. So, don't blame George W. Bush for starting the war against Islam. That honour belongs to Thomas Jefferson, but even he didn't actually

start the war. He merely had the good sense to realise that America needed to *join* it, because that war had already been started by the Muslims themselves.

Matters escalated in 1815 when President Madison asked Congress for permission to send Stephen Decatur to North Africa again, to seek to defeat the Muslim pirates more decisively. This time the main aggressor was Omar Pasha of Algiers, but he was taught a bitter lesson when he ended up with his fleet blown to pieces and his grand harbour full of heavily armed American ships.

Algiers was then forced to pay compensation to America, which made a nice change from what had gone on before. He also had to release all the hostages, just as Iran did in 1981 for President Reagan. President Madison's words following that victory were very apt and we would do well to reflect on them today and to adopt the same policy in our own struggle against Islam:

"It is a settled policy of America that, as peace is better than war, war is better than tribute (i.e. paying money to extortionists). The United States, while they wish for war with no nation, will buy peace with none."

President James Madison

What Presidents John Quincy Adams and Theodore Roosevelt said about Islam

John Adams, the second President of the United States, had a son, John Quincy Adams, (1767-1848) who became the sixth President. He had an even clearer view of Islam than his father had, as shown in this quotation from one of his essays which was written before he was elected to Congress in 1830:

"...he [Mohammed] declared undistinguishing and exterminating war, as part of his religion, against all the rest of mankind.....The precept of the Koran is perpetual war against all who deny Mohammed is the prophet of God."

John Quincy Adams

Consider this even starker statement made by President Theodore (Teddy) Roosevelt, who was in the White House from 1901-1909, and who is widely regarded as being one of the top five Presidents of all time. Note the clarity of his views, and his willingness to speak his mind and tell the truth, which today's leaders dare not do. Note also how he makes clear that Islam has to be resisted, not only with words, but with *military force*. That is as true today as it ever was. The only difference is that our leaders will not even say it, let alone do it:

"Christianity is not the creed of Asia and Africa at this moment solely because the seventh century Christians of Asia and Africa had trained themselves not to fight, whereas the Moslems were trained to fight. Christianity was saved in Europe solely because the peoples of Europe fought. If the peoples of Europe in the seventh and eighth centuries, and on up to and including the seventeenth century, had not possessed a military equality with, and gradually a growing superiority over the Mohammedans who invaded Europe, Europe would at this moment be Mohammedan and the Christian religion would be exterminated.

Wherever the Mohammedans have had complete sway, wherever the Christians have been unable to resist them by the sword, Christianity has ultimately disappeared. From the hammer of Charles Martel to the sword of Sobieski, Christianity owed its safety in Europe to the fact that it was able to show that it could and would fight as well as the Mohammedan aggressor... The civilization of Europe, American and Australia exists today at all only because of the victories of civilized man over the enemies of civilization because of victories through the centuries from Charles Martel in the eighth century and those of John Sobieski in the seventeenth century.

During the thousand years that included the careers of the Frankish soldier and the Polish king, the Christians of Asia and Africa proved unable to wage successful war with the Moslem conquerors; and

in consequence Christianity practically vanished from the two continents; and today, nobody can find in them any "social values" whatever, in the sense in which we use the words, so far as the sphere of Mohammedan influences are concerned. There are such "social values" today in Europe, America and Australia only because during those thousand years, the Christians of Europe possessed the warlike power to do what the Christians of Asia and Africa had failed to do — that is, to beat back the Moslem invader."

Theodore Roosevelt

How Charles Martel of France, and later King John III of Poland, saved Europe from Islam by being willing to confront the Jihadists with military force

As we have seen, today's politicians in the West, though not in more sensible countries like Japan, the Philippines, Hungary and Poland, are not willing even to name Islam as the enemy, let alone use military force to withstand it. That is why western Europe is now being overrun by Muslim immigrants, some of whom are jihadists. However, it was not always so and, quite apart from the Crusades, which some people may know a little bit about, there are also three lesser known wars in which Europe was saved from Islam by the use of military force.

The first was under the leadership of Charles Martel of France in AD 732. The second was under King John III of Poland in 1683 and the third was in Greece in the 1820s and 1830s. Let's look very briefly at these three wars, because they provide a lesson that we urgently need today. Charles Martel, the grandfather of 'Charlemagne', was a Frankish (French) statesman and military leader. As a Duke, and also as Prince of the Franks, he was the de facto ruler of France from AD 718 until his death in 741.

He saw that Islam, which was then just over 100 years old, had already conquered all of Arabia and had then spread rapidly outwards, solely by means of violent Jihad. It had even conquered Spain in AD 711 and was now fighting its way into France, determined to take over the whole of Europe. Matters came to a head in the October of AD 732, exactly 100 years after Mohammed's death, when the Arab armies, led by Al Ghafiqi, were resisted by Frankish forces led by Charles Martel. This battle, which we know as the battle of *Tours* or, alternatively, the battle of *Poitiers*, was won decisively by the French.

Charles Martel then went onto the offensive, pushing the Muslims out of France entirely and effectively ending their ambitions in Europe for nearly a thousand years. However, the key point is that the reason why Charles Martel defeated the Muslims is that he realised they could only be stopped by *military force* and because he had no hesitation about using it. In taking that approach Charles Martel was the complete opposite of today's weak, dishonest, cowardly politicians who won't even criticise Islam, let alone fight it militarily.

The next major battle against Islam in Europe was in 1683 when King John III of Poland defeated the Ottoman Turks at the battle of *Vienna*. He was King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania and, like Charles Martel, he had no hesitation at all about fighting back, with full military force, to defend his own country, and Europe as a whole, from being overrun by Islam. The city of Vienna had been besieged by the Turks for two months.

The siege was ended when the Turks were defeated by a powerful coalition of armies from the Habsburg Empire, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and the Holy Roman Empire, all of which were under the command of King John III. This was a decisive turning point in European history, after which the Turks ceased to be such a menace. In King John's war against the Turks, which continued until 1699, the Muslims also lost almost all of Hungary, which they had previously conquered.

However, these were not the only times in history when Islam has been thrown out of a nation which had previously been ruled by it. Such "*de-islamification*" has also been achieved in Spain, Portugal and Greece. In fact, the Greek island of Crete achieved it twice, as we shall see below. There isn't space here to go into detail, but here are the bare facts.

Spain and Portugal began to be conquered by Islam in AD 711, when the Muslim leader, Tariq Ibn-Ziyad landed at Gibraltar, which is now British territory. By the end of his campaign, most of the Iberian Peninsula, i.e. Spain and Portugal, was under Islamic rule. It was then that the Muslims tried to cross the Pyrenees to conquer France, but were defeated by Charles Martel, as we saw above.

Muslim rule in most of Spain and Portugal then continued, despite varying levels of resistance, until it was finally beaten back by the Catholic kingdoms of northern Spain in what has come to be known as the '*reconquista*' or reconquest. This eventually ended in 1492, when the last remaining Muslim-held territory was won back and set free from Islam in the battle of *Granada*. For the avoidance of doubt, I am not endorsing Catholicism, but simply pointing out that those Catholic forces only succeeded in driving Islam out of Spain and Portugal *because their political leaders were willing to use military force*.

Grasping that fact is the key to understanding this whole problem. Islam cannot be defeated by pacifism, or by lighting candles or by millions of us changing our Facebook profiles to show the flag of the latest country to have suffered a jihadist attack. None of that will achieve anything, as is proved by the fact that all those measures are being used to a tiresome extent at present and are utterly failing to stop the ongoing terrorist campaign.

On the contrary, we are simply making it easier for them, and causing them to despise us even more than they already do, by our pathetically weak, passive, feminine responses to each outrage. By contrast, highly effective military action was taken by the Spaniards. Moreover, it did not end with their victory in 1492. Even after that, they continued to resist Islam to such an extent that, in 1567, King Philip II of Spain even made the use of the Arabic language illegal.

He did so because he was deadly serious about the nature of Islam and the threat it posed, and he was absolutely determined to prevent it from ever coming back. But that wasn't all. The Spaniards were also willing to physically expel Muslims from the Iberian Peninsula, i.e. *to deport them* in large numbers, to make sure they posed no ongoing threat.

Imagine if the Spanish leaders had been as squeamish and feeble as ours now are about deportation, or if they had focused on the Muslims' supposed 'human rights', rather than on protecting the freedom, and the lives, of the Spanish and Portuguese peoples. If those leaders had acted as passively and weakly as ours now do, then Islam would inevitably have staged a rapid come-back in the whole Iberian Peninsula, as it now doing in our day.

How Greece was set free from Islam by fighting against the Muslim Turks and how the British poet, Lord Byron, fought in that war

Let's turn now to Greece, which fell under the control of the Muslim Turks, i.e. the Ottoman Empire, in the mid fifteenth century, at about the same time as Spain and Portugal were driving Islam out. By the way, when we say Greece was under Turkish rule, we must be clear as to what that means. It means Greece fell under the domination of *Islam*. We need to say that explicitly because the point is missed otherwise. This persisted until the early nineteenth century when the *Greek War of Independence* broke out, in 1821, after a national uprising was proclaimed.

The Turks fought savagely to suppress the Greeks but, in 1827, a combined fleet of naval ships from Britain, France and Russia destroyed the Turkish fleet at the battle of *Navarino*. This was a decisive turning point in the whole war. Then, in 1828, France landed troops in the Peloponnese to stop the Turkish atrocities and, with their help, the Greek forces were able to regroup and then to advance, seizing more territory from the Turks. After this, the Western powers imposed a ceasefire and, in 1832, Greece was finally recognised as a sovereign state, albeit that the island of Crete was not included.

The story of Crete's resistance against Islam is longer, and far too complex to tell it all here. However, the Turks managed to keep hold of the island of Crete when the Greek war of independence ended. It was briefly liberated during that war but, in 1828, the island was reconquered by the Muslims, though by Egyptian forces, not Turkish. It then became an Egyptian province, albeit that Egypt itself was a vassal state, subject to Turkey, and part of the Ottoman Empire. Then, in 1840, Crete was transferred to be under direct Turkish rule again.

So, Crete had successfully driven Islam out, only for it to come back again. Thankfully, the story did not end there, and we can take encouragement from that, which is why I included this episode. There then followed a long and complicated series of events by which the people of Crete continued to resist the Egyptians and the Turks, and Islam itself. In particular, there was an uprising in 1866 which was eventually put down by the Turks. However, it led to growing international support for the Cretan people, even in America.

The long campaign of resistance did not finally end until 1898 when the Ottoman forces were expelled, and Crete became an independent state, although it later re-joined Greece and became a part of that nation. The reason I mention Crete in particular, is that Crete's story illustrates the crucially important point that *Islam is not invincible*. Therefore, it is always worthwhile resisting it, even if it has already conquered a nation, or *reconquered* it, as in the case of Crete.

Therefore, no matter how much ground Islam may have captured, geographically or politically, and no matter how many Muslims may have moved into a country, it is still worth resisting it and seeking to reverse the tide, even if you have to do it twice, like Crete. It shows that there is always hope for any nation, provided their Governments are not passive dhimmis, but have courage, self-respect, and the will to fight for their citizens' freedom.

It is unlikely that you have ever heard any of this about Greece because it is not taught in schools, just as the genocidal massacre of the Armenians by the Turks in the early twentieth century is not taught either. But even if it has ever been mentioned, it is extremely unlikely that any history teacher would be brave enough, or honest enough, to mention the role played by Islam in the Greek War of Independence. They would probably speak as if Islam had nothing to do with it, or as if the Turks were not Muslims, and as if the nations being ruled over from Turkey were not part of an Islamic *Caliphate*.

Most people are also unaware that the famous poet, Lord Byron, was killed in Greece in 1824 while fighting for the Greeks. But even those who do know that, such as perhaps a few students of English literature, would probably only think that Byron was fighting *for* Greece, whose history and literature he loved. It would not occur to them that he was fighting *against* the Turks and, in particular, *against Islam*. Yet that was the very reason the Turks conquered Greece in the first place, i.e. to pursue Jihad, and the basis for their savagery against the Greeks.

Such facts of history are now edited out, even in so far as any of this is ever taught at all, which it rarely is. My wife actually went to the same school in Scotland that Lord Byron attended. There is even a statue of him. However, she was never taught anything about *why* Byron died or *who*, or rather *what*, he was fighting against. Islam was never mentioned, even at Lord Byron's own former school where, in every other sense, they were trying to commemorate him. It shows how the '*I-word*' and the '*M-word*' just cannot be mentioned these days.

What conclusions can we draw from each of these wars against Islam?

We have looked at a number of countries which, at various times in history, since AD 732, have fought back against Islam, and refused to surrender to it or to regard it as invincible. Therefore, by their example, one can see that the conquest of territory by Islam is neither inevitable nor irreversible. Even where the Jihadists have taken over, they *can* still be kicked out again, provided there is the moral

courage, and the political will, to resist them and the willingness to do whatever is needed militarily to defeat them.

That kind of clarity of vision, and strength of purpose, were present in the past, but they are sadly lacking in today's cowardly, politically correct and heavily feminised world. Looking at all the above quotations, and the decisive actions of Charles Martel, King John III of Poland, and others, do you see the consistent pattern? These leaders from the past all understood the real truth about Islam and were *not afraid to speak publicly about it* or to fight it militarily.

How likely is it that all these historical figures were mistaken about Islam and that the weaklings and cowards who govern us today are correct? The truth is just as obvious as it ever was. It is simply that our politicians do not have the courage, or the honesty, to speak about it, at least not in public. They care too much about their careers, and too little about their countries, to risk doing that.

However, it is not just necessary to realise that our armed forces need to fight back against the jihadists. We also need to grasp that that fighting must be done *with full force*, not in a half-hearted manner, whereby we only deploy the smallest number of troops or police, and with minimum weaponry. Neither must we restrict their powers and their rules of engagement. If the Jihadists are to be prevented from taking over in any more nations, because those that already have a Muslim majority are probably lost forever, we must allow our troops to fight with every ounce of their strength.

That means no longer placing politically correct limitations on our own soldiers, such as those which led to the conviction and imprisonment of the British Sergeant, 'Marine A', for 'finishing off' a mortally wounded jihadist rather than taking him prisoner. That approach, and a host of other such pedantic restrictions, prevent us gaining the decisive and permanent military victories we could so easily get on the battlefield if we allowed our troops to fight with full intensity.

But also at home, in the civilian context, we need to stop being squeamish about resisting Islam. Therefore, we should immediately, and without any apology, deport all jihadists or known sympathisers. Then let them appeal *from abroad, after their deportation, and at their own expense*, not while they remain here, funded by us, via Legal Aid. Likewise, no planning permission should be given for any further mosques and all immigration by Muslims should be ceased, so that the problem is at least not made even worse.

Charles Martel of France and King John III of Poland would scratch their heads in bafflement at the array of legal, political and military limitations we place on our troops and police in fighting back against Islam. They would be even more amazed at how our civilian population is forbidden from even speaking about Islam unless they want to praise it, and how their Facebook and Twitter accounts are shut down if they criticise Islam – though not if they criticise Christianity! If we hope to remain free countries that limp-wristedness has to end.

The false accusation of 'racism' which is used to intimidate others into silence

Another depressing feature of modern political debate is that the accusation of 'racism' is now routinely levelled against anybody who expresses a view on just about anything, not just things which pertain to race. It occurs even where what is being discussed has nothing whatsoever to do with race. This is usually done deliberately, knowing it to be a false accusation, because the real objective of the one making the accusation is to intimidate his opponent into silence.

There is, of course, such a thing as racism. It does exist, and is a sin, and when it arises we must take it seriously. However, its definition has been so extended, and so warped, that it no longer has its proper meaning. Therefore, most of the time, the racism only exists in the mind of the accuser. Real racism, correctly defined, is to think less of a person, or to treat them badly, or unfairly, *on the basis of*

their race. It does not mean disagreeing with, criticising, opposing, or refusing to give in to the demands of, a person or group who are of a different race, *where their race is not the reason for your doing so*.

Therefore, if we criticise the policies and actions of the corrupt former President Obama, that is not racism, as so many people claim. It is simply to criticise his *policies and actions* and has absolutely nothing to do with his skin colour. Mr Obama was an evil man, and a committed Muslim, and he did great harm, not only by his own actions, but also through the long list of enemies and traitors he appointed to key positions, many of whom are also Muslims.

Thus, it would be equally appropriate, and equally necessary, to criticise Mr Obama, and to describe him as wicked, *whatever race he was*, just as it is necessary to criticise white politicians who are corrupt and evil, such as Hillary Clinton or John Kerry. They worked with and for Obama, held the same misguided views, and committed the same treacherous acts against the American people. So, why would it be racist to criticise Mr Obama, but not racist to criticise them, when one is objecting to the very same things, which all of them did?

This ought to be seen as a statement of the blindingly obvious but, sadly, it still has to be said, because most people don't realise it. The bogus allegation of racism is now used routinely whenever a person says anything with which the accuser disagrees. He will quickly invent some supposed connection with race, however tenuous, and condemn the other person for being a *racist*. That is convenient because it means the accuser doesn't have to address the substantive issue, for example whether Mr Obama's policy on X, Y or Z is right or wrong.

All of that can be ignored and the accusation of racism serves as the entire argument, so that it alone is relied on to discredit whatever was said. They don't address the actual argument, because it is assumed there is no need to do so once racism has been alleged. That accusation does the job, all by itself. By this twisted logic, anybody criticising Mr Obama is '*obviously a racist*', there being no other conceivable reason to criticise him. On that basis, nobody need ever answer the substantive point, or respond to the criticism, or defend Obama's policies.

The same approach is taken to anybody who condemns Islam or criticises the words, actions or beliefs of any Muslim. It is claimed that they too must be doing so because they are '*racist*', even though Islam is *not a race*, but a *religion*. Therefore, to say anything against it, whether rightly or wrongly, has nothing to do with anybody's race, but only their beliefs and practices. There are Muslims on every continent and *from every race* and their Islamic faith is just as false, and just as evil, wherever they live and whatever race they may be.

Those who defend Islam by accusing its critics of being racists are well aware the accusation is false, even as they say it. They nonetheless make it, because they know it is highly effective at silencing people. So, they continue to use that tactic regularly. Linked to the whole problem of bogus allegations of racism are the issues of *immigration* and so-called '*multi-culturalism*'. These two topics have, likewise, been deliberately made so explosive that people are no longer allowed to discuss them openly or to state their real views.

The only view that is considered acceptable, and which will not result in outrage, and accusations of racism, is for you to be in favour of unrestricted immigration. In addition, you must keep on emphasising that you support multi-culturalism. People quickly realise that expressing any other view will result in fierce hostility. Therefore, as people don't like being shouted at, they soon learn not to say anything that will antagonise the '*race police*', i.e. that growing section of the population who are obsessed with race.

They are all around us, in our workplaces, amongst our friends and even in our churches, and they increasingly see everything in terms of race. But if we want to be wise we need to be able to think clearly, fearlessly and honestly, and *without any restrictions*, about the political, economic, military or

religious issues facing our society. That freedom of thought and speech must extend to all issues which, directly or indirectly, touch upon race, and whether in a real or an imaginary way.

There is absolutely nothing wrong with talking about immigration, or about the fact that Muslims have large families, and we must insist on speaking out openly and in public

We must never submit to any of the boundaries or prohibitions that other people seek to impose on us to limit what we are allowed to think or say. Take therefore the issue of immigration. That too has nothing whatsoever to do with race. It is sheer common sense that any country must have rules as to *who* it will let in, and especially *how many*, and that it must be able to enquire as to what skills, trades, qualifications or capital immigrants have to offer. That is self-evident and applies to any country, regardless of its current racial mix or the race of those who wish to move there.

For years, many of us have argued that the UK is letting in far too many immigrants, mainly due to the tragic error of joining the European Union, which insists on free movement of labour within the EU. However, the UK has *also* been letting in very high numbers of immigrants from *outside the EU*, many of whom are *Muslims*, and they bring us all sorts of social, economic, political, criminal and religious problems. What is more, the true extent of that immigration is deliberately disguised by the UK Government by its dishonest policy of only ever speaking in terms of '*net*' migration.

That is an artificial definition which is intended to mislead us as to the true scale of the *inward* migration, or immigration, which is what really matters. The Government therefore takes the figure for those coming *into* the country and *deducts* from that the number of those who *left the UK*. So, for example, in the year to 30 June 2016, the total *net* migration to the UK was 335,000. However, that figure is a dishonest device which is designed to disguise the fact that, in that year, 650,000 people *entered* the UK and 315,000 *left* it.

So, if you were thinking, *as they intended you to think*, that 335,000 immigrants doesn't sound too bad, then think again. You need to see the real numbers, and also realise *what kind of people* are leaving the UK and *what kind of people* are entering it, because we are not comparing like with like. The 315,000 people who left the UK were mainly highly educated and skilled workers and almost all of them were *tax payers*, many at the higher rate of 40%. Furthermore, the vast majority were *not claiming any benefits*.

Therefore, most of those 315,000 who left the UK were native Britons, born and educated in the UK, each of whom were *contributing* perhaps £10,000 to £50,000 per annum to the nation *in tax*, while *taking nothing out*. In stark contrast, the 650,000 who *entered* the UK were, overwhelmingly, *unskilled and uneducated and had zero capital*. Moreover, although admittedly, many of them got jobs, they were mainly *lowly paid jobs*. Therefore, they generate very low *tax receipts* for the UK Exchequer.

However, except for those who do get jobs, who are usually non-Muslim East Europeans, a high proportion of the others end up claiming *welfare benefits* and *remaining on them permanently*. Therefore, one immigrant, especially if he is a Muslim and therefore has a large family, or produces one later, may become a drain on UK taxpayers for decades to come and *so may their children and grandchildren too*.

Due to the extreme sensitivity of this issue, the UK Government is deliberately misleading us into imagining that 'only' 335,000 immigrants entered the UK in 2016, when it was actually 650,000 who came. They also want us to think that those who *left* the UK and those who *came in* were the *same kind of people*, i.e. that it was a '*like for like*' exchange. But it was nothing of the sort. We were generally swapping a taxpayer for a non-taxpayer, and a non-benefit claimant for a benefit claimant and, very often, a non-Muslim for a Muslim.

Therefore, it is not only a question of numbers in absolute terms, but also the *type of person involved*. The key issue is the effect that those coming in are going to have on the *character and cohesion of our society*, not only in 2018, but for generations, to come. When you consider the dramatic difference in the *numbers of children* they each have, the longer term results are even more staggering. You will never hear any of this from the media, or the Government, because they don't want to alert us to what is really happening, but the fact is most Muslims have large families, for various reasons, partly so they can claim benefits for each child.

It is also because they are taught to see population growth as part of the process by which Islam can take over a nation. They know that can be done within two or three generations, even without fighting, if they simply have *2-3 times* as many children as we do and if their *children and grandchildren do the same*. Consider the maths. If a native British couple have two children they will only ever *replace* themselves, at best, with no element of multiplication. Then, if their children do the same they will, likewise, just replace themselves, again with no multiplication.

Therefore, if we imagine a native British couple in 2018, and they have two children, that brings the total number up to 4 people. But 30 years later, in 2048, if we assume that the parents have died by then, and that another generation of children have been born, there will *still be only four people in total*. That is if we ignore the *spouses* whom their children go on to marry, because they are already here in the UK. I am only looking at the *children* who result from those marriages.

However, contrast that with a Muslim family which begins, in 2018, with two parents but goes on to have six children instead of two. Let us also assume that that Muslim couple's six children then go on to do the same, but also that they start their own families when they are only 20 years old instead of 30-33, as is now the norm in the West. On that basis, a Muslim couple can produce five generations in a century, whereas a native British couple will only produce three.

So, let's follow this through, very roughly, and see how many descendants are produced by that one Muslim couple in 100 years, where we assume that each generation has six children, rather than two, and that each generation begins to start a family aged 20, rather than 30-33.

Year	Total number of descendants produced by one Muslim couple	
2018	nil	
2038	6	
2058	36	i.e. 6 x 6
2078	216	i.e. 36 x 6
2098	1296	i.e. 216 x 6
2118	7,776	i.e. 1296 x 6

Remember that the native British couple we looked at earlier went on to *merely replace themselves* in each successive generation. Moreover, even that was only done three times in the century, not five times. Therefore, by 2118, their total number of descendants then living, would still be only two i.e. *if we ignore all spouses*, for both Muslims and non-Muslims, and if we also assume that each generation

dies after having children. That is not actually so, in either case, but the example is deliberately oversimplified to make it easier to follow. Nevertheless, you see the general point.

You will also see why statisticians project that the UK will be a *majority Muslim country by the 2050s* and solidly Muslim by the 2070's! You might quibble with the assumptions in my illustration and prefer to recalculate it on the basis that Muslims have children when they are 25, or even 30, and that they only have 5 children, or even only 4. However, even on that basis, the result is the same, in that they still take over eventually. It just takes longer to get there. That said, my assumptions are probably conservative because Muslim birth rates are much higher than ours, not just marginally so. Thus, some Muslim families actually have *more than* six children, not fewer.

Also, my figures do not include anything to reflect the impact of heavy *ongoing immigration* by Muslims, or of conversions to Islam, over and above the effects of their disproportionately high birth rates. Remember that, unlike the native British population, a high proportion of young Muslims have arranged marriages whereby a husband or wife is brought in for them, from Pakistan or elsewhere.

That means that the growth in the Muslim population could possibly be *even faster* than in my illustration. Accordingly, our policy of allowing virtually unlimited Muslim immigration is to sign the death warrant of our own culture, not to mention our freedom of speech and religion. That is why this issue of immigration by Muslims is so alarming, not just a dry academic argument about statistics.

Moreover, given that we are discussing racism at the moment, the point is that to oppose unrestricted immigration and to impose limits on numbers, and to screen for criminal records etc, is *not racist*. Neither is it racist to single out Muslims for special treatment and to have a policy of excluding them while letting others in, such as Sikhs and Hindus. Those religions, though false, are not based on waging war against us until we either submit to them or are wiped out. Some might view that as a technical distinction, but it seems rather important to me.

Thus, we must insist on the freedom to say whatever we want to say about immigration and not to be intimidated into silence by bogus accusations of racism. We must not allow that slur to be attached to us, even indirectly, and we must ignore it when it is made, as it inevitably will be. Above all, we must not apply it to ourselves. Neither should we honour that false accusation by seeking to defend ourselves from it. The assumption that we are *not* racists should be made *automatically* and should be the default-setting.

That should then stand until and unless we say or do something to indicate that we *are* racists – by the *real* definition, not the bogus one. We should never submit to the requirement to go around proving to everybody that we aren't racists. That is one of the most pernicious burdens imposed upon us by the politically correct zealots who make these unwarranted allegations. One of their master strokes has been to create the false impression that our society is engulfed in a tidal wave of racism. Everyone is then assumed to be a racist unless they strive officiously to prove they are not.

I therefore reject the whole multi-cultural agenda, laden as it is with these unfounded assumptions about '*endemic racism*' and the need to see racism under every stone and as providing the underlying motive behind every thought, word or deed. We are not actually under any duty to build a '*multi-cultural society*'. Neither should we feel obliged to see that as being better than a British society or a French society or an American or Danish society, or any other for that matter.

Every nation, and every race, is valid and none of them requires the acceptance of a policy of multi-culturalism, or the denial of their own culture, in order to become so. It is also extraordinary how one-sided this approach is. It is assumed that a Nigerian, Mexican, or Pakistani culture is obviously valid and praiseworthy. We are also told that we in the West should admire, preserve, and even 'celebrate' those cultures.

However, if anyone speaks up for *British* culture or, even worse, *English* culture, or says they are proud of it, that is automatically assumed to be invalid and, of course, racist. Therefore, those who see value and merit in the British way of life, and who wish to preserve it, are portrayed as small-minded bigots, xenophobes and racists. Yet those who wish to promote and preserve Pakistani culture, or Zambian culture etc, are seen as entirely right and, in particular, as *anti-racist*.

It was God who created the various nations

Let's therefore look briefly at what the Bible says on the subject of nations, because it was God Himself who created each one, allocating them their own boundaries, and also giving them their own languages. None of this happened by accident. God also causes each nation to be large or small, and strong or weak, and He also raises them up and lowers them down:

And he made from one every nation of men to live on all the face of the earth, having determined allotted periods and the boundaries of their habitation,

Acts 17:26 (RSV)

*He makes nations great, and he destroys them;
he enlarges nations, and leads them away.*

Job 12:23 (ESV)

God *wants* each nation to have its own language, land and boundaries, but also to have its own culture and customs. He even gave them different skin colours, according to where on the Earth He sent them to establish their respective nations. Or, in other words, He decided where to send them based on their skin colour, so that they would be better suited to the level of sunlight in that place. We see the beginning of this process of population movement and nation building in Genesis chapters 10 and 11.

As a result of the growth of wickedness in Babel, which we now call Babylon, and especially their development of the occult, God decided to split up the whole human race into different nations, living separately, in different places, and with their own languages. Up to this point there had been only one common language. Also, the majority of people had not spread far since the Flood and were all in what we call the Middle East. But God changed all of that:

¹ These are the generations of the sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. Sons were born to them after the flood. ² The sons of Japheth: Gomer, Magog, Madai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech, and Tiras. ³ The sons of Gomer: Ashkenaz, Riphath, and Togarmah. ⁴ The sons of Javan: Elishah, Tarshish, Kittim, and Dodanim. ⁵ From these the coastland peoples spread in their lands, each with his own language, by their clans, in their nations.

Genesis 10:1-5 (ESV)

The Bible sets out all the different nations which developed from Noah's sons, grandsons and great grandsons, each of whom developed into separate nations. They subsequently travelled far and wide to establish separate, distinct countries all over the Earth and they are listed in Genesis chapter 10, which concludes:

These are the clans of the sons of Noah, according to their genealogies, in their nations, and from these the nations spread abroad on the earth after the flood.

Genesis 10:32 (ESV)

God dispersed the people because of their increasing wickedness, their development of the occult and, in particular, their building of the Tower of Babel as a means of idolatrous worship. He also gave them all different languages to reduce their capacity for wickedness by limiting their ability to communicate and cooperate with each other. God's response did not remove wickedness from the Earth, but it did

reduce its extent and its effectiveness. However, the point is that it was something which *God Himself did*, rather than being the idea of any man:

¹ Now the whole earth had one language and the same words. ² And as people migrated from the east, they found a plain in the land of Shinar and settled there. ³ And they said to one another, "Come, let us make bricks, and burn them thoroughly." And they had brick for stone, and bitumen for mortar. ⁴ Then they said, "Come, let us build ourselves a city and a tower with its top in the heavens, and let us make a name for ourselves, lest we be dispersed over the face of the whole earth."⁵ And the LORD came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of man had built. ⁶ And the LORD said, "Behold, they are one people, and they have all one language, and this is only the beginning of what they will do. And nothing that they propose to do will now be impossible for them. ⁷ Come, let us go down and there confuse their language, so that they may not understand one another's speech."⁸ So the LORD dispersed them from there over the face of all the earth, and they left off building the city. ⁹ Therefore its name was called Babel, because there the LORD confused the language of all the earth. And from there the LORD dispersed them over the face of all the earth.

Genesis 11:1-9 (ESV)

The position is further confirmed by Moses in Deuteronomy. He speaks of how God created each of the nations, divided up mankind, and fixed their borders:

When the Most High gave to the nations their inheritance, when he divided mankind, he fixed the borders of the people according to the number of the sons of God

Deuteronomy 32:8 (ESV)

God wants each of the races and nations to be different and to have their own cultures, rather than all being the same

It follows that God positively wants each nation to be *different* and to have its *own* distinctive culture, customs, traditions, music, dress, and so on. He loves variety and creativity and *doesn't want us all to be the same*. He wants Spanish people to be Spanish and to act, speak, sing and dance in a Spanish way. He also wants Japanese people to be Japanese and to operate in accordance with their own ways and customs. So, the Japanese are meant to be quiet and reserved, but others, such as many African nations, are meant to be more extravert.

The point is that God likes them all, as they are, and does not want them to cease being themselves or to try to be like others. He therefore likes the British sense of humour, French cooking, German music, American enterprise and so on. God wants all of us to be ourselves, to act like ourselves, and to preserve our own nations with their respective styles, manners and cultures. At any rate, He is entirely happy with our doing so, *provided of course that our culture is not sinful*, and He has no objection to us being different from each other.

Of course, that does *not* mean that there is anything wrong with people of different races *marrying* each other. I stress that because a very tiny number of people misguidedly think there is. God just wants to preserve each of the various nations, and for them to remain diverse, because each nation is unique. However, His concept of '*diversity*' is very different from the misguided PC definition of that word which is pushed by the multi-culturalism lobby. God's aim is to have a diverse world in the sense of having lots of nations and cultures, each of which are *distinct and different from each other*, not all blended into one.

The politically correct version of diversity is to insist that the white European nations, plus the USA, Australia, Canada and New Zealand, *and only them*, are inherently *invalid*. It is then said that they should allow unlimited immigration from other cultures to rectify their supposed deficiencies. The

biggest of these ‘defects’ is that they have white skin and, even worse, that many of their own customs and ways are based on Christianity. Liberals therefore denigrate our own British culture, as if maintaining that, or being proud to be British, is somehow wrong.

Yet, at the same time, they would be outraged if anybody suggested that Pakistani culture, or Algerian culture is wrong, or that immigrants from those countries should integrate and adopt British or French culture in place of their own. Thus, there is a double standard. Our own culture is seen as inherently invalid and we are told that it should make way for the immigrants’ cultures. But the culture of any immigrant to the West is automatically deemed to be valid and it is not thought that they should change in any way, or integrate with our culture as the host nation, even after they come to live here.

Once you begin to examine the West’s obsession with racism and the agenda of multi-culturalism, it is quickly seen to be nonsense. But that doesn’t prevent these ideas from being bowed down to by those who want a quiet life. These false allegations of racism won’t go away without a fight. They have to be stood up to. Courageous people therefore need to speak up against it and to show, *publicly*, that they will not submit. That requires courage, but what you say may embolden others and we may then, one day, see a turning of the tide, just as they did in Spain, Portugal, Greece, Hungary, and so on.

For the avoidance of doubt, let me clarify what I mean by *culture*. When I say that God is in favour of us each having our own national identities and our different customs, traditions and cultures, I am *not* referring to *the sinful, idolatrous, and even occultic* things which form part of the cultures of many nations. For example, in Africa and Asia where, historically, the influence of Christianity has been limited, their cultures have been heavily influenced by their *false religions*.

The main ones are Islam, Hinduism, Sikhism, Shintoism and Buddhism, plus the animistic, idol-worshipping, occultic religions that are found in Africa. To the extent that a nation’s traditions and culture emanate from their false religious beliefs, those are *invalid, and God does not approve of them*. So, when I say that God approves of our different cultures, I mean the *innocent, non-sinful, non-occultic* aspects thereof, such as what we eat, how we dress, our styles of music, architecture, literature, and so on.

Thus, God is quite happy that British people eat turkey on Christmas day, whereas Germans eat fish, and that the British drink tea but Americans drink coffee. Such traditions are innocuous. However, He is *not* happy that Hindus celebrate Diwali and Muslims celebrate Eid, because those festivals derive from their *false religions* and are idolatrous and blasphemous. I go out of my way to say that because I was asked to clarify what I mean by ‘culture’ when this book was at draft stage and I hope I have now done so.

Will the antichrist actually be a Muslim, rather than a European, as so many people assume?

There is no space in this chapter to examine this question in any adequate detail because it is a very large issue and would require a lengthy examination of the prophetic Scriptures. It also flies in the face of most of what is taught about prophecy and the assumptions that most Bible teachers and church leaders make. However, I do at least want to flag the issue, because I am increasingly coming to the view that the antichrist will be a Muslim and that the religion he seeks to impose on the whole world will be Islam.

I also believe that the persecution of Christians and Jews in the ‘Tribulation’, most notably the *beheadings* spoken of in the book of Revelation, will be done by Muslims. Consider this verse and ask yourself what other group, in all of world history, other than the Muslims, has used beheading as a means of murder, to such an extent that it is their trademark? Instead of trying to imagine how some other group might arise in future and introduce such a policy, why not just look at the one group which is *already doing that*, and has been doing so consistently, and on a massive scale, for 1400 years?

Then I saw thrones, and seated on them were those to whom judgment was committed. Also I saw the souls of those who had been beheaded for their testimony to Jesus and for the word of God, and who had not worshiped the beast or its image and had not received its mark on their foreheads or their hands. They came to life, and reigned with Christ a thousand years.

Revelation 20:4 (RSV)

For a much fuller examination of this theme of the coming antichrist, and whether the religion which he seeks to impose on the world will be Islam, please refer to my other writings. In particular, see the commentary which I intend to write on the book of Daniel. See also the writings of Joel Richardson, an author whom I greatly admire, whose books have influenced my thinking in this area. See, in particular, his three books entitled *'The Islamic Antichrist'*, *'Mid East Beast'*, and *'Mystery Babylon'*.

In these he argues that the antichrist will be a Muslim, that the 'fourth beast' in the book of Daniel is a revived Islamic caliphate, and that *'Babylon the great'* or the *'mother of harlots'* referred to in Revelation chapters 17 and 18 is Saudi Arabia. That is the land of the Arabs, who are the descendants of Ishmael and the oldest enemy of the Jews. Saudi Arabia is also the birthplace of Islam, the location of its main shrine at Mecca, and the main exporter of Islam to the world via its massive funding of mosques, Islamic propaganda and jihadism. Indeed, the terrorists who flew planes into the Twin Towers and the Pentagon on 11 September 2001 were Saudis.

If all of that is true, then there is all the more reason for us to stiffen our spines and resist Islam now and, in order to do so, to become better informed about it. However, although I can't go into detail here, I would like to at least make a few brief points to explain my reasoning and to discuss the significance of the antichrist being Islamic and the implications of that prospect for us now.

I also want to challenge the widely held belief that the future antichrist will rule over the whole world, such that there can be no opposition to him except by individuals. That cannot be the case because we read in Scripture of whole nations, indeed whole groups of nations, fighting against the antichrist and against specific nations which he will rule over, *and which are now already Islamic*. That must mean that, at the end, some nations will still be non-Islamic, or at least that they will not have a majority of Muslims within them.

There is no space here to examine this complicated theme properly but look, for example, at Ezekiel chapters 38 and 39, in which there is the prophecy of *'Gog and Magog'*. Those chapters identify each of the nations which will, in the future, come up against Israel to attack it. They are listed with the names they had over 2500 years ago, at the time when Ezekiel wrote this. But the point is they are *all now Islamic* nations:

¹ The word of the LORD came to me: ² "Son of man, set your face toward Gog, of the land of Magog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal, and prophesy against him ³ and say, Thus says the Lord GOD: Behold, I am against you, O Gog, chief prince of Meshech and Tubal; ⁴ and I will turn you about, and put hooks into your jaws, and I will bring you forth, and all your army, horses and horsemen, all of them clothed in full armor, a great company, all of them with buckler and shield, wielding swords; ⁵ Persia, Cush, and Put are with them, all of them with shield and helmet; ⁶ Gomer and all his hordes; Beth-togar'mah from the uttermost parts of the north with all his hordes—many peoples are with you.

⁷ "Be ready and keep ready, you and all the hosts that are assembled about you, and be a guard for them. ⁸ After many days you will be mustered; in the latter years you will go against the land that is restored from war, the land where people were gathered from many nations upon the mountains of Israel, which had been a continual waste; its people were brought out from the nations and now dwell securely, all of them. ⁹ You will advance, coming on like a storm, you will be like a cloud covering the land, you and all your hordes, and many peoples with you.

Ezekiel 38:1-9 (RSV)

Briefly, my position is that in the last days the antichrist will arise, and will also gather his armies, from countries which are today *Muslim majority nations*. Moreover, they are all in the Middle East and North Africa. Those nations will then form an alliance or coalition and will invade Israel, as well as persecuting Jews and Christians outside of Israel. This persecution will occur even in nations over which the antichrist does not rule.

Then, after a short but brutal victory over Israel, which will involve terrible persecution of the Jewish people, Jesus will return from Heaven to destroy the antichrist and his coalition of armies. He will do so prior to establishing His Millennial Kingdom. See my chapter above on prophecy, and my forthcoming book on Israel, for more detail. The key point is that if the antichrist is a Muslim, and if the nations he rules over are Islamic, as I believe they will be, then it increases yet further the significance of Islam as an issue. It also makes it all the more important that we resist it now, both as individuals and nations.

Another crucial point is that, if the antichrist's control does not extend to the entire world, but only to some nations, and to parts of others, then it means there is every reason to resist Islam now, because its victory over us is *not inevitable*. In other words, we are not *all* doomed to come under the heel of Islam, even though many nations will do so. Therefore, the fight against it is not hopeless, or bound to end in defeat.

In short, there is still everything to fight for and every reason to hope, and even to believe, that we may be able to save *our own nation* from coming under Islamic domination. Of course, we cannot prevent the antichrist from coming to power, and from causing the Tribulation, in which multitudes of Christians and Jews will be murdered. The Bible says that that will happen and therefore it will. But what we can at least hope to do is to prevent our own nation from being one of those that are ruled by the antichrist.

If we achieve that then our own nation will be fighting *against* him at the end, rather than being yet another of the Islamic nations that are going to fight for him. Obviously, being one of those non-Islamic nations, which are going to be the object of his hatred and wrath, will not be pleasant. However, it is still a lot better than being ruled over by Islam, and eventually by the antichrist, and therefore fighting for him.

At the very least it will be better in terms of avoiding the terrible judgment that God will inflict upon all those nations, and individuals, who support the antichrist and his religion. Please see my other books and commentaries for a fuller discussion of why I believe the antichrist will be a Muslim and how Bible prophecy points to that, rather than to him being a European, as so many assume he will be.