

# The Irrational Ideology of Modern Woke Progressives

## Preface

‘Progressive’ is a long-established term used of the Left. It was appropriated decades ago to denote the desire for social reform, ‘*progressive politics*’. It generally is used to be the opposite of traditional, conservative, reactionary politics by the introduction of liberal ideas.

‘Woke’ is a very recent term that has quickly become global in use. It originally arose out of the Black Lives Matter movement as a term for the awareness of racial problems. People who understood this were ‘woke’; i.e. awakened to the issues. However, it quickly became more general in its use and is now applied to a range of issues pertinent to Social Justice Warriors in general. Thus it includes all the radical, Leftist agendas: Feminism, multiculturalism, racism, Transgenderism etc. In other words, the whole Cultural Marxist strategy.

## Introduction

A century of Cultural Marxist propaganda, chiefly through education systems and the media, has done an astonishing amount of damage to the minds of younger people, chiefly the variously named generations born after 1960.

Because of constant educational conditioning, coupled with an engendered lack of ability to rationally examine and discern truth, these people have become intellectual zombies. They appear to function at a superficial level but underneath the bravado there is rigor mortis.

My heart goes out to these people who are this way because of social engineering by wicked people. Sadly, they do not realise that they are brainwashed by a constant stream of Groupthink programming.

I hope that by coldly outlining their typical ideology that some may see that there is a problem and try to make changes to escape their mental prisons.

In this paper I limit myself to generalised statements for reasons of space. I will refer to other papers where I supply data and sources.

## Evolution

I understand that this doctrine spreads beyond Progressives into many reasonable thinking people, but from a Biblical perspective this is still social conditioning and irrational.

### **The belief**

The origin of all life was a primordial pool of slime on rocks. By some unknown method (such as lightning or a passing comet) this slime was converted into basic protein DNA. There is no scientific method to support such a contention; in fact it is more like Shelly's Frankenstein experiments than science.

These basic proteins, still in pools on barren rocks on a sterile Earth, magically changed into simple cell structures and basic single-celled creatures, again by a method unknown to science. Amazingly, some chemicals in the slime turned into basic plants as well.

The single-celled creatures then gradually morphed into larger and larger creatures, by methods unknown to science until they became fish of various sorts. So one single-celled animal created thousands of species of fish, from minnows to sharks.

Over time, certain fish decided that they had had enough of living in water and decided to take a walk on land and breathe air. Amazingly, they crawled on to land and did not die, despite having no lungs, or feet or hands. In an act of unbelievable magic they transformed from having gills to growing basic lungs and breathable skin, from fish scales to smooth skin, and in time developed into amphibians with ears. So a fish spawned all amphibians, from newts to frogs. Though they lived on land they laid eggs in water.

Still not satisfied, some amphibians decided to remain on the land and roam through various types of topography and even climb trees. Again a massive change of physiology was required which amazingly did not kill every amphibian that tried to change by some unknown method. These curious amphibians became reptiles. Thus an amphibian spawned all reptiles from sand lizards to Komodo Dragons and dinosaurs. Massive physiological changes were necessary, including ditching amphibian smooth skin to again growing scaly skin. Reproduction ceased to be spawning hundreds of eggs in jelly to only a few large eggs in shells.

But it did not stop there. One set of reptiles decided to become a mammal (or some posit that certain fish became whales first). This required massive changes of physiology including changing blood temperature and developing skin that could grow hair. Another reptile became fed up with walking and climbing and decided to become a bird. This change of physiology is astounding. Every aspect of the reptile's body had to become something completely different. This included a new skeletal structure that was lightweight; developing feathers of various kinds to do various jobs; developing a new vascular system and so on. One clever reptile.

Amazingly, at every stage in this process, at least one animal managed to change gradually over time into another animal without dying in the transition. For example, as a fish decided to ditch gills, it did not die before it realised that it needed lungs.

Once the mammals had been invented, gradually over time primates began to exist from nowhere. Eventually apes began to be fed up with having a low skill set and poor cognitive faculties and decided to become human. This happened gradually over time and various

cave men arrived who the day before were apes. These cave men walked with a stoop and grunted, but managed to get a wife from somewhere, who evolved by chance at the same time.

This is another point. In each stage of evolution there had to be two creatures that decided to change into something else to make a fertile pair of male and female and produce offspring. Imaging the search? You've just changed into a new creature but now must find another one that made the same decision. Evolving is tough.

So cave men with no brains gradually decided that living much like apes wasn't good enough so they decided to shed their Neanderthal mind and develop a much better cognitive faculty. In the end homo sapiens was formed.

Now this process, we are told by Richard Dawkins, from slime in a pool on a rock on Earth with no fauna or atmosphere to homo sapiens is absolutely believable and if you don't believe it you are mentally subnormal or wicked.

### **The truth**

There is not a shred of evidence for the change of one species into another, none whatsoever. There never will be because it is a big fat lie.

The basic problem is that for a species to change there has to be a mechanism whereby the animal is able to add information to its genome. Even evolutionists have to admit that there is no known mechanism to do this. However, it's not just one change that's needed, but many complex changes at exactly the same time (e.g. new breathing system, new vascular system, new skeletal system etc.). Regarding mutations, these only subtract data from the genome, they do not add to it and they are nearly always damaging to the host. Therefore, there is no method known to science to enable one species to turn into another.

Another problem is that the basic premise of Darwin was that early life-forms were very simple and gradually changed to become more complicated over millions of years. In fact, we now know that there is no such thing as a simple life-form. Even single-celled creatures are incredibly complicated. With new microscopes and facilities we can see huge numbers of complex processes going on in Amoebas or Euglenas for example. There are motors, brushes, power systems, control systems, transport systems and so on. This blows apart Darwin's theory (yes it still is just a theory). There are no basic simple life-forms.

Darwin's evolutionary theory relies upon the presumption of uniformitarianism<sup>1</sup> allowing millions of years to transpire facilitating changes of species. However, more and more evidence is being discovered showing that this timescale is wrong. For example, there are now multiple cases where dinosaur blood cells have been found intact. Scientific laws state that it is impossible for blood cells and body tissues to survive in the bones of a buried animal for more than 10,000 years. Indeed most soft tissue and proteins have a very limited shelf life, normally from a few months to perhaps a few thousands of years. Animals such as Tyrannosaurus Rex and Hadrosaurs did not die out millions of years ago but fairly recently. This is why there are examples of human footprints next to dinosaur footprints in rocks all over the world. Thus there is no longer millions of years to allow for human evolution from reptiles.

Now we could add more and more problems with this ridiculous theory but there is no space here. I have done this elsewhere. The fact is that the theory of evolution is

---

<sup>1</sup> [In] geology the theory that changes in the earth's crust during geological history have resulted from the action of continuous and uniform processes. Often contrasted with catastrophism. [Oxford Dictionary.]

unscientific and irrational. It should not have survived 150 years. In fact, Darwinian evolution is now out of favour with most scientists who are looking for better mechanisms to explain evolution, such as Punctuated Equilibrium.

For more data see my papers: '*Confronting evolutionary theory*', '*Evolution: the current position*', '*Questions for evolutionists*', '*Simple killer arguments against evolution*', '*The nonsensical position of evolutionary theory*'.

## Transgenderism

### The belief

Trans people are to be identified as their trans claim; thus a man that transitions to identify as a woman should be identified in society as a woman, not a man. Gender is fluid and is determined by personal choice, not biology. It is possible for a person to have a male body but a female brain.<sup>2</sup> The law and society must ignore physical characteristics and appoint any kind of gender according to the wishes of the individual. There are currently 100 different choices of gender.

### The truth

Since virtually every non-Christian believes in the theory of evolution, then the Transgender hypothesis fails because it contradicts evolution. The basic requirement of evolution is survival, and this is centred upon successful reproduction. If every man transitioned to become a fake woman then the human race would die out in one generation. Transgenderism contradicts evolution and thus fails by its own standards.

Gender is not fluid, it is fixed at conception. In fact even the word 'gender' is not really appropriate because it historically has been used to define non-human parts, such as nouns or mechanical fittings (see the Oxford Dictionary). The word applied to describe males and females is 'sex'. However, Transgender activists want us to believe that a person can be one physical sex but a different gender. This process is now so stupid as to posit 100 different genders that people can identify as; in addition there are people that identify as cats, reptiles and babies.

A person is determined by his or her genome; the fulness of their DNA. The genome has all the information to form any cell that is necessary and complete the person. There is no separate source of information to code the cells. Thus a person's DNA defines every aspect of that person. There can be no contradiction within that person's genome.

This means that the DNA that creates and maintains brain cells is the same DNA that creates and maintains the rest of the body. They agree because they are based on the same DNA data. This means that it is impossible that the brain could be female and the rest of the body male. There is no apologetic for Transgenderism.

The reason for the desire of people to change sex is a mental failure; there is something wrong with their thinking. In the same way that in the past people who thought that they were God, or Napoleon, or Julius Caesar were put in mental homes. It is a derangement. It is irrelevant that changing sex makes them happier for a time, the root issues that cause the mental impairment will arise later and cause even more issues. In the same way people take heroin to feel happier for a time, but it creates serious medical issues. Basing life-changing decisions upon temporary hedonistic choices is asking for trouble.

---

<sup>2</sup> This nonsense is taught to police officers who are told to then enforce this belief with sanctions.

In fact, there are now more and more people that transitioned sex in the past who now deeply regret it. Some have become anti-Trans activists trying to prevent young impressionable people making a huge mistake. Many have committed suicide because there is no way back if surgery has taken place. Furthermore studies have shown that Trans people are more likely to suffer depression and commit crimes. You cannot try to defy your inherent physiology without creating mental incapacity.

Parents that actively encourage their children to change sex even below the age of 10 need to be prosecuted for child abuse. Young children are always confused about many things and there is a reason why young children are prevented from doing certain things (voting, joining the army, driving, or even seeing certain films) – they are mentally and emotionally immature. To say that a child, that is not allowed to drive a car, can be mature enough to decide on changing his sex is irresponsible cruelty.

Interestingly, some of the most ardent critics of Trans issues are Feminists; such as commentator Posie Parker (Kellie-Jay Keen-Minshull) and Professor of Philosophy Kathleen Stock.<sup>3</sup> The reason is that Trans men (men that declare to be women) are a threat to women and children. For example, one Trans man in prison was transferred to a women's prison where he assaulted and raped several women.

It is shocking that the Woke lobby is so strong that civil changes have been introduced with no national debate and no legislation from Parliament. Thus we have gender inclusive changing rooms and toilets where biological men can mingle with young women. Trans men acting as female nurses can give intimate procedures to vulnerable women.

The Trans agenda is a farce. It is irrational, unscientific, contrary to biology, contrary to common sense and potentially contrary to Common Law. It has received no statutory support and its allowance has already resulted in crimes. If people want to self-identify as the opposite sex in private then let them do so as long as they do no harm; but public or formal legal acceptance of this must not be allowed.

Worse is the teaching of young children in school that this is acceptable, normal behaviour, which should be condemned and forbidden by statute.

## **Anthropogenic Climate Change**

### **The belief**

The world is getting warmer and warmer. This is causing massive changes to climate, creating new extremes. The cause of this climate change is carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and the rise in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> is caused by mankind. Without radical change to eliminate CO<sub>2</sub>, the world will be destroyed in 12 years.

### **The truth**

Nothing in this scenario is either true or scientific. I will simply itemise basic facts.

- The world is not getting warmer but colder. Global temperature began to stabilise about 1990 and to diminish after 2001.
- The slight rise in average world temperature between 1970 and 1990 was far less than previous extreme heatwaves seen in the late 1800s and the late 1930s. In these heatwaves birds dropped dead out of the sky and a dustbowl formed in mid America. In

---

<sup>3</sup> These people are sometimes called 'Terfs'; i.e. Trans Exclusionary Radical Feminists.

earlier ages the weather was even warmer (the Medieval Warm Period, or the Roman Warm Period for example).

- Changes to climate are cyclical. Temperatures rise and fall over time in cycles. These changes are identified in ice-core and sedimentary samples over thousands of years. There is not a hockey-stick graph of rising temperatures over the last 1,000 years to a great high today. Such graphs are fake.
- Localised extremes can be caused by various mechanisms, such as the El Niño effect but also man-made causes such as Geo-engineering, which is iniquitous.<sup>4</sup>
- The major factors in climate are the sun, the oceans and the clouds. Man is completely insignificant in the face of these giant systems. The actual climate development is extremely complex and cannot be reduced to computer simulations (the basis of climate change speculations).
- Termites produce 10 times more CO<sub>2</sub> than mankind per annum.
- Large volcanic eruptions produce more CO<sub>2</sub> than all mankind's history.
- CO<sub>2</sub> is not the culprit. Firstly, greenhouse gases do not cause global warming. This has now been scientifically proved. Secondly, CO<sub>2</sub> is not a toxic substance but a vital, miraculous molecule that benefits life on Earth. The carbon cycle is the basis of plant life, which supplies oxygen. The more CO<sub>2</sub>, the more green vegetation, the more oxygen. In the past (Cambrian period) there was gigantic vegetation (and animals) due to high levels of CO<sub>2</sub> in the air, up to 7,000 parts per million. Today CO<sub>2</sub> is a mere c.400 ppm. We need more CO<sub>2</sub> not less.
- Climate alarmist doom-laden predictions since the early 1970s have all proved to be wrong.
- All the trigger points, when properly analysed, are false. Wildfires are not getting worse, hurricanes are not getting worse, Tuvalu and the Maldives are not sinking into the ocean; Antarctica is not melting but expanding, polar bears are thriving, etc.

The whole man-made climate change alarmism is a scam of huge proportions. It is made to develop fear amongst the population, particularly the young, and to generate taxes based on nothing to subsidise global corporations that are getting rich out of it by making unnecessary technology.

Furthermore, all the Green measures taken to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, such as sustainable power (solar, wind turbines, biomass pellets) do damage to the environment and to animals. For example: wind turbines kill thousands of bats, insects and birds; hardwood trees in Virginia are being cut down to make biomass pellets to be burned in British power stations (which ironically create more CO<sub>2</sub> emissions than coal); while solar panels require mining rare minerals. None of these measures are as efficient as coal-power stations or nuclear power stations. Ironically, new technology allows coal-power stations to produce energy with all the dangerous particulates filtered out; plus Britain has lots of coal and mining would regenerate impoverished areas.

The hypocrisy of Green activists is ironic. In recent weeks, for example, Extinction Rebellion protests have: destroyed large areas of grass at Trinity College Cambridge, paralysed the London road system creating masses of air pollution from idling cars, travelled all over the country in cars and trains to attend protests exacerbating CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, used mobile power generators based on gas or petrol to supply power to

---

<sup>4</sup> This is chemtrails, where toxic chemicals are spewed out of aeroplanes by aerosols to create clouds for various political reasons (including reducing climate change). These toxins fall to the earth and poison the soil and water, but they exacerbate local weather systems.

microphones for Green activist speakers and created huge areas of garbage and sewage on public parks where they camped out; and so on.

For data see various papers, including '*Climate change lies*' or '*The fabrications behind climate change*'. All my papers mentioned are available at my website.

## **Straight, White males are the cause of society's problems**

### **The belief**

Straight, White males are the basis of the patriarchy and imperialism that oppress the rest of society and especially women. They stole everything from colonial indigenous peoples and contributed nothing for the good of society. They are privileged and thus are the oppressors. They oppress women, the disabled, ethnic groups, homosexuals and so on.

### **The truth**

Of course the first thing to say is that this belief is racist; yet racism is the very thing that Progressives list as a cardinal sin. They cannot see the irony here. If you accuse people of wrongdoing based on the colour of their skin or social position with no other evidence, then you are being racist and bigoted. Simple as that.

In fact it is straight, White males that have contributed more to society than any other people type. A list of this would occupy a whole book. A sample includes: discovering electricity, discovering antibiotics, inventing the plough, the harvester, the reaping machine, the winnowing machine, the printing press, the telescope, the steam engine, the internal combustion engine, aircraft, the telephone, radar, sonar, the television, the weaving loom, the computer<sup>5</sup> – and so on. They invented modern road construction, Portland cement, complex bridges, canals and an electricity grid system. They brought water to the Midlands and the North from Wales.<sup>6</sup>

Virtually all the technologies and applications that are enjoyed by Progressives in this modern age were invented by straight White males. Yet Progressives want to blame them for the world's ills.

It was straight, White males that gave women the vote in Britain. It was these people that abolished slavery, gave women equal pay in law,<sup>7</sup> established Gay rights in law and brought systems of policing, justice and democracy. It was these people that developed the NHS giving free health care to all and a free education system enabling upward mobility. They also stopped Muslim piracy on the high seas and subjugated fascist regimes.

Demonising straight, White males is simply a ridiculous thing to do. It shows that such attacks are made by people with no knowledge of history and no sense of thanks. People must be judged on their own individual merits, not on the basis of identitarian politics.

See my papers, '*Britain*' or '*Refuting establishment lies*'.

---

<sup>5</sup> Babbage developed the early technology theory but the homosexual Alan Turing developed this further; however, he was a White male.

<sup>6</sup> It would be incorrect to say that women had no chance to discover things in history because they were oppressed by men. Gifted women have always been able to rise up above men in any area. Many women became queens or empresses. Hypatia of Alexandria was a gifted philosopher and science teacher who discovered the orbital motion of planets, for example (see later).

<sup>7</sup> Barbara Castle was a pioneer but male politicians brought it into law.

## Championing homosexuality

### The belief

Homosexuality is normal and is even found in the animal kingdom. Homosexuals are not such by choice, resulting from external factors or internal confusion, but they are born with this inclination from birth. It is a normal, rational life choice that does no harm to consenting adults. Thus homosexuals (including lesbians) should be given complete legal rights under the law, such as the right to marry.

### The truth

The Bible explains that homosexuality is a sexual perversion and throughout history civilised societies have frowned upon this lifestyle. In Britain it was illegal until the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. Where civilisations descended into open acceptance of homosexuality and other sexual deviations, it soon declined and was overcome, for example Greece and Rome.<sup>8</sup> In fact, civil acceptance of sexual deviation was an indication of degeneration in a society and its impending doom.

Contrary to claims otherwise, homosexuality in the animal kingdom is not common at all; in fact it is rare to the point of being non-existent. Some animals behave in a manner that observers have confused as being homosexual practices but they are not. It may be that there are cases of actual homosexual behaviour but such would be extreme exceptions. Animals function on the basis of instinct and this is geared up to ensure successful reproduction. Homosexuality in animals would contradict both Creationism and Evolutionary theory.

Homosexuality, like Transgenderism, contradicts the theory of evolution, which Woke people subscribe to. If all men or all women became homosexual then human beings would die out.

Homosexuality is not conditioned from conception but is learned by outside influences or is the result of certain fears in adolescence (such as a fear of women or a fear of impotence). God creates life in the womb and does not instil perversions in the foetus.

Homosexuality is not a safe life choice. The Bible explains that people who commit this sin receive a penalty in their bodies.<sup>9</sup> This penalty is variously explained as enervation or deleterious thinking, but there are specific diseases associated with the practice of sodomy and other things that homosexuals get up to. Chief among these are: syphilis, hepatitis A and B, plus AIDS. Surveys in the USA show that, despite only about 2% of the population being homosexual, they carry more than half of the venereal disease in the country.

The reason for this is that the rectum was not designed for penetration and the cell lining is very thin. It thus becomes easy for the lining to be broken and for transmission of disease. This says nothing about oral infections, which are also common. In addition there are other practices common amongst homosexuality that are too vile to describe and which carry danger of disease.

---

<sup>8</sup> 'In the Doric states, Crete and Sparta, the practice was favoured as a means of education, and was acknowledged by law. Even Socrates could not forbear feeling like a Greek on this point (see Plato's "Charmides"). In Rome, in the earlier centuries of the republic, it was of rare occurrence; but at the close of the sixth century it had become general. Even the best of the emperors, Antoninus and Trajan, were guilty.' Vincent's Word Studies.

<sup>9</sup> Rm 1:27, 'Likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust for one another, men with men committing what is shameful, and receiving in themselves the penalty of their error which was due'.



The Family Research Institute in America has concluded that the average age of homosexual men dying with AIDS is 39 and the average age of homosexuals dying of all other causes is 41. The average heterosexual married man lives to 75. Only 1% of homosexual men live to be 65 or older.

Homosexuals are three times more likely to have alcohol or drug abuse problems; 14 times more likely to have syphilis, and 23 times more likely to contract venereal disease. In San Francisco, Gay city of USA, the rate of infectious hepatitis A is twice the national average.

Christians do not persecute homosexuals but condemn their actions as perverse. Christians seek to do good to all and to love even those who hate them; thus true Christians do not actively hate or act with malice towards homosexuals. In fact, there are many Christian organisations that are outreaches to Gay people to help them find the truth. The Gospel is for all sinners, including homosexuals; God's grace is not restricted from Gay people. Very many people have been converted to Christ from homosexuality and testify to the wickedness of their former life. Many of these subsequently marry and lead good lives.

What Christians condemn is changing the law to favour a moral perversion or to enable police to prosecute individuals that chose to restrict homosexuals from their businesses. Such laws criminalise normality and Christian ethics and go against hundreds of years of legal precedent. These laws also confront many other religious beliefs, including Judaism, Sunni and Shia Islam and Hinduism; in other words, most of the world's population. In fact 53 nations of the world criminalise homosexuality while several Muslim countries execute practising Gays. Normalising homosexuality is a minority trend in the world mostly affecting liberalised western nations.

As an example take the recent confession of Phillip Scofield that he is Gay. Everywhere Woke society has fallen over itself praising Scofield and lauding him as brave. In fact, Scofield was so 'brave' that he hid his inner feelings for nearly 30 years from his wife. He now plans to abandon his wife and children to live a homosexual life; however, his wife stated that she will only divorce him when he has found a male partner. It is not praiseworthy to abandon your wife and children. This is how Woke society turns ethics upside down.

More alarming is the sex-education of children as young as five in liberalised schools today. This tells them that homosexual practises are normal and encourages them to engage in sexual activities, such as masturbation. It does this by giving young kids graphic textbooks illustrating sexual issues. Is it any wonder that kids below the age of ten are committing assault, rape or having mental breakdowns? The sexualisation of children is a prime strategy of Cultural Marxists to degrade society and cause mayhem and this first caused social chaos when it was introduced in Hungary in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

For further reading see my paper, *'Is there pride in being Gay?'*.

## **Black oppression**

### **The belief**

Black people in the west are an oppressed race under the subjugation of white people. They were the prime focus of western capitalist slavery, which made white capitalists rich therefore Blacks deserve reparations for slavery abuses. Today black people are discriminated against and unfairly treated in all walks of life, especially by the police. Signs of their oppression in culture need to be removed, such as statues of slave owners or

Confederate heroes. Employment quotas need to be activated to give preferential treatment to Blacks in the work place.

### **The truth**

Throughout history African people were treated appallingly by a series of peoples. The chief culprits were Muslim slave traders (including Muhammad) and in certain cases Jewish agents that procured and sold slaves to Muslim magnates. The enslavement of Blacks and other races continued for centuries under Muslim control. However, other Black people were in cahoots also. Certain African tribes enslaved other tribes and sold them to Arabs. Chiefs of tribes even sold unwanted people from their own tribe to make a profit. All this continued for centuries before White races came to Africa.

White people were also enslaved for centuries. In fact the word 'slave' is derived from the word 'Slav' because Balkan Slavs were attacked for centuries by Muslims and the people captured as slaves. Muslim slavers even went as far as Cornwall to kidnap White Christian women to be sold as sex-slaves. Over a million White, European Christian women were kidnapped over several centuries.

Even in America, the original slaves were White people. All sorts of races were enslaved, including White Europeans, millions of Brown Hindus and yellow Asians as well as Black Africans. Afro-American people do not have the monopoly on slavery.

The appalling slave trading across the Atlantic is to be condemned but it only lasted 200 years. Muslim slavery continues to this day and has lasted 1400 years. White women are still being sold as sex-slaves. Muslim grooming rape gangs are sort of enslaving young British girls to this day throughout the nation.

It was White, Christian, western capitalists that ended the slave trade and abolished slavery. This was initiated by Britain through people like William Wilberforce in 1834 and 30 years later in the USA. Thus British and American Black people owe their freedom to the actions of White Christian capitalists. Muslim slavery continued outwardly for many more years until the Ottoman Empire claimed to end it in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, though it continued in secret.

In America, many slaves had been treated well by plantation owners, especially Southern Christian ones, even becoming a part of the family. Cases of cruelty certainly existed but this is not the whole story. When they were emancipated after the Civil War in America, many former slaves were actually worse off, having no job and no home. This led to the great northern migration to cities like Chicago to find work. Many ended up on the streets.

In Britain the few Black people had long had a decent place in society after the ending of the slave trade. They had opportunities to work though there was probably some discrimination, as there was to other minority races – especially Chinese people. In America segregation led to much more discrimination and injustice and this continued until the 1960s. After the success of the civil rights movement, Black people had equality in law and opportunity. Isolated cases of local racial discrimination are illegal and are not widespread.

Blacks living in western nations today are not oppressed. In fact they are the most privileged Black people of all time. If they had stayed in Africa with no White colonialism they would still be living in mud huts cooking over a dung fire and walking miles to get water. But since they live in a welfare state society, they have equal opportunities of mobility and get welfare payments when out of work.

Many Black people have used the opportunities afforded by western nations to become powerful and rich. Many Blacks are millionaires. We have famous Black actors; Black musicians and sportsmen; we have Black politicians. One man of African origin has been president of the USA. There is nothing stopping Black people from progressing other than lethargy. Thankfully, there are many Black commentators who vocalise this affirming that they are not oppressed but privileged to be American or British, such as Candace Owens.

Despite it being unwise (since society should be meritocratic) there are Black quotas in most employment sectors. There are active strategies to give Blacks a better advantage than other races. In fact, there are many occasions where this focus on advantaging Blacks has led to problems, such as anachronisms in movies and dramas. Historical truth has often been sacrificed in order to give opportunities to Black actors. But why only quotas for Blacks? What about Mongolians, Chinese, South Americans or anyone else? Quotas are discriminatory.

Defacing or destroying statues of historic figures is a criminal act and cannot be defended. The targets of racial attacks are often poor choices, such as attacking a statue of General Lee. Lee was a friend of Black people and many Blacks not only loved him but also enlisted in the Confederate Army. Abraham Lincoln, however, is not attacked yet he was a true White supremacist who did not like Black people. Neither was he opposed to slavery and the Civil War was initiated to destroy the Southern Independent states. The war was about imposing federalism while the abolition of slavery was a smoke screen to distract from the coup.

The claim of Black oppression in the west is entirely false. In fact, many European nations have been foolishly allowing millions of Black and Brown migrants into Europe at a pace that cannot be catered for. The desire to help Black immigrants has led to ghettos and social disorder because the infrastructure and society cannot cope. Far from oppressing Blacks, western nations have been welcoming them with open arms, giving them houses and welfare while poor indigenous people are starving and using food banks.

The whole Black oppression claim is fallacious.

For more information see my papers, '*Refuting establishment lies*', and my Truth Bomb series on '*Slavery*'.

## Capitalism

### Capitalism

A system of economic organisation, based on market competition, under which the means of production, distribution, and exchange are privately owned and directed by individuals or corporations. All human production requires both labour and capital. In a capitalist system, capital is supplied either by the single owner of a firm, or by shareholders in the case of a joint-stock company. Labour is supplied separately by employees who receive a wage or salary. The residual profit of the firm after wages and costs have been paid accrues to the owners of capital. Firms compete with one another to sell to customers in what is primarily a free market. In its most developed form capitalism, which is based on the principle that economic decisions should be taken by private individuals, restricts the role of the state in economic policy to the minimum. It thus stands for free trade. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century capitalist societies have been modified in various ways: often a capitalist economy is accompanied by the development of a welfare state and is therefore known as 'welfare capitalism' as in western Europe. Another development is the mixed economy, in which the

production of certain goods or services is nationalised, while the rest of the economy remains in private ownership. [New Oxford Encyclopaedia.]

### **The belief**

Capitalism is evil. It creates rich people on the backs of poor workers who are exploited and mistreated. It creates a two-tier society, the rich and the poor.

Much better is collectivism where the state runs everything through nationalised industries and shares wealth amongst all people.

### **The truth**

This is essentially a Marxist interpretation of economics and history. It gained ground initially due to the backdrop of the Industrial Revolution in Britain. This was indeed a time where poor workers were exploited and lived in virtual ghettos of back-to-back housing with poor sanitation.

However, this was not deliberate, it was the natural consequence of a massive, swift revolution whereby many poor rural workers and Irish labourers migrated to growing cities for work and these had to expand at a rapid pace. It took years to sort this huge growth out.

There were individual cases of appalling exploitation, such as of children and young women in cotton mills in Lancashire. But this gradually changed after reforms were passed by the government regarding child labour and hours of work. A few isolated cases of cruelty does not change the fact that most poor workers were glad of a job. Industrial work was better than starving to death in a country village where there was no work.

However, the problems created by the expansion of industry led to the Communist Manifesto of Karl Marx and the claim that he could provide a utopia for poor workers by following collectivist principles and state control of the means of production and distribution.

The truth is the opposite.

After the problems caused by the Industrial Revolution, society began to sort itself out. Industrial benefactors began to introduce new schemes to actively benefit their own workers because healthy workers are good workers. These included creating worker's villages with improved housing, better sanitation and gardens to grow food. Many of these were created as I have explained several times. Reforms were introduced, such as shorter working hours, schemes to assist with housing, alms houses, community schemes for health care, night schools to improve education and so on. Many working areas created their own co-operative initiatives, such as local shops.

More and more improvements were made available because of the financial benefits of capitalism. Surplus wealth was used to improve society by the rich (e.g. funding libraries, theatres, swimming pools and civic amenities) while the increasing wealth of workers enabled them to save for luxuries they had never had before.

Capitalism, more than any other economic system, has provided social benefits to society. This is a historic fact. Low-skilled workers today have all sorts of goods they accept as normal that workers 100 years ago could not have dreamed of. They take it for granted that everyone should have a mobile phone, a landline phone, a television, a car, a fridge, a washing machine and so on. Capitalism has enabled them to purchase these things.

Capitalism has its faults like any other economic system, but it is the best one found so far in history. Poverty has been reduced across the west as a result of capitalism. The change to a capitalist economy has lifted the poor out of poverty wherever it is applied, such as Russia, China and Vietnam.

Capitalism is also the natural order of things. The natural law of supply and demand creates natural capitalism. Even collectivist countries developed their own black markets.

On the other hand Socialism and Marxist Communism have utterly failed in every single nation where they have been tried. Collectivisation does not work. Worse than that, it never leads to a government of the workers but a cabal of an elite few that end up being despotic. Communist governments became far worse than the governments they destroyed and the oppression of communist cabals were far worse than the previous domination of the rich. All the Communist nations initiated purges against working class people and millions died in genocides. These include: the USSR, Red China, Cambodia, Albania and many more, as I have explained many times.

Even when Socialism is attempted to be united with democracy the results are poor. Every British Labour government has ended up creating an economic crisis.<sup>10</sup>

Collectivisation is a failed economic policy; it cannot work theoretically and has never worked in practice. Worse, it always leads to despotism.

One of the benefits of capitalism, based on private property (intellectual and physical) and private ownership, is mobility. Anyone that has a good idea and works hard can set up a business and become wealthy, employing other workers. This is not possible in a collectivist system, which is virtually serfdom under a cabal of administrators that are prone to corruption. The cabal directs policy by fiat and works this out through nationalised industries where everyone has their place like bees in a hive.

The gap between the ultra-rich and the working class today is not the result of free-market capitalism but a negation of it. Western governments have conspired with bankers, globalists, corporatists and financiers to create this bubble of the ultra-rich with deregulation, fiat money creation, proneness to corruption, low-interest debt schemes and encouraging a housing bubble. When the system of greed collapses (such as a recession, debt-crisis or economic crash) the government bails out the bankers with taxpayers' money so as to stop the whole system collapsing. This is a Socialist action not a free-market capitalist action; it effectively nationalises the banks. The free-market would allow a bank to collapse and the system to re-align itself. As it is, governments have created a Ponzi scheme to continue and threaten further collapses.

What is needed today is a genuine free-market system that involves sensible government regulation to hinder corruption. Capitalism is not the problem, corruption is.

Those who claim that capitalism is the key problem and that collectivisation is necessary have no understanding of history or economics.

---

<sup>10</sup> Scandinavian countries are not fully Marxist and in fact the dominant force in society is still their Christian foundations which has mitigated Socialist innovations. However, recent adoption of radical Left migration policies by the Leftist government in Sweden and other places has led to localised social collapse, massive hikes in crime and impending civil war. For example, in Rinkeby, Sweden, migrants have established no-go areas where crime is rampant, grenades explode in the streets, cars are set on fire, where the police, ambulances and postmen dare not set foot and where women dare not walk the street alone, even in daylight for fear of rape and murder. This is not utopia.

See my papers, '*Socialism and godliness*', '*Understanding economic ideologies*'.

## Feminism

### The belief

Women are everywhere oppressed by the male patriarchy and always have been. This happens in all walks of life and in all aspects of society. Women are disrespected, dishonoured, trampled down, and dealt with unequally. They are deprived of opportunities to succeed.

They are paid less and given fewer opportunities in life. Women are unfairly represented in most areas of society and a quota system must be introduced to give preferential treatment to women candidates to restore the balance.

Women are more than equal to men by nature. They can do any job that a man can and do it better. Society will always work fairer if women are in control; a matriarchy is better than a patriarchy.

### The truth

Every statement above is false.

Women have always had significant power over men; in fact most men can be easily manipulated by women. Historically, women were portrayed on TV as controlling men. Sit-coms (paralleling social norms) proliferated where the wife was the domineering character in the family. Often men were portrayed as weak-willed in the presence of a strong woman. At other times the husband was full of bluster and thought he was in charge, but in reality the wife was in control, either subtly (*Terry and June*) or overtly (Margo in *The Good Life* or Hyacinth Bucket [pron. Bouquet] in *Keeping Up Appearances*). The domineering wife has been a comedy trope for generations.

Men tend to die before women. Men frequently die soon after retirement for a variety of reasons and most old age pensioners have always been women.

While there are cases of wife abuse, there are also cases of husband abuse. Both are to be condemned and both are criminal offences. Society does not tolerate abuse of women.

Today women are doing much better than men in many areas of life. Young women are getting better jobs than men; in fact many young men are unemployed or in part-time jobs. Female school children are getting better results than boys. Young men are so disenfranchised and depressed that their suicide rate is the highest in history.

Women are already favoured in employment quota systems (positive discrimination), which is unfair and bigoted. Managers have told me that often they chose a highly qualified man for a certain job but Human Resources overruled them and gave the job to a less qualified woman. The result is a poorer performance amongst executives. Jobs must be allocated by merit.

Britain has laws regarding equal pay and it is illegal to pay a woman less for the same work as a man. However, due to their lifestyle, women often get less money per annum because they take more time off for various reasons<sup>11</sup> and work fewer hours.

---

<sup>11</sup> E.g. pregnancy, childcare etc.

It is a simple physiological fact that women cannot do all the jobs that men do. This is why, despite clamouring for equality, there are virtually no female bricklayers, hod-carriers, steeplejacks, sewage workers, timber-fellers etc. Women are physically weaker than men with a different physical structure; that is just a fact of life. It doesn't make them less important, just different.

Women have every opportunity to do any job that they aspire to if they have the qualifications. Britain has had two female Prime Ministers and many female posts in the Cabinet. The current Home Secretary is a woman. Many MPs are women. The co-head of the Green Party is a woman. The former head of the LibDems was a woman. Britain has a queen not a king, having the longest reign of any British monarch. Most of the top television presenting jobs are performed by women. Many newscasters are women. One woman was Speaker of the House of Commons, and a greatly respected one at that. Many businesses are run by a woman, such as the excellent Michelle Dewberry.

Women do not have to be oppressed and history is full of examples of women that became business owners, wealthy landowners, abbesses, teachers, scholars, inventors, doctors, discoverers, tribal leaders, queens and so on. The Bible praises the virtuous woman that not only runs a home but also sets up a business (Proverbs 31:10ff). If a woman is determined she can succeed. There are many cases of slave women gaining their freedom and becoming powerful and influential.

Historically women have risen to positions of supreme national power; such as: Catherine the Great, Elizabeth I and II, Mary Tudor, Nefertiti, Zenobia (warrior Queen of Palmyra), Cleopatra, Dido (queen/founder of Carthage), Cartimandua (Queen of the Brigantes) and many more. Eleanor of Aquitaine [c.1122–1204] was both queen of France and subsequently queen of England, later regent, who had enormous power and influence. Several women became very powerful pirate lords, such as: Grace O'Malley, Ching Shih or Jeanne de Clisson (the Lioness of Brittany); while others became fierce freedom fighters winning wars, such as the Trung sisters who led the offensive against the Chinese conquerors in Vietnam in 40 AD.

When women were in control the result was not always peaceful and harmonious. Queen of the Iceni Boudicca committed mass murder in her rage against the Romans in Essex. Mary Tudor martyred over 100 innocent Protestants. Catherine the Great annexed Turkish and Tartar lands. In fact very many mass murderers have been women. Women are just as prone to violence as men are because they are human with original sin. A matriarchy is no guarantee of peace. Elizabeth I executed more people than her tyrant father Henry VIII.

In any society if women are talented and persistent they can rise to the top in their chosen profession and have always been able to. Even in 4<sup>th</sup> century Alexandria, which was far more patriarchal than today's Britain, Hypatia [c.370–415] could become a very significant teacher, astronomer, mathematician, inventor and discoverer.<sup>12</sup> The trope that women are always squashed underfoot by privileged men is a fallacy. Most men in history suffered under oppression, sometimes under the oppression of a woman.

There are three chief phases of Feminism. The first was the Suffragette movement. Although the violent protests are to be condemned, the cause was righteous. The second was the equal rights movement of 1960s-70s Feminism; this was also righteous in that it

---

<sup>12</sup> Hypatia (c.370–415) Greek philosopher, astronomer, and mathematician. She taught geometry, algebra, and astronomy at Alexandria, and was head of the Neoplatonist school there. Hypatia wrote several learned treatises as well as devising instruments such as an astrolabe. [Oxford Encyclopaedia.]

secured equal employment rights. The third and current aspect is radical Feminism, which is deranged and contemptible.

Radical Feminism does damage to women. It teaches them to rage and get angry at almost everything they see. It distorts their view of things and deludes them to blame men for everything. It thus creates misandry, which is just as obnoxious as misogyny. It is also irrational in that it usually misjudges the cause of problems, blaming men with no evidence.<sup>13</sup>

Examples of rage include:

It's time to embrace Feminism's anger.

Bitchmedia, Andi Zeisler, 22 October 2018.

The future is furious.

Ibid.

It's time for women to embrace their rage.

Ibid.

I'm an angry woman and that's just fine.

The Independent, Clemence Michallon, 5 September 2019.

I wake up angry ... my anger rides the subway with me. It sits with me at work, It's there when I get home.

Ibid.

I live as a feminist but I'm tired of being so furious all the time.

The Guardian, (letter to) Mariella Frostrup, 24 November 2019.

Ever since I made the conscious decision to live my life fully as a feminist, it has been fraught with conflict and stress.

Ibid.

Rage is not good for the soul and it leads to health problems as well as depression or anxiety. Radical Feminism also leads many women into darker avenues such as lesbianism and witchcraft. Hordes of Feminists have become witches in America and this often leads to profound depression and even suicide. I have known a wife take up radical Feminism, change her character, then become a lesbian or a witch and then break up the family, desert the children and leave the husband, only to succumb to anxiety and depression.

Any ideology that promotes rage, anger and hate is character degrading.

For further details see my papers, '*Feminism*' or '*Refuting establishment lies*'..

## Intersectionality

### The belief

This is better known as Identity Politics. It is the belief that there is an invisible hierarchy in modern society of marginal groups that are seen as oppressed victims, and thus should have more worth than others. The main offenders, or persecutors, are White, straight males (see earlier) and these should be opposed while oppressed victims should be elevated.

---

<sup>13</sup> For instance, if a woman fails to get a job because she is not qualified, she then blames male privilege.



The many victimised groups (which grows all the time) include: women, lesbian women, Blacks, Muslims, the disabled, homosexual males, Trans people and so on. The more groups you belong to, the more value you should be given. Thus a Black women is lower down the pecking order than a White, lesbian, Muslim woman.

Thus White males have no value, even if their opinion is correct. In any argument you shut down the opponent by virtue of shaming them for their place in society. A classic example of this was on BBC's *Question Time* when a mixed race woman could not argue a point raised by the actor Laurence Fox and attacked him as a privileged White man. Most of the audience groaned and applauded Fox when he said that this was racist.

### **The truth**

Ordinary sane common people do not buy into this crazy, sectarian ideology. The only way to ensure a stable society and equal rights for all is to have respect for everyone. Thus there should be no discrimination laws favouring any group at all, because this gives one group more equality than others. If everyone respected and honoured everyone, then there would be peace.

Dividing people into oppressed factions only serves to create social dysfunction and hatred – and this is the point. This is exactly what Cultural Marxists have sought to do; this is just one strategy in the process of destabilising society.

The Christian basis of society, which served Britain for centuries, was that all people had honour as people and that more privileged people (such as wealthy folk) should perform charitable works to help less favoured people.<sup>14</sup> Thus were formed many charities and societies to heal the sick, feed the poor, give homes to orphans and so on. The focus was on doing good to all, loving all.

The focus on Intersectionality is anger and hate against supposed oppressive groups, such as the patriarchy (whatever that is supposed to mean).<sup>15</sup> Intersectional radical Feminists can be seen behaving in a very violent fashion and even acting in a demented manner. Living on the basis of hating certain parts of society does you no good.

For more details see my paper on '*Cultural Marxism*'.

## **Multiculturalism**

### **The belief**

Diversity and multiculturalism are good things. They expand the horizons of society and introduce variation and choice, such as different types of restaurants, celebrations or religions. British society must therefore change and adapt to the introduction of new cultures.

We should welcome unrestricted waves of immigration to broaden society by a mix of racial types.

---

<sup>14</sup> Of course there were individual exceptions of evil people. But the teaching of the Bible and legal statutes encouraged doing good to all.

<sup>15</sup> Many people in positions of power today are women and people from racial minorities. In Britain we recently had our second female PM, we have a female Home Secretary, who is also from an Indian background, we have a Chancellor that is from an ethnic minority and so on.

The indigenous White Christian society in Britain is evil and is responsible for all sorts of bigotry, chauvinism, racism and xenophobia.

### **The truth**

Multiculturalism is the changing and diversifying of British culture to be different from its historic norm, becoming multilateral in scope, embracing and formalising foreign cultures as British. This is done by accepting waves of foreign immigrants of a very different culture: non-Christian, non democratic, intolerant, misogynistic and unpatriotic.<sup>16</sup> This is facilitated by allowing certain migrants to not learn English, not read and write, employing interpreters in public bodies, introducing signs in multiple foreign languages in public services and even turning a blind eye to a parallel legal system in localised areas (Sharia law) along with vigilante police enforcers.

Ordinary, natural diversity created by immigrants is, of course, a good thing but arbitrary, forced, open-ended waves of immigration is not.

Firstly, the indigenous Christian population is not evil at all. In fact the open-hearted, welcoming, tolerant nature of the Christian society is the reason that many immigrants have been allowed into the country in the first place. It is also a place of refuge for immigrants who want to escape their own oppressive societies and are attracted to our type of society that has freedom that resulted from Christian principles.

Most places in Britain that experienced large amounts of immigrants, such as Birmingham or Leicester have done so without social upheaval. Migrants were largely welcomed on the whole (localised bigotry is always going exist and it works both ways). Indeed, migrants changed the face of British society with their restaurants, shops, and contributions to culture. In every department of society migrants were welcomed and assimilated if they wanted to. Thus Italian, Irish, Iranian, Afghani, Australian, Kiwi, Hindu, Sikh, Indian, and a proportion of Muslim communities integrated very well. Thus far multiculturalism worked.

The key point is integration. Where immigrants learned English, accepted cultural norms, were law-abiding and worked hard there were no problems. Indeed, many, especially Indians, were able to prosper enormously and contribute to society.

The problem is when immigrants refuse to do these things, live in tribal ghettos and seek to create a state within a state that multiculturalism breaks down. This particularly affects radical Islamic groups who demand Sharia law, their own vigilante police, their own otherwise illegal practices (such as FGM)<sup>17</sup> and claiming their areas as independent political systems. This is multiculturalism gone bad.

Another problem is uncontrolled immigration that gradually destroys the indigenous society, lowers workers' wages, steals jobs and puts enormous stress on social services. Too many immigrants in localised areas crashes the infrastructure and causes immense damage followed by anger and social disruption.

Despite claims by Leftists like Ash Sarkar, immigration from outside the EU has a big overall cost to the country. This is evaluated by various studies (e.g. Oxford University's Migration Observatory) using different methodologies but all come to a figure between £15

---

<sup>16</sup> This is particularly true of Muslim immigrants from places like Iraq, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Afghanistan etc. where women are second-class citizens, homosexuals are executed and where non-democratic Sharia law or something similar rules.

<sup>17</sup> Female genital mutilation.

billion to over £100 billion gross cost to Britain every year.<sup>18</sup> According to Macer Hall, in 2014-15 migrants contributed £87.7 billion in taxes but cost £106.7 billion in public spending, thus costing Britain £17 billion overall.<sup>19</sup>

The chief problem with current multiculturalism is that it is engineered by Cultural Marxists to deliberately break down British society. These people want to destroy all the norms of White Christian culture to foster a Marxist revolution.

Uncontrolled waves of migrants are the means to water down existing cultures and create a mongrelised, homogenous society. It is a direct attack on nationalism and patriotism, which is seen as the enemy of Cultural Marxism. In addition immigrants tend to vote for Socialist parties.

Two thousand years of British history has developed this nation to be what it is and the basic factor in this development is Christianity. All the invading forces adopted Christianity, even the Norse Vikings, and this was the cement that bound the various tribes together, gradually creating one single British character. All our social norms, political systems, legal systems and everything else stemmed from Christian principles.

Immigrants coming into this country choose to do so knowing our history and so must conform to British standards and not expect to create their own ghettoised plantations. If they want, for example, to live under Sharia law then they should go and live in a country where that exists.

Christianity is not acceptable in many countries and Christians are persecuted to death continually in multiple states. Thus a Christian would not choose to relocate there; it would be stupid. Such countries are not multi-cultural but are chauvinist. Therefore, Salafist Muslims are also foolish to choose to migrate to Britain if they want to set up an Islamic state (which many immigrants claim they want to do).<sup>20</sup> Britain is British and while we welcome natural refugees and decent migrants, we do not wish to see our nation destroyed.

The Woke lie about multiculturalism is that it is a smokescreen for unbridled immigration policies that are deliberately designed to damage British culture. The irony is that these Woke champagne socialists, if their wish is granted, will eventually find themselves living in a Sharia state where all their liberties are curtailed, there is no free speech, no alcohol, Gays are killed, there is capital punishment and women are subjugated and forced to wear veils. Even without further immigration the much higher birth-rate of Muslims will see a national Muslim majority within 35 years. There is already a Muslim majority in Birmingham.

Britons are not racist and do not hate Muslims but they must respond to threats created by Salafist Islamists that not only plan to dominate society but already enact terrorist attacks on our streets. Secular Muslims that integrate in society are welcomed and loved.<sup>21</sup> Sadly

---

<sup>18</sup> The gross cost (e.g. benefits, health care, and housing) minus tax receipts leads to a net cost. EU migrants tend to have an overall positive tax contribution to society.

<sup>19</sup> Macer Hall, 'Migrants cost Britain £17bn a year', 17 May 2016.

<sup>20</sup> Many radical Islamists (including clerics) have publicly stated that Islam demands that they create an Islamic state in Britain (which is true) with its own Sharia law, customs and culture. They have even said that they want to destroy Buckingham Palace and remove the royal family and kill everyone that refuses to submit to Allah.

<sup>21</sup> Typical of these is the Saddiqi family featured in television's Gogglebox. This Pakistani, Muslim family has integrated into British society and the father and two sons are decent, intelligent people. Such folk are not radical Islamists but moderate cultural Muslims. They have condemned radical Islamist violence and rape gangs.

there is a growing number of radical Islamists that hate Britain and want to destroy it. This is where multiculturalism fails.

For further information see my paper, '*Multiculturalism*'.

## Islam is a religion of peace

### The belief

The statement 'Islam is a religion of peace' is reiterated by many Woke Progressives and even the Conservative Prime Minister David Cameron (who was really a liberal that worked against historic Conservatism).<sup>22</sup>

Muslims are oppressed in Britain by Christian fundamentalists, Right-wing activists and bigoted White males. They are an oppressed group.

Muslims have lived peaceful lives in Britain for decades and they are a well-integrated religious group.

Islam is a peaceful religion and no more harmful than any other religion. In fact, those evil Christians should be blamed for the pre-emptive Crusades against Muslims that involved much brutality, more than anything in history.

### The truth

Almost everything stated above is wrong.

### *Differences*

We first have to differentiate between moderate Muslims living in Britain and Salafists (fundamentalists and jihadis).

It is true that many British Muslims are peaceful and moderate, having settled in society well. This includes most Shi'ite and Alawite Muslims (e.g. Iranians or Syrians) or secular Muslims. Secular Muslims are people that have grown up in a background culture of Islam but are not very religious. Many are atheists while some maintain Islamic customs but know little about the Qur'an or the Sira and Hadith (Sunna). None of these are Salafists or jihadis.

On the other hand, there are many Sunni groups that are devoted to a literal interpretation of Muhammad (Salafists) and commit their life to jihad (the fight for a pure religion). Some sections of Sunni Islam, such as Wahhabism, are very radical. It is these groups that commit terrorism.

### *Islam*

The fact is that the texts of Islam (The Qur'an and the Sunna) support the beliefs of the radical Sunnis. At least 109 times the Qur'an commands Muslims to attack and kill non-Muslims (kaffirs), including beheading them.

Muhammad was a bloodthirsty slave-trader who was never happier than when he had a sword in his hand (he said this himself). The Sunna explains his life story in biography (Sira) and statements (Hadith) revealing a very cruel man. On one occasion, with his 12-year old wife in Medina, Muhammad sat all day watching his men behead 800 Jews because they would not believe that he was a true prophet of God. In attacks on cities he

---

<sup>22</sup> He said that his prime achievement was legalising Gay marriage; hardly a Conservative policy.

encouraged killing all men, including the aged and infirm and old women, raping the young women, then enslaving the young women and children.

Islam is also misogynistic. Women are legally worth half of a man (e.g. inheritance laws or legal testimony). In practice today women are treated appallingly. Under Wahabi regimes (e.g. Saudi Arabia) women are not allowed in public without their husbands and must wear a full burka. Single women found outside are prone to being beaten (you can see examples on YouTube). Some have been killed. Women are also beheaded for minor crimes and for adultery.

The reason why Muslim grooming rape gangs exist in Britain affecting tens of thousands of young girls is that non-Muslim girls, especially wearing modern dress, are considered as worthless, less than animals,<sup>23</sup> thus they can be raped and discarded. This is not contrary to Islamic teachings. Qur'an 4:24 allows rape and prostitution.<sup>24</sup>

Homosexuals are also executed; usually by being thrown off a tall building since Muhammad demanded they be thrown from a high place.

It is important to understand that these examples are not extreme forms of Islam by misguided disciples but a literal acceptance of what Muhammad actually said. It is pure Islam.

### *Dualism*

Islam is full of dualism and contradictions. It is possible to find statements affirming peaceful things in the Qur'an but one has to understand how to interpret it.

There are two Qur'ans: the first were the suras written in Mecca, the second are the suras written in Medina. Initially Islam was a religion of peace and developed in an area of religious toleration at Mecca. Later, after Medina when Muhammad gained autonomy, Islam became an intolerant religion of hatred and violence demanding killing or capturing all non-Muslims. The Qur'an intermixes teaching from these two periods.

There is a dualism between Muslims and kaffirs. Thus Muslims cannot enslave other Muslims but they can kill and enslave everyone else. Muslims must protect other Muslims but have no duty to protect others. They can kill, enslave, lie to (*Taqiyya*) and cheat kaffirs. However, Muslims that apostatise must be killed.

There is a dualism between men and women. The subjugation of women is shocking, I will simply list some Islamic laws:

- A man can consummate a marriage when the wife is only 9-years old.
- FGM<sup>25</sup> is commanded by Muhammad (Book 41, Kitab Al-Adab, Hadith 5251).
- A woman can only have one husband but a man can have 4 wives (Muhammad had more).
- A husband can beat his wife for insubordination.

---

<sup>23</sup> A hadith compares women to camels; Abu Dawud, 11.2155.

<sup>24</sup> Note that the finalised report commissioned by the Home Secretary into the rape gang crisis has now been restricted from publication. It seems that the facts are too shocking for the public to be able to cope with. The reality is that individuals have been warning about this for decades. The scope is thousands of underage girls being abused in dozens of British cities for years on end by Pakistani rape gangs. Girls as young as 12 or less were raped hundreds of times while drugged up.

<sup>25</sup> Female genital mutilation (cutting off the clitoris).

- Sharia Law gives instructions for subjugating wives and the final stage is beating them, but not on the face.<sup>26</sup>
- Qur'an 65:4 allows paedophilia of young girls
- A man can unilaterally divorce his wife but a wife needs her husband's consent to divorce.
- A divorced wife loses custody of all children over 6-years old.
- Testimony from four male witnesses are required to prove charges of rape against a woman.
- A woman who has been raped cannot testify in court against her rapists.
- A woman's testimony in court regarding property cases carries 1/2 the weight of a man's.
- A female heir inherits half of what a male heir inherits.
- A woman cannot drive a car as it leads to *fitnah* ('upheaval').
- A woman cannot speak alone to a man who is not her husband or relative.
- When men pray facing Mecca, women must pray standing behind the men.
- A man's prayer can be negated if a dog, a donkey or a woman walks in front of them. Thus a woman is equal to a dog.
- The Hadith states that Women are an affliction to men.<sup>27</sup>

There is dualism regarding homosexuality. It is condemned as a capital crime and yet there are passages, which imply that sex with young boys is acceptable and is a pleasure in heaven.

#### *Violence encouraged*

As a result of Muhammad's clear statement in the Medina passages to prosper Islam by violent methods, and following his actual practice in attacking caravans and cities, subsequent caliphs and sultans entered into a 1400-year long quest to subjugate the world to Allah (the point of Muhammad's teaching) by brutality. More than any other religion or movement, Islam killed over 700 million people in those centuries and enslaved millions more.

The way in which this was done was abominable in the extreme. Frequently, tyrants such as Tamerlane would kill every person in a city except those kept for slavery, especially sex-slaves. The city would be burned to the ground for not surrendering then piles of severed heads would be cemented into tall columns or pyramids up to 15 feet high to serve as a warning. Sometime walls would be made of bodies of the slain and dying. Many were killed by slow torture.

Slavery, especially sex-slaves, continued from the beginning of Islam to this day. Muslims have always preferred white, blonde women for sex-slavery and thus harassed European coastal cities for centuries, going as far as Cornwall. Some areas, such as the Balkans, were ravaged year after year and this is why the word 'slave' derives from the word 'Slav'. After the US eradicated the Barbary pirates in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and international pressure was placed on the Ottoman Empire to abolish slavery following its abolition in the west after 1834 (Britain) and 1864 (America) Muslims claimed to overtly end slavery. However, the sex-trafficking that goes on today involves many Muslim groups from central Europe to Pakistan. The British grooming gangs are an example of this mentality.

---

<sup>26</sup> See Abu Dawud, 11.2137.

<sup>27</sup> Bukhari, 4.52.111.

There has been no force in history as violent as Islam.

As one example, take Temujin (Tamerlane). Just a small sample of his atrocities include:

- It is estimated, conservatively, that Tamerlane killed over 17 million people. This was then an estimated 5% of the world's population.
- 1383: in Isfizar 2,000 people were piled on top of each other and cemented alive into towers of clay and bricks in the centre of the city.
- 1387: in Isfahan, Persia, 70,000 were slaughtered. The writer Arabshah says, '*Temur ... ordered bloodshed and sacrilege, slaughter and plunder, devastation, burning of crops, women's breasts to be cut off, infants to be destroyed, bodies dismembered, honour to be insulted (rape) ... the cutting sword in the fields of their necks and made their graves in the bellies of wolves and hyenas*'.<sup>28</sup> Every man, woman and child was killed. The women and children were taken to a plain outside the city with the children under seven placed apart. These were crushed under the soldiers' horses. The mothers who saw this spectacle were then ridden over also plus seven thousand other children. Tamerlane participated in this crushing to set an example. Each division of the army was commanded to bring back a certain number of heads; those killed were Muslims. 28 towers of 1500 heads were erected.
- 1398: he killed 100,000 Hindu prisoners in one day before advancing on Delhi. The severed heads were used to build a high pyramid.
- He destroyed 700 villages in India. Delhi was so ravaged that it took a hundred years to recover. In one Indian battle he massacred 30,000. Towers were built of severed heads. Some streets were blocked by heaps of the dead.
- 1400: He ordered that 3-4,000 Armenian Christians be buried alive in Sivas, Anatolia, after promising not to shed their blood. Others were drowned with their heads tied between their thighs. 9,000 virgins were carried away into sex-slavery. The city was utterly destroyed.
- 1401: He killed the entire population of Damascus, including fellow Muslims. The people were subjected to all sorts of torture, including new ones invented to cause pain. These included being crushed in a press, slowly scorched over flames suspended by the thumbs, suspended upside down with dust in the nostrils, slowly ripping arms from sockets, pouring powdered ashes into nostrils, mutilations etc.
- In Aleppo, 20,000 heads were severed; massacres continued for four days. All children were slaughtered, their mothers raped in public, including within the Great Mosque. Piles of severed heads were shaped like knolls 15-feet high and 30 in circumference.
- 1401: During the sack of Baghdad 90,000 were killed; their heads were cemented into 120 towers. The Tigris ran red with blood and the air was putrid from rotting corpses.

### *Integration?*

I have explained that moderate Muslims who do not follow the Qur'an or doctrines of Islam have integrated well in the past. The problem is with the growing force of fundamentalist Islam, particularly Wahhabism, which Britain foolishly allows to proliferate in mosques, seminars, home groups and particularly in our prisons where imams are allowed to teach without supervision.

This Salafism demands that Muslims do not integrate at all. They are to remain separate from kaffir society and plan to overturn that society to render it submissive to Allah (submission is the basis and meaning of Islam). This is the burden of jihadism, which can

---

<sup>28</sup> Marozzi, Justin; Tamerlane: Sword of Islam, conqueror of the world, Harper Perennial, (2004), p153.

take many forms. Jihad can involve: terrorist action, subverting Christian morals, raping kaffir women and gaining positions of influence in society using Taqiyya.

The main plan is the demand of imams for fertility. Muslim women are encouraged to have as many children as possible and it is common for them to have more than 9 kids. The purpose is to dominate British society through gaining the majority of the population and thus take Britain over and subject it to Sharia law, killing the royal family and anyone who refuses to submit. At current levels of birth, this could occur by 2035.

Thus uninformed westernised Muslims (ignorant of the Qur'an) and atheistic westernised Muslims tend to integrate well. Both these groups would have been killed by Muhammad. Fundamentalist Muslims will never integrate at all but will continue in jihad until Britain is overthrown. Such jihadis are already well underway to dominate certain parts of British society (such as Luton, Halifax or Birmingham).

### *The Crusades*

The Crusades were a series of expeditions (11<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> century) to secure Christian rule over the Muslim-controlled holy places of Palestine.

The Crusades were not pre-emptive at all; they were a result of the invasion of the Holy Land by Islamic tribes (such as Seljuk Turks, Mamluks, Arabs and others). The original idea was to free the enslaved Christians and Jews from Muslim domination and cruelty, and relieve Jerusalem. It was also to allow pilgrimage to Jerusalem, which was important to medieval churchgoers.

The various crusades had varying effects and did not bring final liberty for Palestine, though it did establish a 'Christian' kingdom for decades, capturing Jerusalem in 1099 until Saladin recaptured Jerusalem, prompting the Third Crusade (1189–92). However, the crusaders did stop the westward invasion of Islamic tribes and helped to stop Europe from being overrun. The previous hindering of the Muslim advance into Europe was by Charles Martel, with his victory at Poitiers in 732. Nevertheless Muslim armies got as far as Vienna more than once.

It is true that there was brutality committed by some of the Crusading commanders, but there was also brutality committed by the Muslim commanders. It was a brutal time. The brutality of the Crusaders over a relatively short period pales into insignificance compared to the violence committed by Muslim armies over 1400 years.

See my papers: '*Islam: theology and history*', '*Islam in five minutes*', '*The Crusades*'.

## **Religion is to blame for all wars**

### **The belief**

'*Religion is the opiate of the people*' (Marx) and has no intrinsic value in promoting well being; it is a mere sop for weak-minded people.

Religion does, however, create tensions in society that lead to hate and eventually war. This is particularly true of Christianity which has caused more wars than anything else.

### **The truth**

The folly of this belief is staggering in its ignorance.



Firstly, true Christianity can never cause war. Christians are the obedient disciples of Jesus and he demanded pacifism. More than that, he demanded that his followers love their enemies. Violence is completely forbidden to Christians who must turn the other cheek when attacked. Therefore, no Christian can fight to defend Christianity.

The problem is that many people, and even nations, call themselves Christian when they are no such thing. There are many that are mere professors of Christianity. Numerous national leaders have claimed to be a Christian and then started a war (such as Tony Blair or GW Bush) but these were not Christians. Their beliefs and character prove that they do not really follow Jesus Christ. Thus the wars that they initiated were not Christian wars.

It is true that in the past some people who appear to be true disciples of Jesus supported wars of self-defence, such as the Smalkald War [1546-1547].<sup>29</sup> These were different times that must be judged according to contemporary mores. Nevertheless such support cannot be defended. I have to admit that even today there are genuine Christians who believe that war is justified for self-defence, but that is not the teaching of Jesus, which is very clear. Certainly there is no Biblical justification for initiating a war.

Secondly, a study of history shows that there are many provocations to war. Islamic history is different; Islam demands war to conquer the world for Allah. Thus Islam does result in religious wars, however, this is an exception. Judaism has also initiated wars in ancient history and the State of Israel has initiated wars in recent history (e.g. the Six-day War). Other religions (such as Buddhism, Hinduism, Jainism or Taoism) do not generally start wars. There have been wars started by Buddhist or Taoist kings but the cause of these wars were materialistic not spiritual.

The causes of war are many and various; they include:

- Annexation: the desire of a stronger nation to occupy the land of a smaller neighbouring nation. Example: the Zulu Wars.
- Invasion: Examples: WWII, the Napoleonic Wars, the Mongol Wars, the Gulf War.
- Putting down a rebellion. Examples: battle of Bannockburn, the Indian Wars in America.
- Securing or defending commercial or trading interests. Examples: the Chinese Opium Wars, the Anglo-Dutch Wars.
- Outright exploitation. Example: the war on the Aztecs by the Spanish.
- Disputes over a royal succession. Example: the Hundred Years War.
- Cementing federalism. Example: the American Civil War.
- Restricting the power of a despotic king. Example: The English Civil Wars.
- Assassination of a national head: Example: WWI.
- A major terrorist incident. Examples: The American-Afghanistan War, the Iraq War.
- An insult to national honour. Example: the Trojan War.
- An insult to personal honour. Example: the Iceni rebellion under Boudicca.
- A determination to stop the advance of a political regime. Examples: the Korean War, the Vietnam War.

---

<sup>29</sup> Where the Lutherans of Saxony sought to defend themselves from the persecutions and attack of the Holy Roman Empire by a pre-emptive strike before the emperor's army was fully mobilised. Luther, who had just died, had argued against war. The first war was won by the emperor but it provoked another one which was won by the Smalkaldic League. The result was recognising Protestantism in Germany at the Peace of Augsburg.

- Imperialism. Examples: WWII, the wars of Nebuchadnezzar, the Spanish-American War, the Peloponnesian Wars.

With some thought we could add to this list, but the point has been made. Most wars are instigated by greed for power and resources.

## **Left-wing politics is kinder and more caring than Right-wing politics**

### **The belief**

Left-wing politics, such as Socialism, Marxism, Social Democracy and Liberalism, focus upon the needs of working people and the necessity of the state to protect and nurture the people. As such they are based on kindness.

These policies are centred in collectivism and nationalised industries based upon big government so that proper control and regulation can secure the needs of the disadvantaged.

Right-wing politics centres upon securing the greed of the rich by privatisation and capitalism.

### **The truth**

Firstly, anyone who thinks that any political party will always be benevolent to the people is greatly confused. All political leadership is prone to corruption and all shades of political parties have been perverted by power. Trusting politicians is rather foolish.

What is more realistic is individual leadership. There are some government heads that function as good leaders but most don't. Leadership is about character not political alignment. Sadly really good national leadership is very rare and most governments stumble about putting out fires and doing little long-term good. Part of that problem is the short terms involved, usually four to five years. This obviates against long-term planning, which is what any country really needs, and after two or three years governments are focused on winning the next election.

Without good leadership both Right and Left-wing governments tend to screw matters up. It isn't the overall direction of politics that counts but making good decisions.

For example, you can make a good case that the railways need to be nationalised because privatisation has largely failed. Rail fares are very high, performance is generally low and the tracks are under public ownership anyway. Recently one of the franchises was removed due to appalling customer failures. But in the days of nationalised British Rail there were also huge numbers of complaints. The food served was universally condemned; there were rail strikes and many line failures due to under investment.

So rail privatisation has problems and nationalised rail also had problems. The solution is not political in nature but making proper choices.

A good argument can be made that utilities need to be under government control (as long as they are invested in properly) because sending profits abroad is stupid and foreign companies having control of vital supplies is a poor strategic decision.

So there are valid individual cases to support nationalised industries while generally supporting privatised commerce.

Regarding performance of Left or Right the best analysis relies upon history.

### *Economics*

Left-wing governments are famously bad on economics. Every British Labour government left the country in economic crisis and several Tory governments had to sort out the mess in the first few years of power.

Left-wing parties are not good on fiscal policy. Famously, the Labour governments of Tony Blair led to low taxes for the rich and a widening wealth gap between the rich and poor. Tory governments were slightly better on this. Part of the problem is that if you raise taxes past a certain point for high-level earners, they leave the country and the nation is worse off (note the exile of the Rolling Stones in the early 1970s). There is a cut-off point of efficiency. Claiming that high taxation fixes social problems is a lie. Furthermore, it is the wealth of the rich that allows them to develop businesses that create employment and to sponsor charitable ventures. There is nothing wrong with the existence of rich people; it is a sign of national success.

The Marxist policies of collectivisation and central government control applied in Communist countries is explicit proof of the uselessness of Marxist economics. In every case where they were applied there was utter failure. The result in several countries was massive poverty, famine, starvation and deaths in the millions.

Conclusion: Left-wing parties tend to be worse on economics.

### *Authoritarianism*

Left-wing government strongly tends towards authoritarianism and even despotism. This is because too much power is centralised with a small cabal. In every case where it was applied the result was catastrophic. We have already mentioned the genocides that resulted in Communist countries.

There are a few Right-wing governments that became fascist, such as Mussolini's Italy, for specific reasons but this is less common than Communist despotism. Fascism is bad for business and provokes rebellions and uncertainty – which creates problems for the market. Right-wing governments do not favour fascism.

Here it should be pointed out that Nazism was originally Left-wing, hence National Socialist Party. The German fascism that developed in the mid-1930s arose because of the nationalistic imperialistic emphasis, not Right-wing social policies.

Conclusion: Left-wing parties always tend towards despotism.

### *Social policy*

One would think that Left-wing governments would be strong on social issues but this is not the case.

Take housing. Conservative governments have, oddly, been effective on social housing schemes beginning with the rebuilding of the nation in the 1950s whereby hundreds of thousands of houses were built and working class people moved into better quality homes. Thatcher's selling of council houses seemed a good idea (get people to own stuff) but backfired as it depleted the social housing market.

Conversely, when rampant immigration (initiated by the Labour Party) put a massive strain on housing, the Blair governments failed to build anywhere near sufficient homes; neither did it replace sold council houses.

It is true that the Conservatives initially voted against the creation of the NHS, which was a feather in the Labour Party's hat, initiated by Clement Attlee, a decent man. After this, funding the NHS has been roughly equal in real terms since then with some qualifications.

The Blair government increased the funding for the NHS to high levels. However, most of this was wasted because, at the same time, it instituted reforms to worsen the performance of the care system, such as by vastly increasing the management and bureaucracy. It also started PFI<sup>30</sup> schemes, which have been a massive drain on NHS finances and have led to poor results. Also the worst hospital health scandal occurred under a Labour government.

However, the David Cameron Tory government instituted a terrible reorganisation of the NHS and at the same time effectively cut the budget significantly by not increasing budgets to the normal medical inflation levels (4%). Austerity, initiated by Tories, has done shocking damage to the NHS.

Overall, looking at several decades, we could say that NHS performance is roughly about the same. Both sides have done good and bad. It is a vote loser to ruin the NHS and therefore no government can openly work against it, but both Labour and Tory governments have privatised parts of it by stealth.

### *Workers rights*

This is a complex issue. Equal pay for women was initiated by Barbara Castle of the Labour Party, which was a watershed moment. But many workers' rights, and even a living working wage, have been initiated by Tory governments.

Labour, on the one hand, were under the control of the unions in the 1960s and 70s and this caused great damage to the country with strikes being a regular occurrence. At one point under Tory Edward Heath the country was plagued with blackouts and a three-day working week. Heath also capitulated to a miners' strike. This could not continue and it led to the downfall of Jim Callaghan in the late 1970s.

It also opened the door to Margaret Thatcher who was a very effective leader in terms of efficiency, leadership and controlling the economy, but she failed to have any sympathy or understanding about the social pitfalls of her policy (N.B. the poll tax). As a result she did immense damage to working class areas in the north and Wales. This came to a head in the miner's strike. Her iron control of this was close to despotism in massive policing costs, virtual pitched battles and removing miner's benefits causing hunger. Yes the unions needed curbing but her actions were appalling, causing generational problems.

Conclusion: all in all both sides are about equal in this matter, doing both good and bad things.

### *National defence*

In this the Tories have sought to prevent war unless provoked. Thatcher successfully went to war in the Falklands, though it is possible that war could have been averted if she had acted more quickly in sending the fleet. War is bad for business so it is not a Conservative thing to do. Harold Wilson (Labour) understood this and sensibly kept Britain out of the Vietnam War that had a shocking effect on lives and economies.

---

<sup>30</sup> Private Finance Initiative.

Modern Labour, on the other hand, has engaged unlawfully; in foreign wars. Most famously Blair took Britain into a completely illegal and pointless Iraq War which claimed over a million innocent Iraqi lives, based on lying to Parliament. This was a war crime.

Both Labour and Tory governments have massively cut defence spending.

### *Lying*

Most politicians are accused of lying to the public and this puts all parties in a poor light. However, formal lying in the form of spin doctoring came to its peak in the governments of Tony Blair. This lying (such as announcing new spend on projects that had already been announced and commissioned) became a prime feature of his leadership. The situation was so extreme that Peter Osborne wrote a book<sup>31</sup> dedicated to exposing government lying.

In the last 30 years the only MP that has been sent to prison for lying has been Labour MP Fiona Onasanya. She was also the first MP to be formally deselected by public vote. She not only perjured herself but got her brother to lie as well resulting in his imprisonment too.

### *Kindness*

Regarding the specific matter of which party is the kindest the historical facts are conclusive.<sup>32</sup>

- Radical Left-wing Robespierre instituted the 'reign of terror' in the French Revolution including, beheading, disembowelling, lynching, mutilating, burying alive, drowning and hacking to pieces.
- Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Vladimir Lenin and Leon Trotsky propagated violent revolution.
- Marxist Socialism resulted in genocides and mass murders in the USSR, Red China, Cambodia, Albania and several other places.
- Marxist Socialism also resulted in famines, starvation and mass death.
- Marxist Socialism resulted in brutal persecution of the intelligentsia.
- Marxist Socialism resulted in brutal persecution of certain religious groups, such as Christianity or Uigurs.
- All Marxist nations immediately established concentration camps for dissidents.
- National Socialism in Germany resulted in mass deaths and persecution.
- Marxist Jew Genrikh Yagoda was responsible for the deaths of ten million Ukrainian Kulaks.
- Marxist Mao Tse Tung was responsible for mass murder of intellectuals and the deaths of scores of millions.
- Marxist Stalin was responsible for millions of deaths.
- Marxist Pol Pot killed over a million Cambodians.
- The Nicaraguan Sandinistas committed mass executions as soon as they took over.
- Bela Kun persuaded the Hungarian communists and Social Democrats to form a coalition government. His Red Army then overran Slovakia.
- Marxist Che Guevara was a serial murderer of men, women and children.
- Socialist (Labour) Tony Blair was partly responsible for over a million deaths in Iraq.

---

<sup>31</sup> 'The rise of political lying'.

<sup>32</sup> I am ignoring the slight differences between Marxism, Trotskyism and Communism here.

- Socialist (Democrat) Hillary Clinton was responsible for the ruination of Libya and the subsequent mass murders, pogroms, social chaos and slavery. She was also a vehement supporter of all American wars, airstrikes and incursions.
- Socialist (Democrat) Barack Obama was the only president to be at war every day of his presidency. He also ramped up drone strikes killing hundreds of innocent people, including several wedding parties killing three generations of family. These strikes are illegal operations in various foreign countries.
- Most American wars were initiated by Democrats not Republicans. Roosevelt promised not to take America into war and then reneged when he gained power. Woodrow Wilson did exactly the same thing. There was no need for America to join in WWI or WWII.
- Black segregation was official Democrat policy since before the Civil War until White nationalist Lyndon Johnson cynically sought to gain the Black vote by deception in the 1960s. (JFK and RFK were unpopular exceptions).
- The Left-wing group Antifa has committed so many acts of violence in America that it has been labelled as a terrorist group.
- Left-wing activists repeatedly speak in hatred using provocative language against Right-wing groups. For example Labour's John McDonnell said that he wanted to imprison all Tories. Kyle Jurek, an operative of Bernie Sanders, demanded mass killings of conservatives to save the Earth.<sup>33</sup>

While Right-wing politicians have started foolish wars, incursions and missile strikes, there are none that I am aware of that initiated genocide.

In addition Cultural Marxists have been engaged in a constant attack on western Christian society for 100 years seeking to destroy all fundamentals of culture while spreading schism and hatred.

#### *Quotes from violent Left-wing activists and philosophers*

We have no compassion and we ask no compassion from you. When our turn comes we shall not make excuses for the terror.

Karl Marx; *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, 'Suppression of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung', 19 May 1849.

All the other large and small nationalities and peoples are destined to perish before long in the revolutionary world storm ... The next world war will result in the disappearance from the face of the earth not only of reactionary classes and dynasties, but also of entire reactionary peoples. And that too is a step forward. [i.e. genocide of conservatives.]

Friedrich Engels; *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, 'The Magyar Struggle', 13 January 1849.

In history nothing is achieved without violence and implacable ruthlessness.

Friedrich Engels; *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, 'Democratic Pan-Slavism', 15 February 1849.

Surely you do not imagine that we shall be victorious without applying the most cruel revolutionary terror?

VI Lenin; George Leggett, *The Cheka: Lenin's Political Police*, Clarendon Press (1981), p57

Carry out merciless mass terror against the kulaks, priests and White Guards;

VI Lenin; George Leggett, *The Cheka: Lenin's Political Police*, Clarendon Press (1981), p103.

---

<sup>33</sup> Natural News, 15 January 2020, 'Breaking: Bernie Sander field operative exposed as radical eco-fascist ...'.

Hang (hang without fail, so the people see) no fewer than 100 kulaks, rich men.

VI Lenin; George Leggett, *The Cheka: Lenin's Political Police*, Clarendon Press (1981), p50.

The revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat is rule won and maintained by the use of violence by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, rule that is unrestricted by laws.

VI Lenin; *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, Foreign Languages Press (1972), p11.

Root out the counter-revolutionaries without mercy, lock up suspicious characters in concentration camps ... Shirkers will be shot, regardless of past service.

Leon Trotsky; Dmitri Volkogonov, *Trotsky: The Eternal Revolutionary*, Harper Collins (1996), p213.

These Cains [Don Cossacks] must be annihilated.

Leon Trotsky; Dmitri Volkogonov, *Trotsky: The Eternal Revolutionary*, Harper Collins (1996), p156.

We were never concerned with the Kantian-priestly and vegetarian-Quaker prattle about the sacredness of human life.

Leon Trotsky; *Terrorism and Communism*, New Park Publications (1975), p82.

All the parties of capitalist society, all its moralists and all its sycophants will perish beneath the debris of the impending catastrophe. The only party that will survive is the party of the world socialist revolution.

Leon Trotsky; *Morals and Sycophants Against Marxism*, New International, August 1939.

[The Red Terror] the extermination of enemies of the revolution on the basis of their affiliation or of their pre-revolutionary roles.

Feliks Dzerzhinsky; George Leggett, *The Cheka: Lenin's Political Police*, Clarendon Press (1981), p114.

We are exterminating the bourgeoisie as a class.

Martin Latsis; George Leggett, *The Cheka: Lenin's Political Police*, Clarendon Press (1981), p114.

Sooner or later we will have to exterminate, simply physically destroy, the Cossacks, or at least the vast majority of them.

II Reingold; Peter Holquist, *Making War, Forging Revolution*, Harvard University Press (2002), pp 166, 194-5.

It is a very good thing, and a significant one too, to exterminate the bourgeoisie and capitalism in China.

Mao Zedong; Philip Short, *Mao: A Life*, Henry Holt, (1999), p447.

We are prepared to sacrifice 300 million Chinese for the victory of the world revolution.

Mao Zedong; Jun Chang and Jon Halliday, *Mao: The Unknown Story*, Jonathan Cape (2005, p457-8.

I propose the immediate launching of a nuclear strike on the United States. The Cuban people are prepared to sacrifice themselves for the cause of the destruction of imperialism and the victory of world revolution.

Fidel Castro; Fedor Burlatsky, *New York Times*, 'Castro wanted a nuclear strike', 23 October 1992.

If the [Soviet nuclear] rockets had remained, we would have used them all and directed them against the very heart of the United States, including New York.

Che Guevara; Jorge G Castaneda, *Companero: the life and death of Che Guevara*, Bloomsbury Pub. (1997), p231.

If any person has a good word for the previous government, that is enough for me to have him shot.

Che Guevara; Hugh Thomas, *Cuba, or the Pursuit of Freedom*, Da Capo Press (1998), p1470.

Hatred as an element of the struggle; a relentless hatred of the enemy, impelling us over and beyond the natural limitations that man is heir to and transforming him into an effective, violent, selective and cold killing machine ... How close we could look into a bright future should two, three or many Vietnams throughout the world with their share of deaths and their immense tragedies ...

Che Guevara; *Message to the Tricontinental*, OSPAAAL, (1967).

In the new Kampuchea, one million is all we need to continue the revolution. We don't need the rest. We prefer to kill ten friends rather than keep one enemy alive.

Khmer Rouge slogan; Pin Yathay, *Stay Alive, My Son*, Touchstone (1987), p148.

Lenin taught us to be merciless towards the enemies of the revolution, and millions of people had to be eliminated in order to secure the victory of the October Revolution.

Nur Muhammad Tarakt (Afghan communist dictator); Christopher Andrew and Vasili Mitrokhim, *The Mitrokhim Archive II*, Penguin (2006), p389.

We'll only leave only one million Afghans alive – that's all we need to build socialism.

Sayed Abdulah (Afghan Communist prison governor), Sylvain Boulouque, *Communism in Afghanistan*, in Stephanie Courtois et al, *The Black Book of Communism*, Harvard University Press (1999), p713.

The triumph of the revolution will cost a million deaths.

Shining Path slogan; *Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, Peru, 28 August 2003, General Conclusions, par 21.*

Such quotes could be multiplied. Marxism is a death cult that promotes continual violence because no government can actually get rid of all dissent, it springs up continually like a new Hydra head.

Everywhere pure Marxist-Communism has appeared it has led to mass deaths, murders, torture, rapes, brutality, gulags, mass imprisonment, famines, economic crisis, social clampdowns, spying on citizens, arrest without warrant, economic downturn and so on. The closer to pure Marxism the system, the worst the effects are. There is a reason why nations ended Marxist systems in the main.

Former Marxist-Leninist states include: The USSR (ended 1991), Red China (continuing but now mixed with capitalism), Afghanistan (ended 1992), Albania (ended 1992), Angola (ended 1992), Belarus (ended 1991), Bulgaria (ended 1990), Cambodia (ended 1991), Congo (ended 1992), Czechoslovakia (ended 1990), Ethiopia (ended 1991), East Germany (ended 1990), Grenada (ended 1983), Hungary (ended 1989) North Korea (continuing), Mongolia (ended 1992), Poland (ended 1989), Romania (ended 1989), Somalia (ended 1991), Ukraine (ended 1991), North Vietnam (ended 1976), South Yemen (ended 1990), Yugoslavia (ended 1992).

Less pure Socialism is not so severe. We could list a few Socialist states as: Peru, Tanzania, Nicaragua, Venezuela, Cuba, Laos, Algeria, Namibia, Bangladesh. Those with multi-party political systems mitigate the effects of pure Socialism.



*Note*

Socialism and Social Democracy are still Marxism-lite. The basic principles of Marxism predominate in the root principles of Social Democracy, they are just hidden under the claim of support for a liberal parliamentary democracy. However, many modern Socialist politicians openly claim to be Marxist or Communist, such as Jeremy Corbyn, John McDonnell or Bernie Sanders. Left-wing commentators are also Marxist at root, such as Ash Sarkar (an avowed Communist) or Andrew Marr (a Trotskyite). The driving philosophy of all Left-wing parties is Marxism. The irony is that these champagne Socialists would be exterminated if there were a genuine Marxist revolution.

*Socialist nations that are mixed systems (not pure Socialism)*

The following nations are often considered as Left-wing in the main, but they are really parliamentary democracies with multi-party systems.

Any apparent Socialism is where Marxism is watered down to create a more Democratic-Socialism that involves principles of capitalism (such as the free market) or democracy (such as multi-party parliaments). The following nations are also those that have a deep historic foundation of Christian ethics. They cannot be considered as pure Socialists but as hybrids.

Because these spend a great deal on welfare, some Left-wing activists claim them as Marxist or Social Democrat. In fact they are not pure Socialist at all but are constitutional democracies with a heavy presence of conservatives.

- Denmark: big welfare state, highest taxes in the world, many small businesses, egalitarian. Officially, Denmark is a constitutional, parliamentary, representative democracy with a constitutional monarchy, which seeks to work by consensus. No single party has held an absolute majority for 100 years.
- Finland: superb education system, 100% literacy, high standard of living, egalitarian, welfare state, minimal state intervention in economy. Officially Finland is a republic with a parliamentary, representative democracy.
- Canada: free market economy, welfare system. Formally, Canada is a parliamentary democracy with a federal government. It is also a constitutional monarchy. It has a liberal tradition. In practice its politics are moderate.
- Sweden: welfare state, high national debt, more government intervention in economy. Nation split by immigration policies creating civil disturbance and high crime. Officially Sweden is a parliamentary, representative, democratic, constitutional monarchy. It has, however, been dominated by the Social Democratic Worker's Party since 1917; thus it is more Socialist than the others.
- Norway: government controls key aspects of economy, welfare state, and high standard of living. The formal political position is a parliamentary, representative, democratic constitutional monarchy; similar to Britain. Currently the Labour Party is in power, but the Conservatives are close behind.
- The Netherlands: minimal government intervention in economy, welfare system, and egalitarian. Formally Holland is a parliamentary, representative democracy with a constitutional monarchy. It strives to function by consensus. It has multiple political parties.

Apart from Canada (which has vast natural resources and wealth), these nations have small populations and great natural resources, services or skills. This enables them to spend more on welfare. In addition, they don't have the problem of wasting trillions on military spending, like America.

Although a small island, Britain has upwards of nearly 70 million people (many would say 80 million).<sup>34</sup> This means that welfare spending is a huge proportion of national wealth and we cannot afford the luxuries of other wealthy European nations. Taxes are already too high. The net cost of 300,000 immigrants a year makes this worse.

### *Conclusion*

Without examining more government departments, we can summarise that both parties do good and bad things.

However, it is true to say that Left-wing parties have a poorer grasp of economics and spend more money creating fiscal deficits. They also tend towards centralised authoritarianism.

Political parties are not the answer. What is needed is effective leadership centred on common sense policies.

What we can affirm with historical certainty is that the more Marxist (more Left-wing) a country becomes, the more it is prone to violence, repression, despotism and hatred.

## Conclusion

Modern Woke Progressives need to wake up and understand that they have been played since birth by Cultural Marxists.<sup>35</sup> They have been brainwashed to hate and condemn with no basis. They support the Left as a result of historical ignorance.

If you hate people for no other reason than they are part of a certain group, then you are bigoted. If you hate a section of society because they are White, then you are racist. If you hate men in general then you are a chauvinist. Hatred is a sign of immaturity and weakness.

Progressives are hypocrites being all the things that they accuse others of. Rather than being progressive, they should be called 'Regressives'.

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

**Paul Fahy Copyright © 2020**  
**Understanding Ministries**  
<http://www.understanding-ministries.com>

---

<sup>34</sup> Census reports do not include huge numbers of illegal immigrants and long-term visitors. Tesco alleges that the population is 80 million based on its grocery database.

<sup>35</sup> To understand the history of this see my paper, 'The origin of Cultural Marxism'.