

Where Angels Fear to Tread

Why, I sometimes wonder does the law permit the media to attack Muslims, whilst it protects Jews and Christians from similar attacks? The simple answer is of course that there is no law against incitement to religious hatred which would protect Muslims, but there is a law against incitement to racial hatred which protects Jews and there is a law against blasphemy which protects Christians.

However it goes deeper than this – because if a Muslim exercises his or her right to freedom of speech by engaging in legitimate analysis of current events from a Qur’anic perspective in the media, more often than not such analysis is either censored or misrepresented so that it can be more easily attacked and ridiculed.

In recent months we have witnessed a sustained media attack on Islam and the Muslims – most of whom are linked with some form of terrorism or other – and even though it is not Muslims who have been responsible in recent years for the slaughter of many tens of thousands of innocent Muslim civilians in the Balkans, Checheniya, the Middle East and Afghanistan.

It is true that Muslims are permitted to speak out against terrorist acts, whether perpetrated abroad or in England, and to make it clear that the way of Islam does not condone such actions, whether they are committed by an individual, or a group, or a government. It is true that Muslims are permitted to encourage people in general terms to worship God by following the example of the Prophet Muhammad and his companions, may Allah bless him and them and grant them peace. It is true that Muslims are permitted to try and put the record straight when Islam and Muslims are misrepresented – but woe betide the writer who seeks to scratch beneath the surface of events in order to see what is actually going on in the world, especially if he or she analyses what is going on in the Middle East.

This is because any credible analysis of what is going on in the Middle East must necessarily entail a critique of Zionism – and anyone who looks too closely at Zionism will inevitably be branded as a racist, anti-Jewish and anti-semitic by the pro-Zionist media.

Imagine if I were to write something like : “The implementation of the Zionists’ publicly declared aim to establish a greater Israel which stretches from the Nile to the Euphrates has resulted in numerous attacks on Muslims in the Middle East and a worldwide attack on Islam and Muslims in the pro-Zionist media. Many tens of thousands of innocent Muslim civilians have been slaughtered as a result of the attempts to realise this aim. With respect, Madeleine Albright, it has not been worth it.”

There would be an immediate reaction in the pro-Zionist media: I would be accused of being racist, anti-Jewish, anti-semitic, a holocaust-denier to boot – and probably one of those conspiracy theory nutters into the bargain. One article would swiftly spawn another which would spark another and internet links and blog-spots would multiply overnight. Some might observe that they agreed with me, but the mud would stick – and few would look closely at the accusations which had so swiftly been made against me. So let us take a closer look :

“Racist and anti-Jewish”

Muslims come in every form, shape and colour – which is why English case law has definitively concluded that Muslims cannot be viewed as belonging to any particular race. Anyone who wishes to accept Islam is welcome to do so, whatever their ethnicity or racial background, and including Jews whether they be white Ashkenazi, or olive Sephardic or Mizrahi, or black Falasha – all of whom English case law regards as belonging to the same race and some of whom have accepted Islam.

If you attend any large mosque at prayer time, especially the jumu'a prayer on a Friday, you will find Muslims of every colour and race standing side by side in prayer. It is not part of the teachings of Islam to exclude anyone because of their race. In the eyes of God we are all equal, except in the respective degrees of our fearful awareness and awe of being continually in His presence. As Allah says in the Qur'an:

Our colour is from Allah

and who is better than Allah at giving colour?

And we are His worshippers.

(*Qur'an*: 2.136-138)

We cannot accept therefore that we are racist. The way of Islam is the best way to promote and establish peaceful integration between people from different races and backgrounds, since what we all share in common is recognition and worship of our Lord, our Creator.

As regards Zionism, it is common knowledge that although many Zionists are Jewish, many are not. The Zionist cause has been supported by people from many different ethnic, racial and national backgrounds from around the world for a number of reasons ranging from personal conviction to practical expediency. It follows therefore, that to be anti-Zionism is not to be anti-Jewish – and equally that to be anti-Zionism is not to be racist.

Most people who are anti-Zionist are anti-Zionist because of all of the suffering that the continued attempts to realise Zionist aspirations have caused. As Jabotinsky declared in 1923, “Zionism is a colonisation adventure and therefore it stands or falls by the question of armed force. It is important ... to speak Hebrew, but, unfortunately, it is even more important to be able to shoot.” As Ariel Sharon declared on Kol Yisrael radio on the 3rd October 2001, “Every time we do something you tell me America will do this and will do that ... I want to tell you something very clear: Don't worry about American pressure on Israel. We, the Israeli people, control America, and the Americans know it.”

What have been the fruits of Zionism? Hundreds of thousands of people have been driven forcibly from their homes and their land and tens of thousands have been killed or wounded by Israeli terrorists, from before Deir Yaseen in 1948 to after Jenin in 2002 and including the Sabra and Shatila refugee camp massacres in 1982. It is not racist to be sickened by such events and to speak out against them – and to advocate the way of Islam as a far more peaceful and positive way of life.

Indeed there are groups of orthodox Jews who are as opposed to Zionism as most Muslims and anti-war protesters are opposed to Zionism. It is ironic that there are even secular Zionists who are not practising (that is, worshipping God) Jews who accuse their practising Jewish critics of being “anti-semitic”!

Since the Israelis deny – on the basis of their race – resident Palestinians the democratic right to Israeli citizenship and the democratic right to vote in Israeli elections, it is clear that Israel is administered in a manner similar to the former apartheid regime in South Africa or to North America before blacks were granted the same rights as whites. If anyone is going to be labelled as being racist, it is in fact the Zionists – and not the Muslims.

To be anti-Zionism is not to be racist or anti-Jewish.

“Anti-Semitic”

As Chaim Weizman makes clear in his memoirs *Trial and Error*, the birthplace of Zionism (and Communism) is southern Russia, not the lands of the traditionally semitic people in the Middle East – and as Arthur Koestler makes clear in his well-researched book about the Khazars entitled *The Thirteenth Tribe* the origins of the southern Russian Jews are turkic, not semitic.

The Khazar, Ashkenazi Jews, are descended from the people of Gog and Magog who are descended from Japheth, the son of Noah – not from Shem, the son of Noah. The word ‘Semitic’ derives from the name Shem and means ‘descended from Shem.’ Thus to be anti-Semitic means to be “anti the people descended from Shem” – not “anti the people who are descended from Japheth”.

The people who are descended from Shem are principally the Arabs (whether Christian or Muslim) and the *original* twelve tribes of Israel. The people who are descended from Japheth include all the turkic tribes, including the Khazars (whether they are followers of the religion of Judaism or not).

This means that anyone who criticises Ashkenazi Zionists for attacking Semitic Palestinians cannot be described as being anti-Semitic – only anti-Turkic (although in fact Zionists are criticised because of their actions, not because of their ethnic origins). It also means that anyone who attacks the Arabs (including the Palestinians) or Sephardic or Mizrahi Jews (including those orthodox Jews who oppose Zionism) can truly be described as being anti-Semitic.

Since we sympathise with the Semitic Palestinians and agree with the Semitic Jews who oppose Zionism, if anything we should be described as being doubly pro-semitic – and not at all anti-semitic.

To be anti-Zionism is not to be anti-Semitic.

“Holocaust Denier”

If the eleventh commandment is, “Don’t get caught,” the twelfth commandment has probably become, “Thou shalt not deny the holocaust.” In some countries it has been made illegal to even question how records of Jews murdered in European concentration camps could have been so accurately kept during the tumult and fog of war.

Since I am a critic of Zionism, it has been alleged that I have denied the holocaust. In fact I have never denied the holocaust, although I have queried the accuracy of the precise number of Jews murdered, since the figure of 6 million would mean that approximately

2,700 Jews would have to have been murdered on every single day of the second world war, the equivalent of approximately two Srebreniza massacres per week for approximately 300 weeks. While observing that this does seem to be a very high murder rate to sustain uninterruptedly for six years, while also simultaneously waging a war on three fronts, I have always maintained that whatever the actual figure is, however much less or more, the holocaust remains a terrible, but not the only, example of man's inhumanity to man. I have always said that even one unjust death is one too many, quoting these words of Allah:

So We decreed for the tribe of Israel
that if someone kills another person –
unless it is in retaliation for someone else
or for causing corruption in the earth –
it is as if he had murdered all mankind.
And if anyone gives life to another person,
it is as if he had given life to all mankind.
Our Messengers came to them with Clear Signs
but even after that many of them
committed outrages in the earth. (Qur'an: 5.32)

To be anti-Zionism is not to be a holocaust denier.

I have always pointed out that I am disgusted by any tyrant who resorts to genocide and in my writings I have contrasted such barbarity with the example of Muslim Spain and the Muslim Ottomans who in return for payment of the annual jizya tax by every able-bodied Christian and Jewish male (4 gold dinars, the equivalent of approximately £150-00 today – far less than the Council Tax) granted the Christian and Jewish communities in their territory protection and self-governance in their internal affairs for centuries. When the Spanish Inquisition was busy exterminating Jews and Muslims in the Iberian peninsula during the 16th and 17th centuries CE, many Jews sought refuge and were granted refuge in the Ottoman territories in preference to Europe where pogroms of Jews were still taking place.

“Conspiracy Theorist”

Since I am a critic of Zionism, it has been alleged that I am a conspiracy theorist. In fact I have always rejected conspiracy theory – “How can an open norm be described as a conspiracy?” – whilst recognising that implementation of the publicly proclaimed Zionist aspiration to establish a Greater Eretz between the Nile and the Euphrates has inevitably shaped events and policies in the Middle East, from before the Balfour Declaration up until the present, including the invasion of Iraq.

If the Zionist dream of a Greater Eretz which stretches from the Nile to the Euphrates is to be realised, this means that parts of Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Kuwait, Arabia and possibly Iran will have to be (and are being) subdued in a manner similar to Palestine – which inevitably means an escalation in conflict in the Middle East. Who will be next, we all wonder, as the pro-Zionist media prepares the general public for what they will eventually be programmed to regard as part of the inevitable process of establishing

“democracy” in the Middle East – in spite of the Attorney-General’s considered legal opinion (7th March 2003) that as regards international law, “regime change cannot be the objective of military action,” – Iran or Syria?

I do believe that there are strategies which, although disguised at the time, in retrospect become apparent as events unfold, but this is not a “conspiracy” - it is tactics. For example, as far as I can see, the invasion of Iraq did not commence until after the weapons inspectors had ensured that there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq which could be used against the occupying forces. To my mind, this was not a conspiracy, it was a prudent military tactic – which also acted as a diversion while forces and bases quietly prepared for an attack which had been planned far in advance of the last minute theatrical denouement played out by the politicians before a general public clearly opposed to the invasion and equally unconvinced by the sudden threat of non-existent weapons of mass destruction. And if my body is found at the edge of a field near the woods with my wrists cut and not much blood – you can be sure it was not suicide!

As regards who plans the strategy, it is clear that large international corporations, like Bechtel, for example, do have long term strategies which are financed by the large banking institutions who handle their financial transactions. Without the finance, the strategy could not be realised. So who decides which war is to be financed and whether or not both sides or only one side are to be financed? Clearly this depends on the desired outcome of the war. The larger the investment, the more careful the planning, both short term and long term – but this is not a conspiracy. Every venture has its business plan. And who elects the governing elite of the international financial community? It certainly is not the general public – and it certainly is not a conspiracy. Every grouping has its chosen hierarchy.

I have been unable to find any explanation other than freemasonry for how linkage is achieved between, for example, the elites of the financial, the military and the political. Objectives are defined. Strategies are considered. Risks are assessed. Decisions are made. The more far-reaching the strategy and the greater the consequences of any decision, the more hidden the process is. This is neither sinister nor dextra. It is how things are done – and it certainly is not a conspiracy. Every grouping has its agenda.

To a certain extent, I am speculating – and if I am wrong, if even at the highest level the freemasons are no more than part-time charity fund-raisers with a fondness for drink and the donning of fancy dress – and if, for example, the significance of the masonic emblem of the pyramid with the seeing eye inscribed with the words “New World Order” in Latin which has graced the American one dollar bill for so many years is no more than a light-hearted piece of fanciful decoration, then of course I apologise unreservedly.

Perhaps, as a result of youthful inexperience and gullibility, I have in the past been unduly influenced by Henry Ford’s 1921 assessment of the notorious *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, which were first translated into English in 1905 – (“They have fitted the world situation up to this time. They fit it now.”) – whether it be the creation of the League of Nations and then the United Nations at an international level (the “official” world government of the proposed new world order, deflecting attention away from the actual unelected financial world government of the present world order), or the creation

of highly regulated police states at a national level, or the creation of economic impotence through interest based debts and crippling taxation at a community level, or the creation of confusion and sexual immorality by spreading false political and social theories amongst members of the general public through the media at an individual level, to give but a few examples – but when the events of the 11th September 2001 and the 7th July 2005 took place in New York and London, I could not help but be reminded of the following passage from Protocol 9 :

“You may say that the *goyim* will rise upon us, arms in hand, if they guess what is going on before the time comes; but in the West we have against this a manoeuvre of such appalling terror that the very stoutest hearts quail – the undergrounds, metropolitans, those subterranean corridors which, before the time comes, will be driven under all the capitals and from whence those capitals will be blown into the air with all their organisations and archives.”

Although I have never attached much importance to the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, since it has never been established who this pamphlet’s authors were or in what circumstances or with what intention it was written, it is with the above possibility in mind (and it remains no more than one of several possibilities) that I did suggest to the Home Office – and by extension to the intelligence services – that the possibility of the role of *agents provocateurs* in such events should be considered when searching for the brains behind the bombers.

Whatever the truth of the matter, to be anti-Zionism is not to be a conspiracy theorist.

And in the words of T S Eliot :

Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge?

Where is the knowledge we have lost in information? (*The Rock*)

And when the pro-Zionist media attacks are launched, what can one do? As Allah says in the Qur’an :

Seek help in steadfastness and prayer.

But that is a very hard thing,
except for the humble:

those who are aware that they will meet their Lord
and that they will return to Him.

(*Qur’an: 2.44-45*)

Ahmad Thomson