

State Violence, Free Speech and the Rise of Xenophobia

By Yamin Zakaria

Global Research, August 27, 2005

27 August 2005

Theme: Police State & Civil Rights

Which is worse, those who incite violence, those who practice violence or those who practice violence while lecturing their victims?

Why do nations, that profit most from the sale of weapons for war, death and destruction, shout loudest in claiming to be proponents of peace?

How can the Christian-West bully others with charges of anti-Semitism, when they are the ones who built the gas chambers, implemented the inquisition, and carried out routine pogroms against the Jews for centuries?

In any legal system, the testimony of a proven liar has little merit if any at all, but why then do we have to accept and abide by the words of those who openly lied about Iraq's WMDs, or is this a virtue of a capitalist-democracy! Now we have mass murderers that have slaughtered over 100,000 civilians in Iraq, preaching about non-violence and the sanctity of innocent civilians, or is that UK civilians only? Words of hypocrites and liars are always exposed by their inconsistent deeds, and the following examples from recent events will further illustrate.

An American Judge recently ruled that it was the notion of free speech dictated by the first amendment, which gave the right to the newspaper [1] in Arizona to publish letters calling for the killing of any Muslim civilians, in retaliation for the deaths of any US soldiers in Iraq. So, here "free" speech takes precedence over the incitement to murder innocent Muslims.

For sure, if any Muslim did anything remotely close to that, they would be automatically locked up in Camp-X-Ray for inciting violence. In fact, just on mere suspicion the Muslims get locked up in accordance to the doctrine of pre-emptive strike. This behaviour in the language of the cowboys from the Wild West or a KKK (Ku Klux Klan) member is: kill the Sand-Niggers and if they say anything we lynch them and even if we think they are gone say something we lynch them, like a per-emptive strike.

This week, the abusive xenophobic preacher, Pat Robertson, called for US Special Forces to take out, (assassinate) President Hugo Chavez, the democratically elected head of Venezuela. Chavez has not waged a military campaign against the US, on the contrary the US have funded coup attempts against him, underlining their status as democracy hypocrites. Despite calling for the assassination of the head of a democracy, on national TV, he has not been accused of inciting terrorism or murder or hate! Imagine the hysteria it would have caused, if a similar incitement was made by any Muslim on national TV, calling for the assassination of President Bush or Blair. NB: these two cases mentioned are not equivalent, as Bush and Blair are mass-murdering war criminals, for whom the Hague or

Nuremburg equivalence are required, with an appropriate sentence for their crimes, whereas President Chavez is a new born baby compared to them!

This incident is even more ironic when you consider that Pat Robertson is a Bible-bashing fanatic, those people are constantly lecturing the non-Christian world and especially the Muslims, that they should turn the other cheek like Jesus. Of course we know why they preach such a message from history, both recent and distant, Africans, Native Americans and others will testify that they got the Bible shoved down their throats, were told to turn the other cheek to invasion, murder, ethnic cleansing and genocide in return for the loss of their lands, languages and way of life.

Chavez's real crime is like Saddam, possessing lots of oil while showing disobedience to the US corporate interests. Pat Robertson himself stated the oil factor: a dangerous enemy to our south, controlling a huge pool of oil that could hurt us very badly. How can a relatively poor and militarily weak country like Venezuela hurt a superpower? Again Pat Robertson stated they could hurt us, meaning it is time for another pre-emptive strike. Far from turning the other cheek, Pat Robertson believes in pre-emptive slaps! These preachers are not followers of Jesus but of Judas.

Then the other crusader, Pope Benedict of the Catholic Church, lectured Muslims to tackle the cruel fanaticism of terrorism, as if "terrorism" is the sole reserve of the Muslims. He obviously thinks that, the Western-Christian forces invading Muslim countries, killing innocent women, children and men by the tens of thousands, delivering State Terrorism are in line with Biblical teachings and Catholic doctrine. Or is this again the noble savage being told to turn the other cheek and not resist, lie back and enjoy it! Does anyone remember the Vatican calling the Serbs and Croats fanatics, murderers, terrorists or any such like? 200,000 Muslims bludgeoned, battered, raped, mutilated, shot, knifed, crucified (oh yes) in the centre of Christian Europe by the Christian Serbs and Croats and not a whisper. Had it been the Muslims slaughtering 200,000 Christians, no doubt it would then have been the cruel fanaticism of terrorism.

Enough with the Christian-Fanatics let us now look at what the secular fanatics have been up to. The shadow education secretary, David Cameron of the Conservative party compared Islamic extremist, meaning those who adhere to Islamic teachings, to the Nazis. I did not realise Muslims adhered to such European traditions as Nazism, was it not invented and practiced in Europe. Why the constant cry about the Muslims not integrating then?

Nazis killed millions and for the last 50 years it is Muslims who have also been killed in their millions, yet to Mr Cameron, we are the aggressors like the Nazis, what a twisted little mind he and his ilk have. The Nazis created unjust laws to victimise and alienate minorities, similar to what the British government has started to do. Like the Nazis, Mr Cameron, it is your government that have bombed, imprisoned, killed and tortured hundreds of thousands of Muslims. Nazi ideology is exclusively based on the supremacy of one race, while Islam is the exact opposite, all races being equal, yet Mr Cameron claims Islam/Muslims are similar to the Nazis. He called Muslims violent for resisting aggression in their own lands, but he thinks that invading a country which did not attack his and murdering over 100,000 civilians is not violent. I thought we no longer live in the age of racist white-Imperialism, Mr Cameron have you heard the one about people who live in glass houses, shouldn't throw stones.

I would not call Mr Cameron or Blair or Bush Nazis, as the Nazis were more civilised in some

respects. The Nazis did not for instance imprison, rape and torture children [2] as the "liberators" has been doing in Iraq. It was not the Nazis who started to bomb civilians en masse. German and Japanese cities were deliberately targeted to cause maximum deaths amongst the civilians, a favoured tactic of $\hat{a} \in \text{Domber} \hat{a} \in \text{Domber} \hat{$

Why were the Atomic bombs used against Japan's cities when it was already close to surrender? It was close to surrendering because the firebombing of Tokyo had already killed more than the numbers in Hiroshima and Nagasaki combined; also Hirohito already sent a message through Stalin to Truman that he wanted to negotiate surrender. If, the bomb was used to bring the war to an early end, surely the first one was more than adequate, why the second bomb after three days, in a war that had already lasted 6 years? Because these are the actions of inhuman beasts and savages; and these are the people lecturing the world about terrorism. However, I do agree with many of the Americans who claimed the bombs ended the war early and saved lives, because the back-up plan was the mass-production of chemical weapons to be used against Japanese cities that envisaged killing as many as 5 million people. So, you see, the most violent people on earth are lecturing the Muslims, and it would take the action of millions of Islamic "terrorists" to attempt to equal their horrific record.

Now Blair wants to crack down on anyone glorifying or justifying "terrorism" But who will crack down on those who justify, glorify and actually practice terrorism, State Terrorism? If "terrorism" is the problem then why not define it, and more importantly apply the definition consistently. Obviously neither the US nor the British government can define it, as they will themselves be incriminated by those definitions. They are too embarrassed to say what those terms really mean: Terrorism is retaliatory strikes against the US and UK aggression; incitement to hate†is expressing political opposition to the Anglo-US war crimes; incitement to violence is calling for armed resistance to US-UK aggression.

Not surprising, Blair is off to join the Carlyle group after he leaves the post of Prime Minister and he has been rewarded handsomely for generating the business of war. Naturally, he joins the war industry as the Carlyle group has very strong links to the White House and defence industry. Blair, you will be drinking the blood of the Iraqi children and consuming the flesh of their parents, I wonder even Hell can accept or accommodate people like you.

Another glaring hypocrisy missed by many is the issue of women's rights. Post 9/11 and 7/11, majority or significant proportion of the attacks were directed against Muslim women in the US and the UK. They are easily identified by their Islamic clothing of Khimar (Head Scarf) and Jilbab (long loose dress). After, lecturing about how sacred women's rights are in the West and especially how oppressed Muslim women are, the society did not even think twice to attack the so-called "oppressed" One would have expected these flag bearers of womens rights, to show at least some level of remorse for attacking Muslim women, after the event. All those infamous and anti-Islamic newspaper columnists, journalists and politicians found their tongues and brain cells paralysed, suffering from a disease called hypocritus!

You see, the acid test works, hypocrites and liars cannot hide, as sooner or later they will be exposed by their own deeds.

Whilst Bush and Blair try to legislate against people thinking, disagreeing and resisting; they are dependent on the masses not seeing past their spin. Sooner or later people will ask about their inconsistencies, their hypocrisy and their lies, and they will have a great fall, when that happens, all of the presidents men wont be able to put Grumpy and Lumpy back together again!

The original source of this article is Global Research Copyright © Yamin Zakaria, Global Research, 2005

Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: Yamin Zakaria

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca