GlobalResearch
Center for Research on Globalization

The London Bridge Attack and What Is Behind the String of Terrorism

By Brandon Turbeville
Global Research, June 08, 2017
Activist Post 5 June 2017

Region: Europe
Theme: Intelligence, Police State & Civil Rights, Terrorism, US NATO War Agenda

"The rocket bombs which fell daily on London were probably fired by the Government of Oceania itself, 'just to keep people frightened.'" – 1984

There is much to say about the attacks that took place in London last night. If Theresa May has her way, however, there will be little chance to say anything. The ice queen of the common people has, in the wake of the horrific attacks, not only called for a suspension of the general election but also for greater control over the Internet. Now, with British SAS troops moving into London and much of the city already acclimated to seeing fully armed British soldiers on the streets, Britain has abandoned all pretense of the "Western freedoms" it once inaccurately portrayed itself as representing. The U.K. is now openly embracing the commune-fascism it once went great lengths to keep hidden.

Prime Minister Theresa May (credits to the owner of the photo)

May, in her totalitarian speech, claimed that the Internet needed more control because terrorists were allowed "safe spaces" online where their ideology could take root and blossom. Therefore, May wants the U.K. to bring legislation and pressure to bear on private companies to regulate and censor content and spaces online under the guise of preventing terrorism.

Of course, the U.K. could stop funding ISIS and other terrorists and terrorist organizations across the world. It could immediately ban Saudi Arabia from funding Wahhabist mosques all across England. It could cease allowing more immigrants from entering a country that has long suffered from an enormous shortage of jobs and whose communities are the locales from which these terrorists almost solely come from. The U.K. could even re-prioritize police efforts to arrest and prosecute victimless drug crimes and focus on actual

violence and terrorism but, I digress. It appears that freedom, economics, and reason are now passé, while shutting down free speech and free thought sounds like a much better option.

There are, however, at least three points that need to be made about these acts of terrorism as well as the previous ones in relation to the U.K. Indeed, there are three levels to any discussion of the attacks at London Bridge.

First, after decades of unfettered immigration from cultures often far different than that of the U.K., the British people are now reaping what has been sown by their government in the form of often violent hostility to anything British and British culture in general. Granted, many of the immigrants have entered Britain from lands that jolly ol' England bombed, occupied, or generally terrorized for decades and, thus, you can see why British patriotism might not be the highest on their priority list. Still, after decades of such policies which were admittedly implemented for the purpose of changing British culture forever, England's cities contain areas where white Britons are now afraid to go for fear of being attacked by "immigrants," and members of council who refuse to shake the hands of their female constituents because it violates their extreme form of religion. Anyone who has traveled to England and especially London in the last few years can attest to the vast demographic changes that have taken place as a result of Britain's open immigration policies.

The elephant in the room is that the overwhelming majority of terror attacks are coming from these communities. Most Westerners, however, are afraid to state the obvious because doing so will undoubtedly open them up to catcalls of "racism" and "xenophobia," the punishment for questioning the sacred cow of "cultural diversity."

But the question of terrorism in the U.K. is not that simple. Right wingers would have everyone believe that such terror is the work of "Muslims" and immigrants and that the issue doesn't go any deeper than that. Some people, according to them, are just bad seeds at the macro level and so "they" are the problem and "we" are the good guys. "Muslims" are taught from day one to hate Westerners, Christians, Jews, and all non-Muslims. Even the ones who aren't violent and who act like any other Westerner, according to the right wingers, are just acting, waiting for their chance to destroy Western society and impose the caliphate from within.

But where does radical Islamic terrorism really have its roots? It certainly is not in Syria since both the Syrian government and the Syrian people have been the greatest force against it for the last six years. It certainly wasn't Saddam Hussein and it isn't Iran. In fact, it's nowhere that the United States and the U.K. have been bombing for the past several decades. The roots of extremism come from British allies like Saudi Arabia and other Gulf states.

source: yournewswire.com

More importantly, the roots of extremism are firmly planted in the halls of MI-6, the CIA, and other Western intelligence agencies as well as the halls of the British government who not only manipulate jihadists, but actually create, fund, and direct them throughout the entire world, including on British soil.

Simply put, the U.K. is experiencing the results of the arming of terrorists across the world, allowing Saudi Arabia to fund Wahhabist mosques throughout England, and engaging in imperialist wars all over the planet. Whenever you dump money into terrorism and incubate it on your soil, shit tends to happen.

After all, when you allow a foreign country to pour millions of dollars into mosques that teach children and angst-ridden young people in the ways of extremism as well as hatred for an authoritarian government that keeps them down, all the while dropping bombs on their next of kin overseas, what exactly do you expect to follow?

Lastly, we cannot ignore the history of terrorism in the Western world, particularly the terrorist acts that have taken place in the years after 9/11. Almost all of these attacks appear to have been the result of pre-planning by Western intelligence agencies much more so than any that are organic "homegrown" or simply jihadist-based terrorism. That is not to say that the will, desire, and means to conduct such attacks against British society do not exist. Quite the contrary. However, in the vast majority of the attacks in Britain, the assailants were well known to authorities, many having even been arrested, released (from rather serious crimes), and monitored before, during, and up until the very moment the attacks took place. Such is a hallmark of false flag government-sponsored terror.

Labour candidate, Jeremy Corbyn (credits to the owner of the photo)

These attacks are much more often than not, completely engineered by Western intelligence agencies or, at the very least, known about beforehand and allowed to happen for political purposes. Whether it is terrifying the domestic population into accepting a greater police state or more foreign wars, or whether is simply an attempt to change and direct the public's mood in one direction or other, false flag terror has been used expertly throughout the post-9/11 Western world. Thus, it would be entirely naïve to suggest the timing of the attacks is not intentional. Indeed, only a week before the general election as the wave of popular sentiment appeared to be leaning to the apparent anti-war Jeremy Corbyn when ISIS attacks innocent people in the most grotesque fashion, not only inspiring a "crackdown on the Internet" but also a suspension of the general elections. This suspension is likely to last just long enough to smear Corbyn as a weakling and a naïve

peacenik who isn't fit to lead in the modern world of domestic terror and constant violence.

But if it is not a coincidence that the attacks occurred when they did, what does that mean? Clearly, it means that the real organizers were members of a deeper state apparatus than anything resembling bearded freaks in a London flat, obsessing over jihadists forums.

The UK has never been known for freedom and democracy but now even the semblance of normalcy and relative calm has disappeared from England and, once again, British people will be living in a country full of troops on the street where the freedoms of thought, speech, and even expression will be suppressed. The troops will serve to remind them that they live in a truly authoritarian country and to make sure that anyone who doubts the new reality will be relieved of their disbelief.

The wars will not stop, however, and neither will the terrorism unless the British people initiate a revolution of their own which brings about an end to the U.K.'s foreign wars, funding of terrorism, trampling of rights at home, and destructive immigration policies.

Brandon Turbeville – article archive here – is the author of seven books, Codex Alimentarius — The End of Health Freedom, 7 Real Conspiracies, Five Sense Solutions and Dispatches From a Dissident, volume 1 andvolume 2, The Road to Damascus: The Anglo-American Assault on Syria, The Difference it Makes: 36 Reasons Why Hillary Clinton Should Never Be President, and Resisting The Empire: The Plan To Destroy Syria And How The Future Of The World Depends On The Outcome. Turbeville has published over 1000 articles on a wide variety of subjects including health, economics, government corruption, and civil liberties. Brandon Turbeville's radio show Truth on The Tracks can be found every Monday night 9 pm EST at UCYTV. His website is BrandonTurbeville.com He is available for radio and TV interviews. Please contact activistpost (at) gmail.com.

Featured image: RT via Activist Post

The original source of this article is Activist Post
Copyright © Brandon Turbeville, Activist Post, 2017

Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: Brandon Turbeville

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