

How To Defeat The Western Propaganda War On Islam. Global and Domestic Islamic Institutions Have Failed Miserably To Defend Islamic Civilisation

By Matthias Chang – Future Fast-Forward

Preamble

In my meditation this morning, Whisper urged me to pen another message to all of you, regardless of your Faith, on the Western propaganda war on Islamic Civilisation. Muslims have lost this critical war because the leaders of Global Islamic Institutions have betrayed Islam and more damning is their inability to appreciate, practice and exemplify the model of Islamic civilisation.

Muslim leaders are barking up the wrong tree and diverting the UMMAH of their focus that the Holy Quran is the foundation of Islamic Civilisation. Period!

Failure To Appreciate Islamic Civilisation

People of all Faiths are generally lazy and even though they pray every day to the Almighty, and may have read the Holy Scriptures, they do not practice what they preach!

Go and discover from the Internet the meaning of “civilisation” and you will discover with just a click of the mouse that,

A civilization is generally defined as an advanced state of human society containing highly developed forms of government, culture, industry, and common social norms.

How many countries, labelled as “Muslim / Islamic” nations, come within the above simplified definition. None has dared arrogate that their country is a “developed” nation, but rather a “developing” country in the tedious process of evolving to the “developed” status, carrying the humiliating baggage that they are still “developing”.

What stage of development and by what Western standards?

Pitiful!

What a pitiful state of affairs! And yet, these countries and their inhabitants are so arrogant and ignorant, strutting like a peacock, as if they are so superior but in reality, nincompoops, still licking the arse of their colonial overlords!

The added insult is that a challenge was issued by one of the leading spokespersons of the Western civilisation, the American political scientist, professor Samuel P. Huntington in his book, **“The Clash of Civilisations”**.

How many Muslims have read this clarion call by Huntington to the Western powers that be, to be ready for this “Clash”, this war of civilisations? Very few, and even if they did, they did not fully understand the implications of the ensuing wars.

From the **Seminar Magazine**, I extracted the following:

On **5 November 2001**, **Noam Chomsky** gave a lecture on ‘Military, Democracy and People’s Right to Information’ at a public forum convened by the National Campaign for the People’s Right to Information. During the question-answer session that followed the lecture, Chomsky was asked whether he thought that ‘the present conflict between the Taliban and the US and its allies can be seen as a “clash of civilizations” of the kind expected by Samuel Huntington.’ His response:

Remember the context of Huntington’s thesis, the context in which it was put forth. This was after the end of the Cold War. For fifty years, both the US and the Soviet Union had used the pretext of the Cold War as a justification for any atrocities that they wanted to carry out. So if the Russians wanted to send tanks to East Berlin, that was because of the Cold War. And if the US wanted to invade South Vietnam and wipe out Indo-China, that was because of the Cold War. If you look over the history of this period, the pretext had nothing to do with the reasons. The reasons for the atrocities were based in domestic power interests, but the Cold War gave an excuse. Whatever the atrocity carried out, you could say its defence against the other side.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the pretext is gone. The policies remain the same, with slight changes in tactics, but you need a new pretext. And in fact there’s been a search for pretexts for quite a long time. Actually, it started twenty years ago. When the Reagan Administration came in, it was already pretty clear that appeal to the pretext of the Russian threat was not going to work for very long. So they came into office saying that the focus of their foreign policy would be to combat the plague of international terrorism.

That was twenty years ago. There’s nothing new about this. We have to defend ourselves from other terrorists. And they proceeded to react to that plague by creating the most extraordinary international terrorist network in the world, which carried out massive terror in Central America and Southern Africa and all over the place. In fact, it was so extreme that its actions were even condemned by the World Court and Security Council.

With 1989 coming, you needed some new pretexts. This was very explicit. Remember, one of the tasks of intellectuals, the solemn task, is to prevent people from understanding what’s going on. And in order to fulfil that task, you have to ignore the government documentation, for example, which tells you exactly what’s going on. This is a case in point.

Just to give you one illustration. Every year the White House presents to Congress a statement of why we need a huge military budget. Every year it used to be the same: the Russians are coming. The Russians are coming, so we need this monstrous military budget. The question that anyone who is interested in international affairs should have been asking himself or herself is, what are they going to say in March 1990? That was the first presentation to Congress after the Russians clearly weren't coming – they were not around anymore. So that was a very important and extremely interesting document. And of course, it is not mentioned anywhere, because it's much too interesting. That was March 1990, the first Bush Administration giving its presentation to Congress.

It was exactly the same as every year. We need a huge military budget. We need massive intervention forces, mostly poised at the Middle East. We have to protect what's called the 'defence industrial base' – that's a euphemism that means high-tech industry. We have to ensure that the public pays the costs of high-tech industry by funnelling it through the military system under the pretext of defence.

What does this have to do with Huntington? Well, he's a respected intellectual. He can't say this. He can't say, look, the method by which the rich run the world is exactly the same as before, and the major confrontation remains what it has always been: small concentrated sectors of wealth and power versus everybody else. You can't say that. And in fact if you look at those passages on the clash of civilizations, he says that in the future the conflict will not be on economic grounds. So let's put that out of our minds. You can't think about rich powers and corporations exploiting people, that can't be the conflict. It's got to be something else. So it will be the 'clash of civilizations' – the western civilization and Islam and Confucianism.

So, arseholes, and **notwithstanding this strident warning** of the reasons for the clash of civilisations (mentioning Islam), **Muslims nations did not give a f#@k and the leaders in OIC had their heads between their legs**, fantasising screwing Western virgins in the “Wonderland of Make Believe”.

I cry for Islam and the hypocrisy!

China and Russia knew the danger and prepared for the ultimate clash of civilisation which we are witnessing now in the war theatres in Ukraine, Gaza, Lebanon, Syria, Libya, the prelude to the Main Clash, WWIII.

Read my article I sent out yesterday and the questions that I posed! You did not bother to read because you had your head between your legs!

Why is it so difficult to join the dots when it is right in your face?

Again quoting Noam Chomsky, another warning,

Well, you can test that. It's a strange idea, but you can test it. For example, you can test it by asking how the United States, the leader of the western civilization, has reacted to Islamic fundamentalists. Well, the answer is, it's been their leading supporter. For instance, the most extreme Islamic fundamentalist state in the

world at that time was Saudi Arabia. Maybe it has been succeeded by the Taliban, but that's an offshoot of Saudi Arabian Wahhabism.

Saudi Arabia has been a client of the United States since its origins. And the reason is that it plays the right role. It ensures that the wealth of the region goes to the right people: not people in the slums of Cairo, but people in executive suites in New York. And as long as they do that, Saudi Arabian leaders can treat women as awfully as they want, they can be the most extreme fundamentalists in existence, and they're just fine. That's the most extreme fundamentalist state in the world.

What is the biggest Muslim state in the world? Indonesia. And what's the relation between the United States and Indonesia? Well, actually the United States was hostile to Indonesia until 1965. That's because Indonesia was part of the nonaligned movement. The United States hated Nehru, despised him in fact, for exactly the same reason. So they despised Indonesia. It was independent. Furthermore, it was a dangerous country because it had one mass-based political party, the PKI, which was a party of the poor, a party of peasants, basically. And it was gaining power through the open democratic system and therefore it had to be stopped.

The US tried to stop it in 1958 by supporting a rebellion. That failed. They then started supporting the Indonesian Army, and in 1965 the army carried out a coup, led by General Suharto. They carried out a huge massacre of hundreds of thousands, maybe a million people (mostly landless peasants), and wiped out the only mass-based party. This led to unrestrained euphoria in the West. The United States, Britain, Australia – it was such a glorious event that they couldn't control themselves.

The headlines were, 'A gleam of light in Asia', 'A hope where there once was none', 'The Indonesian moderates have carried out a boiling bloodbath'. I mean, they didn't conceal what happened – 'Staggering mass slaughter', 'The greatest event in history'. The CIA compared it to the massacres of Stalin and Hitler, and that was wonderful. And ever since that time, Indonesia became a favoured ally of the United States. It continued to have one of the bloodiest records in the late twentieth century (mass murder in East Timor, hideous tortures of dissidents, and so on), but it was fine. It was the biggest Islamic state in the world, but it was just fine. Suharto was 'our kind of guy' the way Clinton described him when he visited in the mid-nineties. And he stayed a friend of the United States until he made a mistake. He made a mistake by dragging his feet over IMF orders.

After the Asian crash, the IMF imposed very harsh orders, and Suharto didn't go along the way he was supposed to. And he also lost control of the society. That's also a mistake. So at that point the Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, gave him a telephone call, and said literally, 'We think it's time for a democratic transition.' Merely by accident, four hours later he abdicated, but Indonesia remained a US favourite.

Had I not warned repeatedly, that the Zionist Anglo-American Empire decides and chose what leaders needed to be installed as its lackeys? What further proof did you want?

There is now a "Clash of Civilisation"! What are the Muslims doing about it?