Embedded Protest

We must understand that protest movements in the DTS are fully embedded into their societies. The atomized individuals of high-tech mass societies have very limited physical or mental autonomy apart from being part of the whole. This is because of the systematic disintegration of communities and autonomous structures. They are completely dependent upon the dominant society, and particularly the multi- and transnational networks to fulfill even their most basic needs, like water, food, clothing, housing. And they know that moving out of bounds may result in heavy penalties and isolation.

You cannot really put up a serious struggle against an enemy which has nearly complete control over you. One of the most fundamental rules of resistance is that we have to develop self-sufficient and sustainable communities which can keep the struggle alive even under all kinds of pressures being applied against us.

The protest movements in the DTS generally have no solid material or spiritual foundation, and are therefor easy to handle by the authorities. Protesting in a cage is better than doing nothing at all, and may actually help to save or recover some dignity and self-respect. But it does not offer any hope to ever break out and gain control of our own lives.

What we are often told is that we have to settle for small incremental changes taking a long time. This is not only quite discouraging, but seems plain wrong. From what we can learn from the past, there have been periods of rapid and fundamental change, whole civilizations disappeared, knowledge and ways were lost.

The stakes are quite high today, maybe higher than ever before. The reason is that the DTS, which dominate world order today, not only have the most destructive technology, but also an extremely destructive and violent mentality. We have forgotten what it means to be a human being and part of creation. Not willing or able to face ourselves and take responsibility for our actions, our societies, full of fear, will continue to spread death and destruction until the bitter end.

Internalization of Defeat

Internalization of defeat means to retreat without being physically forced to. It is a state of mind which makes people give up before they even seriously try. The perceptions and expectations of affected people are altered in such a way that they are obedient in anticipation of what may happen, become submissive and overly careful, and shrink when even remotely threatened. Like as if their backbone had been broken they can no longer walk straight.

Political movements in the DTS lost on many fronts and repeatedly, but even more important is the apparent inability or unwillingness to accept the challenge, to learn and reorganize. Indeed, most of the political left gave up or corrupted their positions, appearing both disoriented and fearful, mentally and physically giving ground to the enemy without being forced to. The enemy is not something abstract or theoretical, but first and foremost ourselves and our own societies.

Thoroughly indoctrinated to the point of inability to see themselves and their actions for what they are, and corrupted by comforting privileges and self-righteousness, the most DTS-schooled people are generally among the last true believers and strong defenders

of Western civilization with its core idea-values freedom, democracy, human rights, progress, rule of law and private property.

In particular, and especially since the end of the Cold War, the DTS peace movements lost most of their credibility. Not only did we fail to stop the most outrageous aggressions by our countries, but repeatedly proved ourselves complicit. Be it by supporting sanctions against Iraq, accepting or even demanding 'humanitarian' intervention, keeping silence about persecution of 'terrorist suspects', or refusing to name 'peace keeping operations' as military intervention and occupation, to point out just some examples. This does not mean that all participants of the peace movement are compromised, but if a peace movement allows these kind of positions to be a part of itself, the movement as such is compromised.

The refusal to stand in defense and uncompromised solidarity with the attacked, and their struggles against us, reflects a clear decision to stand with our own (aggressor) society against the attacked others. This is further aggravated by the fact that these assaults and occupations are easy to analyze and comprehend, unprovoked aggressions by our societies, destroy and kill operations against heavily outgunned and largely defenseless populations, with no component of self-defense, despicable and justified only by might and overwhelming violence.

The situation was different in some of the inner-imperialist wars of the past (for example WW-I and WW-II), insofar as these were wars of the Great Powers fighting each other for control over foreign peoples, territories and world order. The anti-war movements could be against war as such and avoid taking side because these wars were among equals in spirit and purpose. In contrast, the colonial/imperialist/humanitarian interventions and assaults of today clearly demand that we stand up and struggle in solidarity on the side of the attacked, without condition or hesitation and against our own societies.

After the Cold War, the political 'left', of which much of the 'peace' movements are a part, found itself caught in its past, unwilling or unable to adjust to changing contexts and make good use of the bitter experiences of defeat and defection, identify and build upon the few strengths and victories, turned instead into a relict of the past with no momentum to break the vicious cycles, where even large numbers of people on the streets became meaningless at best.

So they still look out for the 'good side' worthy of support, and if the attacked in their judgement are not really 'good' or even 'bad', they are in trouble. Still internationalists striving to save the whole world not just from themselves and their societies interventions and assaults, but committed to 'help' promote 'peace and justice worldwide'.

I am most tired of the 'peace and justice worldwide' talk, which, in some abstract sense, sounds good to most (after all, who is openly for war and injustice?), while at closer look being the worst totalitarian nightmare imaginable. In the context we are living today, 'peace worldwide' can only be a negative peace in terms of absense of any serious challenge to the rulers, the violent imposition of relations as forced pacification with every serious resistance broken and suppressed, and people living in complete subjugation and desperation, hoping for always the next election to bring some modest change of their fate and mostly waiting in vain.

'Peace and justice', like freedom, democracy and human rights, have been turned into propaganda for intervention and aggression to force compliance under the particular and narrow worldview of the dominant societies.

Who can negotiate and define from a position of hegemony, and whose justice and institutions will prevail? The answer is as simple as the consequences: there will be no justice, insofar and as long as the DTS rule continues.

The question must be allowed to ask: what if peace is not an option, mainly because the DTS won't stop attacking and the anti-war forces are too weak and undetermined to force them? What if justice requires victory because it should not be compromised?

The principle of non-violence

We see the workings of internalization of defeat in the constant repetition of the ideology of non-violent protest and civil disobedience as the only legitimate means of resistence. If accompanied by determined and forceful action, it may at least retain some credibility. But it generally seems more or less self-defeating, because dividing struggle into legal/illegal and peaceful/violent is one of the main means of governments to weaken and control protest/resistance movements.

For example, how could the Iraqi resistance possibly be non-violent and why should they comply with human rights, international law and conventions? Isn't it much more effective to kill recruits before they enter into service for the occupation/colonial government and deter others to even try to join the colonial police and military forces? Aren't foreign contractors a good target and at least a good source of funds through ransom? And why would NGOs not be an appropriate target given their crucial role in the processes of pacification, social engineering and mind control? And, above all, what would give members of the aggressor societies the moral standing to judge the methods of resistance used to defend against them?

Ghandi

Powerful idea-values have been created from prominent non-violent struggles of the past. Ghandi and the Hindu anti-colonial struggle in India is maybe the most prominent example. Some crucial reasons for British departure from India are usually conveniently ignored, not because they are secret, but in order to exaggerate the effects of the anti-colonial peaceful mass protest. The British

- had exploited their colony to a point where the costs of the occupation had become a bad investment;

- after WW-II no longer needed to recruit troops from their colonies;

- had agreed, in negotiations with the US, to open their colonial enclosures in favor of world market multinationalism (the New World Order);

- were concerned with handing over power to loyal forces and weakening their enemies.

India had long been the forerunner and showcase of British colonialism and was to be the model for de-colonized independence as well. The outcome of that exercise couldn't have hardly been more pleasing to the British. What the British had achieved, with the help of Ghandi, is a smooth transition from British colonial rule to so called independence. The new Hindu rulers were loyal to Britain all the way, now self-administering, but not at all independent. Meanwhile, the de-colonization process was

not non-violent at all. Just the violence was not primarily targeting the colonizers, but erupted among the peoples of the subcontinent instead.

> It is interesting to note that in most cases when the oppressive occupational forces are overthrown, it is the down trodden and oppressed who take their revenge and the oppressors have to face the wrath. To the contrary, the British colonialists were peacefully watching and enjoying Hindus and Muslim busy in cutting each other's throat. No one of us even looked at occupation forces with disdain.

> British occupiers rather became more important and honourable. A British, who had never been to Indian sub-continent, was sitting in a Hotel in Lahore, drawing red lines and giving final touches to the future map of the sub-continent. Every line from his pen became a crack in the Muslims unity and added strength to India in the years to come.

> On the other hand, last viceroy, Lord Mountbatten, was sitting with top Indian leaders in his Delhi palace. The Indian leadership delivered eloquent speeches in Indian parliament on the blessings of independence and freedom from the British rule on August 5, 1947. However, soon afterwards they visited Lord Mountbatten, and Jawaharlal Lal Nehru offered him to be the Governor General of India. He gladly accepted the offer. ... [1]

Not for his service to the British and the upper Hindu castes to build the post-colonial Brahminic Social Order (BSO), but because they want to limit resistance to peaceful protest and non-violence is Ghandi being praised by leaders of the Western World. In many cases, the division of resistance on the basis of means instead of goals has gone so far that solidarity and unity in struggle has become a farce.

> [The Western World] praise it [non-violence] because they would like people of countries they exploit or occupy to resist only by 'non-violence'. The praise is extended in the hope that it would help in social engineering ... that ensures that the underdog seldom barks and never bites. The truth, however, is that the *satyagirah* (peaceful protest) by M.K.Ghandi attracted huge crowds and their passion often led to violence. ...

> The religious doctrine of *Ahimsa* [non-injury] and political methodology of non-violence continue to have a role as an instrument of social engineering in India. It is used to decry movements of liberation and to demonize Muslims and Sikhs. But it plays no part in the design of Indian polity or policy. The Government of India feels free to use force to keep the people disarmed and down; in fact it uses force frequently and wantonly against them. India has little use for the legacy of M.K.Ghandi ... Even his principal legacy - bringing Dalits [Untouchables] , STs [Scheduled Tribes] and BCs [Backward Castes] within the Hindu fold - stands discredited and inadequate, even unfocussed and misdirected. ... His prime role and his biggest achievement were to hide the true scope

```
of his fake non-violence and sell it as a doctrine of peace
and harmony. [2]
```

Civil Rights and Anti-Apartheid

Other prominent examples are the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa and the Civil Rights Movement in the US. Both were quite limited in scope, mainly struggles against racism and for nominal equality and increased participation/integration. Both failed to re-distribute wealth in favor of the dispossessed, and did not at all question the political/judicial/economic system and principles. The limited scope of demands allowed the dominant society to compromise and implement reforms which ultimately enabled it to turn things to its favor and keep the bottom down.

The legacy of Dr M.L.King is a heavy burden in several aspects. As much as he may have been a person of integrity and determined to struggle against racism, his dream of unity, and peace and justice worldwide continues to resonate until today, although we should have long been awaken, see things like they are and act accordingly. Racism is no longer official government policy, but nevertheless systemic and systematic, unceasing and everywhere to sense although harder to prove. Black peoples continue to be among the most poor and oppressed peoples within the USA, only the Indigenous peoples tend to be living under worse conditions. Mass imprisonment and prison labor are used to devastate and terrorize communities while recovering some of the costs of the system and lowering the bottom line of price and conditions of labor.

Dr King's "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere." is not only wrong, but justification of worldwide intervention in the name of justice. Quite the opposite, the idea of justice everywhere is a threat to justice anywhere.

South Africa, instead of becoming a beacon of liberation and mass empowerment, under ANC rule resumed its role as SIC (Sub-Imperialist Country), now unhindered by sanctions and boycotts, even highly regarded and respected. Meanwhile, the masses of South Africa and neighboring countries continue to suffer poverty and powerlessness, still deprived of the land and means of production under control of the White settlers and international capital. South Africa was instrumental in paving the way for collaboration between the AU and NATO against African peoples. African troops are being used to intervene against and occupy weak African countries under directives of the UN/DTS. There is no definition of an AU to protect, defend or liberate its member countries from UN/DTS intervention and exploitation, to regain control of finances, trade and resources from international capital and IFIs in order to be able to define and control development for themselves. Post-apartheid South Africa helped make sure that the dream of African Unity turned into a nightmare of accelerated (re)colonization and forced assimilation.

"Their violence hardly ever fails"

The sad and disturbing truth is, that the most violent societies are the most dominant, and that their violence hardly ever fails to achieve desired goals. Violence and terror are extremely successful means to put people down, spread fear and thereby deter from resisting, or just to eliminate people regarded either as dangerous or overpopulation. Modern societies could not exist without massive armed forces and prisons, and their wealth depends on military superiority and enforcement of their interests.

The potential of non-violent resistance may not be underestimated, but on the other side we should not fail to see that armed struggle can inflict significant damage even to a vastly superior enemy. To fundamentally change relations and order can never be

a orderly peaceful process. Instead it will always be tumultuous and more likely than not increasingly violent as things grow more acute.

Peaceful means is the keyword of the rulers to restrict people to harmless expressions of opinion. Wait for the next election, call or write your political representative, protest or march surrounded by cops or fenced into some space. Don't damage any things, don't block traffic or business, don't defend yourself and yours against state violence, in short, don't really do anything to fight back. And we behave like sheep, confined into the desired space by the dogs on command by the shepherd. How pathetic!

Beware the 'Social Globalizers'

The most dangerous political groups and organizations today are the 'social globalizers', the one-world, human rights and democracy, liberal and multi-culti, peace and justice worldwide people. They are so dangerous because too many people listen to their sly talk and forked tongues. They try to lure people into believing the rotten ideology and idea-values of the Europeans and their Diaspora and thereby defend White supremacy and prolong DTS domination.

Always in another propaganda campaign, lying and spinning stories is an integrated and indispensible part of the activities of political/activist groups and organizations. Attributes like frank, honest and straight are rarely found, particularly among those in the upper hierarchies. This is not so much individual and personal, but part of their role. Whoever the actor, the role is already largely defined through the expectations of the constituency and how politics works.

There have always been rational and ethical constructs for more intervention and aggression. And hardly ever do interventionists talk about their underlying motives and interests. And there were always those colonial subjects and 'third world' people who parrot or even embrace the ideas and values of the oppressors, especially when educated and schooled their way or enjoying privileges of whatever kind from them. Much too often, cowardly hiding behind curtains of political correctness and nice talk, we find ruthless interventionists, assimilationists and warmongers.

It became obvious in recent years that most of the political groupings of the DTS left and right share basic principles, assumptions and interests, and that political differences among them are merely about tactics and interpretation. For some example cases, read The Right like the Left. In particular, they remain convinced of their superiority and see themselves as entitled to lead the world, mostly presented as 'aid', 'assistance' and 'consulting', a rephrasing of the colonial White man's burden.

The whole notion that the aggressor societies have a role to play helping their victims out of the horror they bombed and maneuvered them into, is pathetic. Even worse, genocide prevention and intervention, advocated by people from the most violent societies ever known, is nothing but cynical justification of more mass extermination, subjugation and oppression. We have proven repeatedly that we know much about how to organize and profit from war, how to seize trade, exploit and devastate, contaminate and impoverish, destroy and exterminate. Whoever wants more of the same may go with us.

The DTS are tolerant as long as they remain unchallenged on top of the hierarchy and be the final judges. They reserve for themselves to punish any nations or nation not in their fold or trying to break free, and distribute rewards for obedience and assimilation. Those who dare resist will face all kinds of pressures and a comprehensive strategy of

triage (assimilate, subdue, exterminate). Following the globalizers of whatever political orientation is a one way street to the worst tyranny ever suffered throughout all known history.

Respect other Way of Life

Everything circles around the core issue, which is how we relate to other peoples and ways of life, meant not just as individual freedoms, multicultural deviation or minority protection, but people living by fundamentally different comprehesive codes and principles. The key is to leave other peoples alone and refrain from intervening into their affairs. Respecting other ways of life is principally incompatible with concepts to oblige all to comply with whatever human rights or international laws and standards.

Humans cannot create any absolute principles or rules, because everything human is just relative to other human. As humans we are limited in all kinds of ways and not at all eternal and absolute. The concept to declare human rights as morally binding for all, whatever the talk and tactical calculus, at closer look reveals a totalitarian mindset.

We need some other humans because we are social beings, we need food, water and shelter to survive. There is plenty of food sources and water for all of us. No need for any lifeboat ethics. We are all free and therefor responsible. But beyond these basic commonalities we are different in most aspects. Race and sex, classes and castes, culture, customs, language, relations among each other and with other living, purpose in life and definition of objectives, obligations and responsibilities, cosmology and metaphysics, rationality and perceptions, attitudes and religious beliefs...

And not just do we see all these differences, but we find that often these differences are serious and even mutually exclusive. What one peoples want is not what others want, and some things are not even tolerable for some which are essential for others. Mostly there is neither need nor benefit in compromizing and we can avoid unnecessary confrontation by separating and going each our ways. It is imperative at this point to give up the idea that any political/economic/judicial system may be fitting all.

For example, democracy has become something of a universal idea-value. Not that the practise of democracy would in any way justify the notion that it is somehow a superior system and value in itself, even less a universal one. But, defying all reason and experience, it is being treated that way by many. It is fetish more than anything else, where a means is being treated as if it were an objective in itself. To such lows has the spiritual and intellecual understanding of the DTS and their followers descended.

Living under secular democracies all life, from my perspective, it is the worst of all systems, for both theoretical and practical reasons, but let me just mention that democracy tends to dumb people down to a level of party slogans, and that it features falseness and dirty compromising instead of good speech and wise decisions. You have a vote, but it usually has only minuscule statistical and none practical weight. Voting really is a procedure to confirm that someone (still) believes in the system.

Another example how different people define and understand. The primary sources of law for Muslims are the Qur'an and Sunnah. Contrary to popular prejudice, there is no problem with modernization and adjustment of these laws, because the basic concept is that these laws are eternal and immutable as revealed by the Creator.

```
What must be taken into account is the profound difference
between the Semitic and more particularly Islamic conception
```

```
of law on the one hand and the modern one on the other. The
Semitic conception, shared by Judaism and Islam, sees law as the
embodiment of the Divine Will, as a transcendent reality which
is eternal and immutable, as a model by which the perfections
and shortcomings of human society and the conduct of individuals
are judged, as the guide through which man gains salvation and,
by rejecting it, courts damnation and destruction. [3]
```

The problem therefor cannot be to adjust Shari'ah laws to the fashions and convenience of the believers, but that the believers do not live according to the divine truth and laws. To be clear, there is negotiation and interpretation, different schools and traditions, but remaining within the frames as defined by Islam.

```
These days we are often told that we must keep up with the times.
Rarely does one ask what have the 'times' to keep up with. For
men who have lost the vision of a reality which transcends time,
who are caught completely in the mesh of time and space and
who have been affected by the historicism prevalent in modern
European philosophy, it is difficult to imagine the validity
of a truth that does not conform to their immediate external
environment. Islam, however, is based on the principle that
truth transcends history and time. Divine Law is an objective
transcendent reality, by which man and his actions are judged,
not vice versa. ... To attempt to shape the Divine Law to the
'times' is therefore no less than spiritual suicide because
it removes the very criteria by which the real value of human
life and action can be objectively judged and thus surrenders
man to the most infernal impulses of his lower nature. ... [4]
```

However, it is clear that non-Muslims surely should have no say about how Muslims live and how Muslim societies organize themselves. We don't need to agree or disagree because our approval is not asked for. Every peoples and society needs to figure out for itself which way to go and how. And surely these processes will include disagreement and conflict, sometimes escalating into disintegration and war. Which is all good or bad depending on the point of view, but surely it is the peoples themselves and close neighbors, to the extend that they are directly affected, who should be the ones deciding their own affairs.

References:

[1] "Occupied Pakistan", Abid Ullah Jan, Independent Centre for Strategic Studies and Analysis, 2002, http://icssa.org, http://nointervention.com/archive/pubs/ICSSA/ Pakistan/Occupied_Pakistan.pdf

[2] "Authentic Voices of South Asia", , 0-9548929-1-7,

[3] Islamic life and thought /by Seyyed Hossein Nasr. ,0873954912 (pbk.), page 25

[4] Islamic life and thought /by Seyyed Hossein Nasr. ,0873954912 (pbk.), page 26

Abbrevations:

AU: African Union

DTS: Democratic Totalitarian Societies
The dominant societies of North America (U.S., Canada), the hegemonial European countries, plus Japan, Australia, Israel.

IFIs: International Financial Institutions

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization