

## **The One Point Plan**

Muslims Enact Hate Speech Every Day:  
Applying Current Hate Speech Laws To Mosques

Draft  
12th May 2018

## 1 Introduction

### 1 *One Point Plan - Surah One*

Surah One is the foundation of all prayer. All practicing Muslims know Surah One, if they know any part of the Koran. If there is a single part of the Koran where they have asked their imams for an explanation it is Surah One. There are dozens of examples on YouTube of Imams and Sheikhs explaining the meaning of Surah One. Thus we can confidently assume that they know that this small part of the Koran - which they recite many times each day, every day of the year - denounces Jews and Christians. And if it is claimed that they do not know this, then we are under an obligation to ensure that it's use is stamped out before they do find out that their religion is founded on the hatred of the Other. Surah One is hate speech and I have a Koran by Muslim scholars which demonstrates that this is so.

### 2 *Attack On Islam Must Be Singular*

The One Point Plan is a recommendation that the outlawing of Surah One be only one point of attack on Islam. Anything more complex than a single point enables the enemy to sow confusion. Anyone attempting to stop Islam through reason is caught on the horns of a dilemma. Provide too little information to demonstrate that Islam is fundamentally noxious and people won't believe it is as bad as it truly is. Provide too much information and ordinary people are overwhelmed whilst most of the educated elite are already Quislings working for Islam and the complex structure allows them to find weaknesses in the case being made. These weaknesses need not be logical fallacies or equivocations on our part. If they can mislead the public by spinning the truthful messenger as a bigot, that will suffice as a weakness which the Quislings will exploit.

### 3 *Islam is Kuffarphobia*

As we can see below, even the Five Point Plan ("The Affirmation" at the end of [A Proposed Charter of Muslim Understanding](#)) was able to provide the Quislings with angles from which they could spin the Five Point Plan to make it look discriminatory. So we must focus on the most simple, atomic line of attack. And when the Quislings accuse the messenger of bigotry, that must be seen as an attack that can be made to bolster the need for the actions demanded in the One Point Plan. So those who advocate the One Point Plan may need to actually carry a detailed Koran around with them and to turn to the first few pages to prove to an audience that every day devout Muslims assemble for a collective act of hate speech. Whilst a life-long scholar of Islam such as Professor Bernard Lewis can say that "from the time of the Prophet to the present day, the ultimate definition of the Other, the alien outsider and presumptive enemy, has been the kafir, the unbeliever" ([The Political Language of Islam](#), 1988, p.5). This is something that most decent people are reluctant to accept: the concept of a religion predicated on the violent hatred of Others appears to them to contradict the very nature of religion.

### 4 *Failure to Act brings UKIP to power*

The One Point Plan has to refer to existing laws in order to constrain Islam, because anything that requires a UKIP government to be in charge might never materialise. As with Brexit, getting this change matters more than who does it. It could be that no-one except a UKIP government would put the One Point Plan into action. If that is the case, then the continued reminder to the Kuffar public that Islam is hateful towards non-Muslims on a daily basis should serve to help bring a UKIP government to power. Surveys show that across Europe the majority of Europeans are already hostile to Islam. With increasing enforcement of political correctness across all institutions and with hate speech prosecutions for those who don't toe the party line, surveys and polls are proving increasingly unreliable when it comes to the public's hostility to the cultural war being waged by Leftists. But even so a recent survey by Chatham House showed that across Europe those in Britain were the most tolerant towards continued immigration by Muslims, with only 23% in favour of it and 47% being opposed to any more immigration, with more

people fearful of giving an answer than were in support of further Muslim immigration. This hostility exists despite wall-to-wall deception on the nature of Islam. If campaigners can focus on proving one point which thoroughly undermines this deception about Islam, then the campaign will serve as a laser beam through which this pre-existing hostility is directed. It may well be that other political parties in Europe will take up this campaign with successful results before any government in Britain does so. This will not matter. Islam being constrained and reversed in one country provides inspiration to the public in other countries that this can indeed be achieved. Believing we are helpless ensures we don't even try to resist.

### **5 One Point Plan Deadly to Islam**

The application of hate speech laws to Surah One is something so fundamental to Islam that the successful adoption of the One Point Plan will put the process of Islamization into reverse. I'm not the first to suggest that this is a fundamental fissure in the gap between what Islam is and what Islam has been presented to the Kuffar public as. Indeed, in a less expansive form, the one point plan can be found in Solomon's (2006) A Proposed Charter of Muslim Understanding: "8)d Forbidding any anti-Jewish or anti-Christian supplications at all times, particularly at prayer times and other religious gatherings". The importance of this fissure is missed because the Charter contains too much information. Even a summary version, such as the Five Point Plan at the end of the Charter, provides too many angles which permit the aims of the Charter to be dismissed. Moreover, even if every Muslim agreed to the Five Point Plan such agreement would only serve to increase the gap between what Islam is and what the public are led to believe it is, because Muslims are authorised to appear to reject Islam if such rejection serves to further the control of Islam. Adoption of the One Point Plan would be a far more fundamental assault on the hateful underpinnings of Islam than might be apparent at first sight. Since Surah One is the core of the Islamic liturgy our society would have to install surveillance equipment in Mosques to ensure compliance. Let them devise a new liturgy that does not incite hatred of other religions. If this is fundamentally impossible then the public need to know that hatred is the very essence of Islam.

### **6 Recap: the One Point Plan**

Since UKIP believes in universal values and the rule of law, then the existing hate speech laws must be applied to statements made in Mosques. Can you imagine the outrage if every UKIP meeting began by compelling those present to denounce Muslims? Can you imagine the outrage if every day in every Christian service the priest led his congregation in a denunciation of Muslims and Jews? Let's put this into comparably offensive language to that used by Muslims, imagine if each church service began by saying "God hates Jews and Muslims are the Anti-Christ". It is unimaginable that our society would permit the Kuffar to publicly denounce Muslims the way that Muslim denunciations of others is permitted. This must stop. The rule of law must obtain. And all those who think themselves liberal and progressive should support this plan.

## **2 The Battleground**

### **1 Demographic Time Bomb**

If you are unconvinced that the attempt to force the topic of Islamic reform via the Proposed Charter of Muslim Understanding has failed over the past decade, if you think that we have not seen Islam gather strength in the UK in that decade, let me point out that at the very least the Muslim population has doubled in size in that decade, which probably means the number of Mosques and Madrassahs and Islamic faith schools have also doubled. Indeed, the size of the Muslim population may have more than doubled in size - after the 2011 Census Muslim academics were crowing that the Census had been designed to permit Muslims to conceal their number here, and that Muslims had taken up this

opportunity to conceal their number (see Dr. Leon Moosavi, "Why Has the Number of Muslims in the UK Risen So Much?", [https://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/dr-leon-moosavi/why-has-the-number-of-mus\\_b\\_2279610.html](https://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/dr-leon-moosavi/why-has-the-number-of-mus_b_2279610.html)). It might seem counter-intuitive to you that Muslims would seek to conceal their number. However, all I can tell you is that having lived in the heart of Muslim enclaves for nearly 40 years (Manchester, Birmingham, London) I can tell you that the mosques have got extraordinary power to control the behaviour of Muslims, including getting Muslims off the streets of London and Bradford for more than a month leading up to the 2010 General Election (where the BNP were still a viable political force, and it was feared they would actually get some MPs in Parliament).

To compound our problem in estimating the size and growth of the Muslim population in Britain, the government has said that there will not be another Census after the 2011. One of the reasons given was that even supermarkets have more accurate demographic data - and according to supermarkets by 2007 the UK population was already 77 million, when official data only had the UK population at 63 million in 2011 (see "City Eye: Facts on a plate: our population is at least 77 million", The Independent, 2007, <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/business/comment/city-eye-facts-on-a-plate-our-population-is-at-least-77-million-5328454.html>). We are facing a demographic time-bomb. As the HNH report shows, even the Left are now admitting this.

## **2 Young & Leftists Don't Care**

In case this document falls into the wrong hands, let me state up-front: I am married to an Asian, half my brothers are married to black women, half my sisters are married to black men. To commemorate the establishment turning on war hero Enoch Powell, a Leftist organisation calling itself "Hope Not Hate" produced a report based on a survey they conducted (see <https://www.hopenothate.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Britain-Divided-50-years-on.pdf>). It's clear their aim was to show how wrong Powell was with his warnings of a future of racial violence in Britain. However, the most extraordinary result is found on page 16, where HNH cite the work of a demographer at Oxford University who has predicted that by the 2060 the white British people will be a minority in their own country. That HNH should admit the "demographics is destiny" thesis is shocking enough. But what I found even more shocking was their preparedness to include the results of them asking what their respondents thought about this inevitable yet slow-motion genocide. At most only 2% of the respondents expressed a positive attitude toward the replacement of their society without their consent. I include a copy of the page from the HNH report below (Appendix 1). How do you think that people are going to react as this realisation leaks out? Ten years ago those who warned of this demographic time-bomb were dismissed as paranoid conspiracy theorists. There are many reports from the last 20 years showing that the white majority are disproportionately the victims of racist violence in Britain - see for example, "Most race attack victims 'are white'", The Independent, (1999) <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/most-race-attack-victims-are-white-1069502.html>; "Racial murders: nearly half the victims are white", The Guardian (2006), <https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2006/oct/22/ukcrime.race>. If we are too weak to stop this slow-motion genocide, do you think that we will have the strength to unite against Islam by the time that the indigenous population are reduced to a minority? If 40 years sounds like a long time away, let me remind you that it is only 40 years since Ayatollah Khomeini took control in Iran. Consider how fast that time has gone and how many in-roads Islam has made into Europe in those 40 years.

## **3 Surrounded By Leftist Quislings**

Amnesty International and all the Leftist organisations who are supposedly opposed to slavery, apartheid, discrimination, etc. are at best silent about the inhumanity of Islam or at worst are complicit with this inhumanity. As Nobel prize winner Professor Hayek pointed out in "Why I Am Not A Conservative" (1960), even the British Conservatives are just slow-motion socialists. Without an opposing programme, conservatism only acts as a brake on the implementation of the plans of socialists. Despite the Thatcher Interregnum, the Tories have gone back to implementing the programme of socialism (at a

slightly slower pace than the socialists would). It's no surprise to me that after decades of Tory socialism we are now on the verge of having a Communist PM and Chancellor in waiting. The politically-correct censorship of the Blairite socialists will return to silence us totally when the Communists are in charge. Even the Conservatives are demonstrating extraordinary Fascism with their banning from the UK Pamela Geller, Robert Spencer, Martin Sellner, Lutz Bachman, Brittany Pettibone, Lauren Southern and Tore Rasmussen. Most of these were banned in the last four months.

#### **4 Leftist Islamic Alliance**

The Leftists are not only silent about actual ongoing slavery and apartheid in Islamic states, but they are silent about declarations from Islamic organisations which denounce the UN Declaration of Human Rights, statements which make it clear that Muslims put Islam above any man-made rules like the UN Declaration (here I am referring to the OIC's and UN's adoption of the Cairo Declaration of Human Rights Under Islam). So, given the Left's alliance with Islam there is no point in treating the Leftists as honest brokers. The Trotskyists are the conscience of the Left, and by the early 1990s the Trotskyists had made an alliance with Islamo-Nazism. It's not even that the Trots got buy-in/support from Muslims. The Trots have made a unilateral and unconditional alliance with Islam - see The Prophet and the Proletariat (1994) by Chris Harman of the SWP's Central Committee. The very use of the word/concept of "Islamism" is to use a distinction more or less invented by the Trotskyists in the 1990s.

#### **5 On Islamism**

We pointed out in Mohammed's Koran that at the start of the 1990s this concept of "Islamism" was seen then as a neologism by academics in the field of Islam. It was Trotskyists, the conscience of the Left, who popularised this distinction a decade before the Tories started to use it. The principal expert cited by Trotskyist Chris Harman is Olivier Roy, a Maoist professor in France. Prof. Roy has told the establishment what they want to hear, by 2002 claiming that "Islamism" is on the decline, and has been rewarded in France with plush government jobs. Solomon's Charter of Understanding was phrased as if it expected Leftists to be honest brokers. Using this word "Islamism" is to align oneself with the prevailing narrative, which is a Leftist narrative constructed by the Trotskyists to exonerate Islam. My one-point plan accepts that they are unprincipled hypocrites. The only thing to do is to pinpoint their alliance with Islam and put pressure on that point.

#### **6 Deception Is Moral In Islam**

In his excellent book Modern Day Trojan Horse (2009), Sam Solomon has some Appendices based on Fatwas from Islamic websites. The first concerns the legitimacy of deception on the part of devout Muslims: "Deliberate ambiguity is regarded as a legitimate solution for avoiding difficult situations that a person may find himself in when someone asks him about something, and he does not want to tell the truth on the one hand, and does not want to lie, on the other" [Solomon:2009:p97]. Citing Bukhari, the Fatwa goes on to list many different forms and examples of permitted deception. The fullness of this Fatwa (principally aimed at Muslims deceiving Muslims) shows how deception is pervasive in Islam. Since Islam is defined as "the religion of truth" there is no reason why any Muslim should care about lying to non-Muslims. Thus we must assume that if deceiving other Muslims is permitted, then a fortiori the deception of non-Muslims is of even less consequence. "Equivocation means saying something which has a closer meaning that the hearer will understand, but it also has a remote meaning which what is actually means and is linguistically correct". [Solomon:2009:p98] The fatwa even goes so far as to say that if a Muslim is forced to renounce Islam or denounce Allah, he is able to say something similar to the required denunciation in order to satisfy the person with the power to demand the denunciation (there is even a hand gesture a Muslim can make whilst deceiving someone, our equivalent of crossing our fingers, but for them it is inscribed in a doctrinaire fatwa [Solomon:2009:p99].

## **7 Dar Al Kufr**

The fatwas selected by Solomon also include one that says if Muslims are unable to live by the rules of Islam, then that is Dar al Kufr, and Muslims must migrate from that land to one where their Islam is unimpeded, and that Muslims in countries where Islam is unimpeded must help their “brothers” to undertake this emigration [Solomon:2009:p112]. One of the principal conditions for Dar al Kufr is the inability to openly practise Islam [Solomon:2009:p113]. On this basis, we Kuffar cannot accept that any Muslim is being honest with us if what the Muslim says or does goes against Islam.

## **3 Fighting Back**

### **1 Objections to the Charter/5 Point Plan**

The Charter looks like an attempt to reform Islam or at least try to expose that Islam can't be reformed. Yet when the Left can be brought to discuss the document they portray it as discriminatory, bigoted, or prejudicial. (see <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2014/feb/04/ukip-mep-gerard-batten-muslims-sign-charter-rejecting-violence> ) Before 2014 I was unable to find any news report that discussed the Charter. It seems to me that in 2014 it was only being discussed as an attempt to rubbish UKIP in the wake of it being revealed that UKIP's “Commonwealth Spokesman” had been in prison as the leader of a kidnapping gang. This is typical behaviour of the Left: if they cannot make some document or organisation look bad, it is ignored. Years later when it can be framed badly, that is when the Left will report on it. So when they discuss the Five Point Plan and the Charter, they throw in many other issues: banning new mosques, that people confuse British Muslims with Islamic States, claims of shock and outrage from Tory MPs, claims from Muslim MPs that it shows ignorance of British Muslims, and that anyone who thinks they can impose restrictions on Islam is a deluded “Walter Mitty”. Thus UKIP needs to hone their policy to state that there is just one policy: stop exempting Mosques from the hate speech laws. Instead of focusing on good Muslims v bad Muslims, good Islam v bad Islam, or the panoply of evils in the Koran and Islam, it needs to be just One Point: Every day in every mosque Muslims are committing collective acts of hate speech when they denounce Jews and Christians in reciting Surah One of the Koran in their prayers.

### **2 The One Point Plan: Surah One**

The purpose of the prayer (Salat) is to demonstrate a total submission to Allah and a commitment to follow the Sharia path unconditionally. Surah One is thought to encapsulate the whole of Islam. In Reliance of the Traveller, a manual of sharia law, §§f8.13 to §§f8.26 it is clear that Surah One (the Fatiha) is the single most essential component of the Koran recited in all prayers. Multiple copies of this 1200 page manual are found in public libraries in Tower Hamlets (and presumably other public libraries). It is a book in the UK which vastly outsells books by “moderate Muslims”. It is also a book which the publisher appears to have withdrawn, not because it doesn't sell well, but because too many Kuffar are using it to prove what Islam is all about. Despite the fact that it is an expensive hardback book, it was reprinted every three years between 1991 and 2017.

In Mohammed's Koran, we provide one of the most intelligible expostions of the Koran in history, by putting the Surahs in chronological order (something that Kuffar scholars in Germany, Britain and France did in the late nineteenth century, a technique which became concealed as the twentieth century progressed). In our book we also strike out all the abrogated verses, thus removing from view those parts of the Koran which have been cancelled by later verses. However, even then, much of the Koran is elliptical, and throughout the classical history of Islam many Muslim scholars produced vast exegeses in order to explain the Koran to Muslims. Mohammed's Koran took 400 pages to prove to the reader that a) hatred of non-Muslims pervades the Koran, b) jihadi terrorism is seen as a moral act in Islam. But since

Surah One is the synopsis of Islam and is the foundation of the daily prayer, I believe the One Point Plan explains Muslim hostility towards non-Muslims in the simplest possible way. Moreover, it also offers the simplest possible solution to this problem. If curtailing their daily Two Minute Hate leads to the banning of Islam then the latter is a necessary consequence. So how do we easily and conclusively prove to an audience that in every prayer Muslims are denouncing Jews and Christians?

The key to doing this is the following book: The Nobel Qur'an, (Darussalam, Riyadh, 1996). This book is subtitled A Summarized Version of Al-Tabari, Al-Qurtubi, and Ibn Kathir (with comments from Sahih Al-Bukhari). This is a parallel Arabic/English text of the Koran. In addition it is an exegesis using excerpts by those classical commentators, assembled by two contemporary scholars, Dr. Muhammad Muhsin Khan and Dr. Muhammad Taqi-ud-Din Al-Hilali. It is so clearly NOT intended for us Kuffar, since the book starts at the back. The Arabic text is on the right of each page (i.e. is the first thing an Arabic reader would see). This is a very disorientating experience for a reader civilised in the Western tradition of literacy.

The book exists in a one volume and a nine volume set. Here I am referring to the one volume edition. The Preface contains a date of 1985 and of 2003, but has a copyright notice of 1996. I assume from these details that this book was first published in 1985, then subsequently in 1994 and 2003. This twenty year publishing history gave the respected Islamic scholars much opportunity to hone both the English translation and their selection of the reference material. The book contains certificates in Arabic, attesting to the quality of the work.

Here is the translation of "Surah One: The Opening":

1. In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful.
2. All the praises and thanks be to Allah, the Lord of the 'Alamin (mankind, jinn and all that exists).
3. The Most Gracious, the Most Merciful.
4. The Only Owner (and the Only Ruling Judge) of the Day of Recompense (i.e. the Day of Resurrection).
5. You (Alone) we worship, and You (Alone) we ask for help (for each and everything).
6. Guide us to the Straight Way.
7. The way of those on whom You have bestowed your Grace, not (the way) of those who earned your Anger,<sup>(1)</sup> nor of those who went astray.<sup>(2)(3)(4)</sup>

Footnote <sup>(1)</sup> for line seven of Surah One, says that those who earned Allah's anger are the Jews whilst those who went astray are the Christians. Bringing a copy of this book along to televised interviews is the best way to hammer home the message that Islam is founded on publicly gathering to hate other religions. Footnote <sup>(3)</sup> for the last line of Surah One says that any Muslim who does not recite this denunciation is someone whose prayers are invalid. Thus this text shows that the very first chapter of the Koran ends with a denunciation of Jews and Christians and that without this denunciation the prayers of any Muslim are invalid. Thus this Surah is fundamental to being a practising Muslim. Can you imagine the outrage if the Church of England began every service by getting the congregation to join in saying "Oh Lord, guide us so we don't behave like the Jews and Muslims"? Do you think if it was the case that for a thousand years Christians had denounced Muslims on a daily basis, that we would have allowed Muslims to have come into our country and allowed them to build mosques? Would we have passed laws that put Muslims above the rest of us, as the UK has done?

Of course, the Quislings will try and say that this interpretation is a "Wahhabi interpretation". But even the supposedly moderate Ahmadiyya Muslims acknowledge that Surah One relates to the Jews and Christians (Commentary on the Holy Quran Vol. 1 Surah Fatiha Compiled from the Writings and Pronouncements of The Promised Messiah and Mahdi Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian, trans. by Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, London, 2004, p.122). So now that we can prove that even the supposedly

moderate Muslims agree on the meaning of this Surah, we can also find “moderates” who confirm that this Surah is required every day. Popular books on Islam by Islamophilic authors state that this Surah is recited 5 times a day in the public daily prayers (e.g. Dr. M. Nevin Nadimi, *Islam and Peace*, 2011;) Some Muslim writers will claim that the final verse simply denounces the unbelievers (i.e. all non-Muslims) Highlights on The Meaning of Al-Fatiha: the Opening Chapter of the Muslims’ Glorious Book, Al-Qur’an, Dr. Salah Ed-Din A. Nefeily, Egypt, 2005, p.63), but that should not be much consolation to atheists and agnostics, Jews and Christians, Hindus and Sikhs. The idea that Surah One denounces all unbelievers means that it is hatred directed towards an even larger catchment of non-Muslims.

Robert Spencer was pointing out in 2007 that in total devout Muslims recite this hate speech 17 times a day: “The Fatiha (Opening) is the first sura (chapter) of the Qur’an, and most common prayer of Islam. If you’re a pious Muslim who prays the five requisite daily prayers of Islam, you will recite the Fatiha seventeen times in the course of those prayers.” <https://www.jihadwatch.org/2007/06/blogging-the-quran-sura-1-the-opening> . Spencer lists a slew of classical Islamic scholars who explain that the religious groups whom Muslims denounce in this prayer are Jews and Christians. Moreover, he agrees that the upshot of this prayer is that it “anathematizes” Jews and Christians. I suggest “denounces” as a more appropriate description of what is going on. Spencer points out that Muslims have recited this “prayer” in the Democratic National Convention in 2007, and at the Texas State Legislature. By 2017 this Islamic hate speech had become part of the prayers given in Oldham Council chamber. <http://www.christianconcern.com/our-concerns/islam/islamic-prayers-in-oldham-council> It thus creeps out of mosques and into even our institutions.

What is the response to the claim that most Muslims never read the Koran, so they wouldn’t know what it was they were reciting? That Muslims are taught that the final line of Surah One is a denunciation of Jews and Christians is easily obtained from the evidence in this video: [https://youtu.be/nEhk\\_J-A1fY?t=152](https://youtu.be/nEhk_J-A1fY?t=152) In the modern age Muslims don’t even need to buy themselves a copy of a Tafsir or Koran with exegesis to find out what Surah One is about, as there are dozens of imams and Sheikhs on Youtube who provide explanations. Here is one who can be seen reading a Koran from back to front <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g8Q1VaL-3GI> , showing how Islamic is this kind of structuring of a book on the Koran that is read from back to front and right to left.

What should be the response to those people who say “you can’t prove that this hate speech is being said in Mosques”? Well no-one even knows how many Mosques there are in the UK. So how can anyone possibly claim that they know factually what is going on in these buildings? But we do know what is going on there according to the obligations of Islam and the texts of Islam. In the event of this objection being raised, the response should be to ask if they agree then that every Mosque needs to be put under surveillance and that all services are conducted in English so that we can ensure that this hate speech is not being recited.

UKIP adopting this One-Point Plan is not going to change the world. However, it gives the public the opportunity to understand that Islam is not a religion like Christianity or Buddhism, nor is it a doctrine like Liberalism or Multiculturalism, no matter what the Quislings claim when saying “Islam is a religion of peace”. UKIP need to have a policy that is this simple, that can’t be claimed to be discriminatory. Moreover UKIP advocating that Mosques be subject to hate speech laws doesn’t require UKIP being in power for the policy to be put into effect. Advocating for the non-preferential implementation of hate speech laws doesn’t even commit UKIP to the existence of hate-speech laws.

### **3 Prosecuting Islam for Hate Speech**

UKIP’s position should be that if people want to see the Mosques stop preaching hatred of non-Muslims every single day, then people need to elect a UKIP government who would force the state prosecutor to remove the exemption that Mosques have been given in relation to hate speech laws. If this is repeated as UKIP’s sole policy on Islam then the message will be kept simple. Whenever UKIP is attacked as bigoted or racist or Islamophobic, the UKIP response should be “unlike Muslims we do not,

and would never, start each meeting by forcing the members to denounce Muslims". Every attack on UKIP must be parried into an attack on what Muslims do every single day, as proven by the first few pages of the Arabic/English Koran referenced above. No society should want to police people's thoughts, but since we already have laws in place to criminalise hate speech in public, we must put a stop to the other parties' failure to tackle the endemic hate speech found in Islam. The law was specifically planned so that Muslims would not be prosecuted - "Home Office Minister Paul Goggins... assured the Muslim community that there was nothing in the bill that would prevent scholars from delivering their sermons or from reciting from the Qu'ran and ahadith... that what the bill would do is criminalise incitement to religious hatred against individuals" (<http://www.virtueonline.org/england-muslim-council-asks-quran-be-exempt-religious-hatred-law>).

In what ways does the the law not apply to what Muslims say in Mosques? The Racial and Religious Hatred Act (2006) defines religious hatred as "hatred against a group of persons defined by reference to religious belief or lack of religious belief" (29A).

**Section 29B of the Act says:**

(1) A person who uses threatening words or behaviour, or displays any written material which is threatening, is guilty of an offence if he intends thereby to stir up religious hatred.

(2) An offence under this section may be committed in a public or a private place, except that no offence is committed where the words or behaviour are used, or the written material is displayed, by a person inside a dwelling and are not heard or seen except by other persons in that or another dwelling.

(3) A constable may arrest without warrant anyone he reasonably suspects is committing an offence under this section.

Muslims accept 100% of the Koran, in its entirety. They will not renounce any part of it, including refusing to renounce the calls to kill the people denounced in the daily prayers. Muslims know this, therefore they must be taken to accept that their daily prayers stir up hatred and are threatening. Our society would not tolerate Christian services which denounced Muslims as the Anti-Christ, and that's without any terrorist attacks on Muslims by Christians. No-one would permit UKIP to mandate that each meeting must begin with a Two-Minute Hate directed at Muslims. It should be argued that since there have been 30,000 Islamic terrorist attacks since 9/11, with Islamic State and Boko Haram having shown us what they will do to non-Muslims, it is reasonable for any non-Muslim to fear Muslims and to find these words threatening.

**Section 29C of the Act says:**

(1) A person who publishes or distributes written material which is threatening is guilty of an offence if he intends thereby to stir up religious hatred.

(2) References in this Part to the publication or distribution of written material are to its publication or distribution to the public or a section of the public.

**Section 29D of the Act says:**

(1) If a public performance of a play is given which involves the use of threatening words or behaviour, any person who presents or directs the performance is guilty of an offence if he intends thereby to stir up religious hatred.

However in part (3) of 29D the Act says

a person shall not be treated as aiding or abetting the commission of an offence under this section by reason only of his taking part in a performance as a performer.

On this basis it might be held that the Muslims involved in the hate speech in a Mosque are performers receiving direction. In which case, it is the Imam who would be held criminally responsible.

If convictions cannot be obtained against the daily recitation of Surah One in every mosque, then the CPS should be instructed to go after all those people who distribute the Koran (unless the copies of the Koran include text which renounces or denounces the violent verses). Perhaps it needs to be a crime to publish any Koran which contains any verses which inspire hatred towards non-Muslims or disobedient Muslims. But whatever the policy that UKIP come down to pursuing, it should be simple and it should be a demand that the hate-speech laws be applied to Muslims. The absolute minimum position must be that any space where Muslims gather to pray will be closed down if verses such as Surah One are recited. To ensure that this hate speech is eradicated, all Mosques will be fitted with CCTV and recording equipment to ensure compliance.

We have to understand that we have man-made laws. If the Quisling elite had decided to make Islam illegal, then the laws could have been put in place. Legal academics tell me that the English law recognizes no geographical jurisdiction. If our laws are man-made and are not even limited to the confines of England, then we can and should be looking to make Islam illegal. As I have stressed above, the window in which we can do this is closing fast, and will close within my lifetime. The very least we can do is to advocate for the non-exemption of Muslims from the laws put in place to silence people drawing attention the negative consequences of having imported Islam.

Whilst Section 29J of the Act, on protection of freedom of expression, says

Nothing in this Part shall be read or given effect in a way which prohibits or restricts discussion, criticism or expressions of antipathy, dislike, ridicule, insult or abuse of particular religions or the beliefs or practices of their adherents, or of any other belief system or the beliefs or practices of its adherents, or proselytising or urging adherents of a different religion or belief system to cease practising their religion or belief system.

It is important to remember this was a clause which was only there at insistence of the House of Lords - even Blairite Labour wanted far more draconian applicability of the "religious hatred" law, to even apply to those who inadvertently said something that a Muslim found offensive. We should be under no illusions that if the Quisling parties could get away with a more draconian law, they would have done. What we are now witnessing is the State (no doubt under the urging of Muslim and Leftist groups) of antiquated laws being resuscitated as hate speech laws. A prime example of this is the case of Chelsea Russell, a 19yo girl in Liverpool who is now a convicted racist, based on her transcribing a song! The song contained a word blacks can use to refer to themselves, but if a white person uses the same word they are designated as racist. The trajectory is clear: in the not too distant future, we non-Muslims will be found guilty of hate crime for telling each other that the Koran says "kill the unbeliever". She was convicted for breaking a newly-reinterpreted law that was originally intended to stop anonymous callers phoning people and causing distress. This law fell into disuse with the advent of things like 1471, caller ID and call-blockers. But now it is being used to police the internet. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-merseyside-43816921> Let's remember: this conviction could only take place because the CPS gave the prosecution the go-ahead. Do you really think that a Merseyside police officer thought of an obscure law on heavy-breathing when the lyrics in question were posted to a website? Of course not. This can only

have come because police forces have been encouraged to re-purpose this law to ramp up the range of activities which can be classed as "hate-crime".

Do not fool yourselves. Our enemies will introduce laws that criminalise our speech whilst not criminalising the speech of others. No black woman would have been prosecuted for posting those lyrics. I foresee a time when, having established sufficient case law, anyone who posts a comment to the internet along the lines of "Koran 9:5 says 'kill the believer'" will result in a Kuffar being criminalised but not a Muslim.

#### **4 Feasibility**

In a cross-europe survey in April 2018, YouGov asked respondents in 11 countries spanning the fringes to the centre of Europe, "What are the two most important issues facing the EU at the moment?" ([https://d25d2506sfb94s.cloudfront.net/cumulus\\_uploads/document/6qz917s9ky/EUIResults\\_Europe\\_April\\_2018\\_Toplines\\_FINAL\\_180430\\_w.pdf](https://d25d2506sfb94s.cloudfront.net/cumulus_uploads/document/6qz917s9ky/EUIResults_Europe_April_2018_Toplines_FINAL_180430_w.pdf)). In every single country surveyed "Immigration" was the No. 1 issue, with "Terrorism" being No. 2. In my opinion both these issues map onto an objection to Islam (as the other surveys have shown that the hostility to Muslims across Europe is virtually uniform - in the case of both surveys Spain is the country least worried by immigration/terrorism and Muslim immigration).

Why have other critics of Islam not advocated for the application of hate-speech laws to Mosques? I think there are a variety of answers. In the Anglophone world, most of these critics are American, and I think their First Amendment rights would make them averse to this policy (as I pointed out, Robert Spencer articulated the problem with Surah One whilst I was still a blinkered Leftist). Across Europe it could be that countries like France and Holland simply don't have the same hate-speech laws as the UK. Certainly Wilders position is becoming simpler but "more extreme", with talk of a introducing a law to ban Islam (<https://twitter.com/geertwilderspvv/status/990931219159310336>). This is no surprise given the length of time he's been living under threat of death, and the consistent failure of other parties in working with the PVV, and the failure of the Dutch electorate to give the PVV enough votes that his party would not need to be in coalition. The UK is years away from being in the position of the PVV. However, the UK and UKIP could be uniquely positioned to advocate this simple but devastating attack on Islam. The more noise UKIP creates about this simple policy, the more likely some other European country will take notice and seek to constrain Islam in the same way. The more that the routine hatred in Islam is highlighted, the more people will seek to stop the Islamization of their country.

The 2006 Charter of Understanding contained this One Point Plan but it is submerged in so many other noble points that it is easy to miss. Looking at how the media tried to use the Charter in 2014 to denigrate UKIP, it is important to learn the lesson that the Quislings must not be given any opportunity to introduce doubt in an audience about the rectitude in curtailing Islam. Perhaps when the Charter was written the authors had no idea of just how much "hate speech" would be used to justify banning writers from entering the UK or imprisoning those who did harmless and meaningless acts like leaving a bacon sandwich near a mosque. The "outrage culture", the victimhood narrative used by Muslims and the media, must be adopted by us. We are the true victims: we are 19/20ths of the UK population, but we don't conduct even 1/200th of the Islam-related terrorist attacks.

As a life-long Leftist, I was late waking up to Islam. I'd lived among Muslims for decades and shoved my fears to the back of my mind, even though when I would argue with other Leftists about these fears, I couldn't believe that these Leftist friends could satisfy themselves there was no problem with Islam and that "Muslims will just integrate and abandon Islam" when the evidence in front of their eyes was the reverse. In 2009 when I finally got confirmation that things were far worse than I had ever suspected, I spent years trying to argue with Leftists that they must do something to change their stance, or across Europe the Left would be consigned to the toilet of history. It took me years to realise I was getting nowhere, and that it wasn't just my friends but that the Left in general were willfully blind even in the face of a mountain of evidence (particularly the evidence from the doctrines and history of Islam, as told by Muslims). I realised that I had to abandon the Left, and it took me some years and the loss of most of my

friends and some of my identity in the process. I realise that most Leftists are never going to go through this process.

Most of the public are not Leftist activists. Most will more readily abandon Leftism as an explicit ideology than I did when they are provided with information (they will not be so ready to abandon the bribes which Leftism has given them as voters e.g. the NHS, public sector employment, the myriad of welfare benefits). We are seeing this abandonment play out across most of Europe (with the exception of Spain, which is probably a unique case, given the huge rise in living standards there being co-extensive with the end of the forty year rule by Franco and his followers). As long ago as 2010 I correctly predicted the move to the right across Europe, and I correctly predicted Brexit when even Farage doubted the success on the night. By the time of the US Presidential election I was so confident of my ability to predict the move against the Left that I learned how bookies worked and made the first bet of my life, that Trump would win (I got odds of 9:1).

UKIP can only benefit from being the party in the UK adopting this One Point Plan. None of the major parties will even begin to try to restrict Islam. They know that in the long-run their future lies in courting the exploding groups in the demographic time-bomb. And they are all wedded to political correctness and groupthink. Of the dissident parties, UKIP is the only party with a sufficiently large and experienced base to get this policy known to the public. I believe that UKIP are pushing at an open door. The people of Britain have shown that for all their dissatisfaction with the programme of population replacement underway for decades, they are not prepared to give support to a racist party (hence the BNP's failure). This is why it is important for UKIP to be presenting a policy that does not look like it is discriminatory towards Muslims. Moreover, in having a one-point policy it is very simple to present and argue, and leaves UKIP the freedom to use any other airtime to present the party as more than a one-issue party (even though I believe that the Islamisation of Europe and the demographic time bomb are by far the greatest threats Europe has faced in its entire history).

In reality, the successful implementation of the banning of Surah One in Mosques is fatal for Islam in Britain. It is effectively a ban on Islam, yet it is no more than the consistent implementation of laws which have existed for more than a decade and principles which the Left have been conditioning the public to accept for more than two decades. Whilst Islam adopts a large variety of tactics (from terrorism, to infiltration and bribery) to win across a whole range of issues, we don't have to do the same. We need to understand that as a civilisation we have man-made laws and a commitment to logic and universalism. By identifying a single point of Islam which most people can justify to themselves is bad and must be stopped through the application of laws to which the rest of us are subject, this tiny fracture can be used to bring down the whole edifice (at least in Britain). Every time that UKIP get to present this policy it will serve to educate voters about Islam, allow them to justify to themselves and others their hostility to Islam, and present them with a simple but uncontroversial policy to curtail at least these negative aspects of Islam. Most voters are not going to realise that the banning of Surah One is tantamount to the banning of Islam.

If UKIP do not successfully communicate to the electorate that there is a simple plan to curtail Islam, then the voters are left feeling hopeless. In the absence of a clear and moral plan why would they vote for UKIP rather than the other parties? Why would they vote for the Conservatives rather than Labour, if neither party is prepared to tackle Islam? When faced with parties who are otherwise indistinguishable, why would the electorate not support the party that offers them more free stuff? All evidence is that since the Tories knifed Thatcher, with every year the Tories simply move further to the Left (with the Tories banning and imprisoning more critics of Islam than Labour ever did). If nothing changes, either Corbyn will be elected or the Tories will continue moving further to the Left than Tony Blair.

If UKIP adopts the One Point Plan and sufficiently articulates it, I can foresee several objections, and I try to envisage some responses:

1. This is discriminatory. A: No, it's the opposite of discriminatory; the rest of us are subject to hate speech laws and so must Muslims be.

2. It's not true that this is a core part of Islam. A: The Noble Qur'an in my hand proves that it is indeed a core part of Islam. Why did Muslim leaders seek exemption from the hate speech laws passed by the Labour government in 2006?

3. You can't know that this Qur'an is used in Mosques in the UK. A: You can't even tell me how many Mosques there are in the UK, so you have no idea whether or not this kind of hate speech is being practised there. If we need surveillance cameras in Mosques to prove that it is not being practised as you claim, then that is what we must pursue and Muslims should welcome the opportunity to prove that they are not practising the hate speech which this book says they are doing.

4. Why aren't you going after Christianity? A: We can find nowhere in the Christian liturgy where there is hate speech practised on a daily basis. If you can provide me with this then I can go to the party and ask for the text you have identified to be removed from the liturgy.

5. Just because it asks Muslims to condemn Jews and Christians doesn't mean it is hate speech. A: If any organisation in Britain mandated that its members must each day recite a mantra denouncing a group of people for their religious beliefs, would you want them to be the people exempt from hate speech laws?

6. The successful implementation of this policy will effectively abolish Islam in Britain. A: Are you saying that hatred of non-Muslims is the very foundation of Islam? If so, do you realise what the implications of that are for the future as the Muslim population nearly doubles in size every decade?

7. The courts will never convict Muslims for this hate speech. A: We can't know that the institutions of Britain exempt Muslims from hate speech laws until we try. We are asking for the consistent application of existing laws.

I have so little confidence in what passes for democracy in Britain, that I can't predict that this One Point Policy will put UKIP in government. However, the issue with Islam is only going to get worse. The only feasible party to posit any kind of "progressive" solution to this problem is likely to benefit from such advocacy. By far the biggest threat to the success of UKIP from advocating this policy will come from Muslims and Leftists, who have proven their willingness to kill their opponents. Muslims will understand that this One Point Policy is an attack on the very foundations of Islam. With the Left the policy might at least serve to rub their noses in their own hypocrisy. Keeping the policy simple means that Leftists cannot mislead themselves and others about the nature of this policy.

Since the Left are now giving credence to the ideas about the demographic time-bomb that were cast as "far right" conspiracy theories a decade ago, it cannot be more than a decade before the wider public understand the truth of the demographic time-bomb. And once the public do understand the demographic time-bomb, then I believe they will be prepared to turn to an openly racist party (it might take another decade before such a party gets into power). Given that for a century the public have been conditioned to want Leftism (which is why the Thatcher Interregnum was an aberration), I believe that the racism of National Socialism will be dusted off and rejuvenated. I have quietly tracked many discussions on the internet over recent years, and a common pattern I notice is that well-educated, intelligent young people (under 40) quite quickly move towards a position of racism when they are faced with the true

nature of Islam and/or the demographic time-bomb. When such people conduct live debates on this subject on YouTube these debates are often the highest-ranked live broadcasts of the day. Yet this subject gets virtually zero airtime in the mainstream media. On the odd occasion that it does e.g. the 50th anniversary of Powell's (so-called) "Rivers of Blood" speech, the chattering classes are outraged that demography and warnings are even discussed, even when it can be guaranteed that when the debate does surface in the media it will be framed to make those who take the problem seriously are cast as racists who foam at the mouth.

The realisation that there is no party with a policy to tackle either of these issues (Islam and demographics) quickly gives way to a readiness to adopt what might otherwise be unconscionable ideas among young intelligent people. Given the censorship of Twitter and Facebook, I often lose track of these people who I watch making the transition from "concerned" to "informed" to "banned", because once they start to articulate what they think needs to be done or to express their support for something like National Socialism, they are kicked off the social media. In many cases, these people will just go underground (they are probably smart enough to find areas of the internet where they are still free to discuss and organise - for example, Gab.ai is awash with people who most of us would describe as Nazis or at least racists). Friends who live in very stable white working-class communities assure me that the mood is turning very dark, with people openly expressing their hostility not just to Islam but also to immigrants and even transexuals. Due to censorship and since the majority of the public have no voice, this move towards a racist socialist party will go largely unnoticed. I believe that there are deep and fundamental problems with the fiscal and monetary policy across the West for the last century, and I expect to see another Crash at least on the scale of 1929. How long that can be averted is up in the air, and I don't believe that any party worrying the voters about that will succeed. If that Crash transpires and there are no measures for LibLabCon to kick it down the road, then all bets are off.

I believe that as a matter of urgency UKIP must address these issues before a racist socialist party returns. If UKIP can get MPs into the Commons, they can give hope to people that there are civilised solutions. Without this hope, people will embrace uncivilised solutions. Normally the ruling elite in a democracy will adapt to sequester new issues (we saw this with the "Green movement" in the 1990s). But with Islam and the demographic time-bomb they have decades of complicity. So I do not believe that they can or will change. I think that advocacy of the One Point Plan is the vehicle that will bring about a UKIP government.

**Appendix 1**

Population estimates vary, but it is not disputed that the UK is rapidly becoming a more diverse country. Some believe that by 2050, 30% of the UK's population will be from black and minority ethnic groups<sup>4</sup>, while Oxford demographer David Coleman sets the rate much higher, arguing that by 2060 white British people will be a minority<sup>5</sup>.

When given Coleman's population estimates, the majority of people react negatively. For Londoners, Labour or Liberal Democrat supporters, Remain voters, under 25s, or highly educated people, the most common response was indifference. However, the majority of our poll feels uneasy (35%) or unhappy (31%) or disappointed (25%) at Coleman's suggestions. The strongest responses are negative, unease or unhappiness, held by Conservative voters, 65+s or Leave voters. This discomfort at Britain's growing diversity paints a worrying picture of race relations in the UK.

This unease is further reflected in how people feel about future community relations. When asked 'Thinking about the relationships between different

communities within the UK, do you think generally get better or worse over the next 10 years or will there be very little change?' there was little optimism. 43% of all respondents think it will get worse, and just 14% of people believe relationships between different communities will be better. Worryingly, this crosses many denominational and political divides.

Our post-referendum poll in 2016 found that 60% of people felt that Britain is more divided since the vote. We also saw an increase in the number of people who believe there are tensions between different communities at a local and national level. The referendum may have had some impact in denting public optimism about community relations, but anxiety about future social relations also reflects wider doomsday thinking about the future where multiculturalism is perceived to have failed. Disturbingly, many feel that these tensions will lead to violence.

Society has changed considerably from the time Powell made his Rivers of Blood speech,

