
The war against the Muslims

“**THE MUSLIMS**” is a strange and inadequate phrase for almost one in four of the people on the planet (or more than one and a half billion people). “The Muslims” are of numerous races and traditions that between them speak hundreds of dialects in dozens of languages in scores of different countries across five continents. Yet this is the phrase used by Islamists to dragoon all their diverse co-religionists into a single homogeneous mass community known as the Ummah or the Community of Believers (Ummat al Mu’minin). Islamists use the idea of this mythological community for two reasons, firstly because it strengthens their claim that there is only one Islam and only one literal truth derived from the *Quran* and the sayings and deeds of the Prophet Mohammad. The second function of the myth is that it can be used to strengthen the notion that “The Muslims” are the singular target of a war being waged against them by the United States and its allies.

This absurd proposition is buttressed by the fact that the United States and its allies is indeed waging war on a number of fronts against multifarious Islamist insurgencies and terrorist groups throughout the world. By identifying themselves with the supposedly homogeneous *Ummah*, the Islamists are able to argue that an attack upon Islamist militants and suicide bombers is an attack upon *all* Muslims.

This aspect of Islamist ideology has been extraordinarily successful in recent years, pulling in widespread support among millions of ordinary Muslims for the peculiar notion of Muslim victimhood. This fact is, perhaps, unsurprising, given the manifest dangers and perils under which many observant Muslims and their children are compelled to live out their lives. However, it is much more surprising that

socialists and left-wingers throughout the West appear to subscribe to the same mythology; the idea that under the leadership of the United States the Nato powers are conspiring against the world's Muslim populations has gained a considerable following among Western radicals in recent years.

This has resulted in a convergence between radical socialist opinion and the outlook of Islamists, which has permitted socialists to forge extensive alliances and coalitions with mainstream Muslim organizations whom, while holding Islamism at arms' length, subscribe to the myths associated with the *Ummah* canvassed by radical clerics and armed militants.

This convergence is rooted in the events of 9/11 which many on the left characterised "as the chickens coming home to roost" – Islamists targeting American civilians was somehow 'understandable', if not entirely legitimate, in what the left regarded simply as an inevitable process of resistance to the exercise of American power in the Middle East and elsewhere. Subsequent events in Afghanistan and Iraq have strengthened this radical commitment to perpetuating the myth of Muslim victimhood.

However, it is well to remember that the founding principle of the founding document of the UK's Stop The War Coalition was expressed as follows: "The aim of the Coalition should be very simple: to stop the war currently declared by the United States and its allies against 'terrorism'." This was penned just ten days after the Islamist attacks upon Washington and New York, and it was ratified at a large meeting in London in October 2001.

In this way the left set its face stoutly against fighting Islamist terrorism. Indeed, it became fashionable for a time to ridicule the very idea of a "war" against "an abstract noun", until those with heightened historical consciousness, pointed out that the left had engaged in a war against "fascism" (an abstract noun if ever there was one) and also in the struggle against "racism" and "sexism". But, it was the asymmetry of the War On Terror, with wealthy capitalist states on

one side, and corrupt dictatorships, theocracies, feudal patriarchies, and a multitude of Islamist military groups and terrorist cells on the other, which attracted the condemnation of the radical left. This, together with the rank hypocrisy of the Western democracies, in allying themselves with the corrupt monarchies and principalities of Saudi Arabia and the Gulf completed the picture, in which the left felt compelled to denounce the fight against Islamist terror by arguing that Islamism was simply the “understandable” or even the “legitimate” response of embattled Muslims towards the manifest crimes of Imperialism.

This posture has led the radical left into the contradictory position of disapproving of terrorist attacks upon civilians and, simultaneously, attacking any attempt on the part of the governments of democratic states to break up terrorist cells and training camps. This, of course, would be fair enough, if the left-wing organizations and commentators in question had an alternative strategy for defeating the Islamists, one that offered greater prospects of success than those of governments in Washington, London or Paris.

This, however, is just what the left does not have. Their only demand is that we should simply surrender to the Islamists. We should stop all armed actions against them, immediately withdraw all Nato troops to their home countries, close all military bases held by America and her allies around the world, and dissolve the State of Israel. In this way, by meeting all the demands of the Islamists, the radical left argues we would destroy the Islamists' *raison d'être*, and forge the basis for peace and progressive advance throughout the world.

From this perspective the Islamists would simply disband their cells and organizations and return to their homes in order to live happily ever after. Those few irredentists who might still present a problem to the peace loving peoples would be easily routed by the overwhelming force of progressive socialist

arguments greatly empowered by the defeat of the imperialist conspiracies against the Muslims.

Meanwhile, back in our world, socialists on the World Socialist Web Site are arguing that “The real target of the US and UK military is not Al Qaeda, but the Yemeni civilian population.” Last week’s *Socialist Worker* weighed in with evidence “to suggest that the US launched two cruise missile attacks on 17 December that killed up to 160 Yemeni civilians”.

No one should doubt that enormous numbers of civilian men, women, and children have died in the War On Terror, however, the socialist press appears to have an extraordinarily partial account of this struggle. The enormous numbers of Muslims randomly slaughtered by Islamists nowhere make their appearance in the socialist press or blogosphere. Nor do these radical enemies of America and Britain ever pause to note the entirely deliberate slaughter by Islamists of Muslims loyal to some ‘incorrect’ version of Islam. Despite this, one can be fairly certain that since the Battle of Fallujah, many more Muslims have been deliberately killed throughout the world by the actions of Islamist militants and suicide bombers than have been killed by Nato forces or Western sanctions.

The depth of the Islamists’ hatred is literally unfathomable, their death list includes all opponents from Dutch filmmakers to Danish cartoonists, and British novelists; it encompasses Pakistani Christians, Malaysian Christians, apostates of all kinds, Shia Muslims, homosexuals and, of course, liberals of all sorts. Indeed, anybody who opposes the Muslims and the literalist interpretations of the *Quran* appears to be worthy of a dog’s death.

The socialist press is undismayed by all this murder and mayhem because it simply aggregates the deaths claimed by Islamist vengeance with the death toll attributable to Nato forces and lays the grand total on the doorstep of the White House. All deaths in the War On Terror are quite simply the fault of the Americans. This is how the modern left ducks its responsibilities, and in so doing, announces its own bankruptcy.