Our Muslim Troubles:

Lessons from Northern Ireland

By El Inglés

Table of Contents

I. Foreword

I was born too late for anything other than the tail end of the Troubles to really enter my consciousness directly. As would have been true for many people of my age, I had no particular interest in politics when the Good Friday Agreement was signed in 1998, and lived too far from any area likely to be attacked by the IRA for their increasingly infrequent and non-lethal acts of terrorism to make much of an impression on me. The Omagh bombing is the only Irish republican terrorist attack of note that I can remember being aware of at the time.

My total ignorance of Irish history and the Troubles was something that I became increasingly aware of over time. This awareness heightened fairly rapidly after I somehow commenced a second (and non-remunerative) career as an analyst of the possibility of violent conflict between Europeans and Muslims in Europe. Eventually I decided to address this intellectual deficit and embarked upon an open-ended and entirely self-directed research project into the Troubles. On doing so, I not only discovered much fascinating history, but also a massive treasure trove of insights into the type of conflict likely to erupt eventually between British patriots keen on keeping Britain British and seditious Muslims keen on turning it into something rather different.

However immodest it may sound, the utter lack of concern about or interest in the Troubles that prevailed over the first three-and-a-bit decades of my life has given me one key advantage in trying to draw lessons from them. British though I am, they are nonetheless *history* to me, in that they do not possess any particular emotional heft one way or the other, and therefore allowed me to approach them in what I hope has been a largely dispassionate manner.

I explain this not out of some sudden autobiographical urge, but out of a desire to have taken seriously by readers the following claim: nothing I say about the Troubles or any actor within them, state or non-state, should be taken as implying any value judgement thereupon. As suggested above, I view the Troubles selfishly, as a huge body of data existing to be mined for an advance understanding of what we British are likely to fairly shortly find ourselves involved in with our Muslim fifth column. Retrospective approval or condemnation of the various parties to the Troubles I will leave to others.

II. Preliminary Note Concerning Assumptions

Before we commence this discussion in earnest, we need to dispense with the preliminary matter of explaining our assumptions, or, more accurately, one key assumption that will underpin the entire essay: that the UK government will vacillate uselessly in the face of ongoing Muslim immigration and consequent Islamization until we are plunged into a crisis, and probably for some time afterwards too. Cynics will mutter in response that few assumptions have ever been as safely made, but there is a serious point to be made here. There are already a number of European countries (such as Denmark and the Netherlands) in which committed and unrelenting opposition to the horrors of Muslim immigration is voiced daily by ever-more-effective political parties. How effective these parties will be in staving off catastrophe is another question, but at least they constitute real electoral choices, real chances to avert the disaster of a collapse into outright ethno-sectarian violence. As the situation degenerates in their respective countries, their support will undoubtedly grow and allow them, eventually, to form governments to deal with the problems in a way which offers some possibility of a real solution.

In contrast, and for reasons that we shall explore, there is as yet a complete and utter vacuum in this regard in mainstream British politics, a vacuum which looks likely to exist for some time yet. There is no obvious momentum towards the creation of a credible political alternative to the paradigm that insists that the Muslim presence in the UK is not problematic in and of itself, and that it will suffice for us to persuade a tiny minority of confused Muslim extremists that secular democracy is the way forward for the human race.

It is entirely possible that even an eruption of violent conflict between Muslims and British will fail to dislodge mainstream politicians from their idiot paradigm, at least for a time. As such, we will assume that the hypothetical violent conflict we examine in this document takes place in the context of a British government (or successive governments) that is (or are) essentially flummoxed by the nature of the problem and the nature of the best response. In contrast with the exceptionally clear-sighted Geert Wilders of the Netherlands, who appears to have no illusions whatsoever as to what his country faces or why, we must assume that we will be led by people who have no comprehension of the fundamentals of the situation they are faced with. The current, Conservative-led government is certainly a step upwards from the previous Labour government in this regard. As yet, however, it shows no outward signs of understanding what this country now faces as a consequence of several decades of Muslim immigration.

Of course it is conceivable that a figure could emerge in the UK to lead a government determined to push back against Islamic colonization. But analyses of a) a European people resisting Islamization with a government elected for the purpose, and b) a European people resisting Islamization after having descended into crisis thanks to a useless, dithering government, are two entirely different things. Given that the latter scenario seems vastly more probable in the British case, this document deals with it exclusively. In other words, we assume that the actions of the state will be focused on somehow desperately trying to contain the violent conflict in question while doing nothing to seriously address the key factors underlying it. This scenario is not nearly so unrealistic as it might sound. As we will argue elsewhere, violent conflict is a certainty if we continue to tread the path we are on at present, and the desperate fumblings British governments in the late 1960s and early 1970s

that helped create and then exacerbate the Troubles should serve as a warning to those who assume the competency of government.

We note again that, deeply imperfect though it is, the current Conservative-led government has already started to detach itself from the toxic legacy of Labour on immigration, multiculturalism, and related matters. This is heartening stuff, rendering as it does the assumption that the British government will blunder uncomprehendingly into new, Muslim Troubles in the next two decades less likely than it would otherwise be. However, the assumption that this is what will happen is still the underlying assumption of this essay for the following reasons: a) any consideration of the course of events over the next two decades deals with so many parameters that some must be held constant to prevent the combinatorial explosion of possibilities derailing the entire analysis, b) though the British ship of state may have slowly started to change course, it is still far too early to know how effectively it can do so, and c) it is clearer analytically and more bracing psychologically to plot out the worst-case scenario and later consider the possibility that things could work out better, than to chart a more optimistic scenario and later be faced with the reality of things working out far worse. The future we describe here is probably the worst possible future Britain can face with regards to its Muslim population. Those who wish Britain and the British a better one should ask themselves how to help deliver it.

III. Why Conflict is Inevitable: Contingent Conflict vs. Organic Conflict

We must first understand why violent conflict is inevitable between British and Muslims if the breakneck population growth of the Muslim population of the UK is allowed to continue.[1] That relations between Europeans and their respective Muslim populations are, in general, poor and deteriorating, is hardly a matter for dispute. But what is there in this that allows us to conclude that an Islam-induced breakdown of civil order and subsequent violent conflict are inevitable in the UK?

We make a distinction here between two different types of conflict: *contingent conflict* and *organic conflict*. A contingent conflict is a conflict that is entered into because, at key decision points or forks in the road leading to said conflict, decisions are made that lead in the direction of war rather than peace. An organic conflict is a conflict that, though it will certainly be *triggered* by specific events that could, in principle, not have happened, was inevitable all along in that an unstable situation existed which must, sooner or later, have disintegrated into violence through some triggering event whose nature was of less significance than its mere occurrence. Needless to say, there is no definitive, rigorous way of determining which conflicts are or were organic and which contingent in nature, but the conceptual framework provided by this dichotomy is of use in understanding the nature of the conflict that awaits us in Britain.

More specifically, we claim that the Troubles were a contingent conflict but that our Muslim Troubles will be an organic conflict. Understanding the difference between these two conflict types is pivotal to any understanding of what European countries face as a consequence of the insanity of Muslim immigration.

The Road to the Troubles

Though the Troubles grew out of the long and bitter history of British involvement in Ireland, for our purposes it will suffice to move straight into the 20th century, the partition of Ireland, and the creation of the Northern Irish state.

Since its creation in 1921 as a direct consequence of the Irish War of Independence, the province of Northern Ireland (henceforth abbreviated to NI) was an anomaly in the United Kingdom, to an extent not commonly appreciated by most British people even today. Politically, it had been engineered in such a fashion as to assure the overwhelming dominance of its Protestant, British-origin majority. This engineering consisted primarily of the following:

- Restrictions on the franchise at local government level, which reduced the political influence of the Catholic minority
- Gerrymandering at the local government level that resulted in majority-Protestant councils even in majority-Catholic areas

---

[1] This is not equivalent to saying that there will be no conflict if this growth is *not* allowed to continue.

- Privileged access to jobs and housing as a consequence of the previous two factors

- A draconian Special Powers Act that allowed the NI government to take exceptional measures to maintain law and order in the province

- A reserve military force, the B Specials, almost entirely Protestant, that was used in times of emergency to enforce public order vis-à-vis Catholic disorder

With the global political ferment of the 1960s, the Catholic population of NI began to mobilize politically to seek redress for these issues. The Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association (NICRA), founded in 1968, advocated entirely peaceful methods for doing so. At this time, the IRA (not yet split into the Officials and the Provisionals, something that would happen in late 1969), badly defeated in a wholly ineffective military campaign waged against the NI state from 1956-1962, had effectively ceased to exist as any sort of credible military force, and was a long way from the minds of most nationalists north or south of the border.

The British government of the day left matters largely to the NI Parliament at Stormont, the seat of Protestant political supremacy. Subsequent to the Partition of Ireland in 1921 and the passing of the Anglo-Irish Treaty in 1922, this seems to have been a pattern for all British governments, who wanted as little as possible to do with all matters Irish. The consequent lack of restraint imposed upon the Protestant political establishment in NI would turn out to be a major contributory factor to the collapse of 'regular' civil strife into civil conflict and guerrilla war.

We have claimed that the Troubles were a contingent conflict. What does this mean? It means that the road to the Troubles presented decision-makers in the British government with a number of key decision-making junctures, at which the possibility existed to defuse rather than escalate the conflict. This is not to suggest for a moment that the British government wanted the Troubles to occur. Rather, it highlights the extreme difficulty involved in making good decisions with respect to complex matters when the stakes are high.

More specifically, we identify the following events as being amongst the most important such junctures:

- October 1968: A peaceful Catholic demonstration in Dungannon, which includes nationalist politicians, is responded to with extreme violence by the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC) and attracts global attention.

- January 1969: A People's Democracy march from Belfast to Derry is viciously attacked near Derry by Protestant mobs and left essentially unprotected by the RUC. Further violence follows when the RUC moves to break up a demonstration held to welcome it into Derry.

- August 1969: A march in Derry by the Apprentice Boys is faced with Catholic counter-protestors who attempt to disrupt it. The RUC moves against the counter-protestors, leading to days of extremely violent rioting in and around the Catholic Bogside housing estate. Catholics in Belfast organize their own riots to draw RUC resources away from Derry, and extreme violence between Catholics on the one hand and

Protestants and the RUC on the other results, resulting in fatalities and large numbers of house burnings. The British Army is deployed on the streets of NI as the violence proves to be beyond what the RUC can contain.

- July 1970: British Army house searches aimed at locating a weapons cache on the Catholic stronghold of the Falls Road, Belfast, lead to large-scale rioting, gun battles, and a curfew as the army expands its search to the entire area. Several people are killed, and the event is considered a watershed moment in the deterioration of relations between NI Catholics and the British Army.

- August 1971: British security forces intern hundreds of suspected IRA members in an attempt to cripple the resurgent Irish republicanism.[2] Widespread riots and gun battles result across NI, resulting in many dead. IRA recruitment surges as a consequence.

- January 1972: A NICRA anti-internment civil rights march in Derry ends in thirteen unarmed Catholic civilians being shot dead by British paratroopers in one of the most notorious events of the Troubles. Again, recruits flock to the IRA and the point of no return has been crossed.

At each of these junctures, completely different decisions could have been made as to what to allow and what to forbid, what to do and what to leave undone. If the British government had intervened more assiduously in NI in 1968-1969 to placate Catholics and protect them from state and non-state Protestant violence, it is possible that the civil rights movement there would have achieved its aims before a resurgent IRA (mainly the PIRA, strictly speaking), stepping forward to defend Catholic areas from attack, succeeded in piggybacking its own unforgotten objective of a united Ireland onto what started out as a civil rights movement. It is instructive to bear in mind that, when British troops were originally deployed in NI in 1969, they were welcomed by the Catholic population as a non-partisan force that would protect them against loyalist attack. Relations continued to be reasonably good between Catholics and the army for some time, though the next crucial juncture of the Falls Road curfew and house searches hammered the final nails into the coffin of this period of relative cordiality.

Internment is widely considered to have been a disaster. Based on poor intelligence, some of which was so out of date that one veteran of the Easter Rising of 1916 was pulled in despite having been inactive for over 50 years, it left many key figures at large and brought in many people of no significance. In contrast with the IRA campaign during WWII, when then-Taoiseach de Valera interned IRA members due to his concerns that their actions in England would jeopardize Ireland's neutrality, this time the Republic of Ireland refused to introduce internment south of the border, which crippled its effectiveness. Furthermore, it targeted only republicans at first, leaving loyalist paramilitaries at large. As such, it is hard not to conclude that its costs far outweighed its benefits, especially given that it was a march against internment that degenerated into the nightmare of Bloody Sunday.

From bad to worse to worse again, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the Troubles could have been avoided by nudging events in different directions at key points in time, which makes them the very definition of a contingent conflict. Needless to say, this claim cannot

---

[2] The IRA had now split into the Provisional IRA (PIRA) and the Official IRA (OIRA). The OIRA announced a permanent ceasefire in 1972 and eventually became a marginal presence in republicanism. The PIRA (also known as the 'Provos') is what British people are thinking of when they speak of the IRA. We refer to it as the PIRA in this document in the interests of clarity.

be definitively established. We acknowledge the possibility that making extensive concessions to nationalists in 1969 might have enraged loyalists to such an extent that they simply launched into their full-bore sectarian killing campaign in that year rather than 1972, precipitating a similar conflict in a slightly different way. This caveat to one side, there does appear to be a strong degree of consensus that, had the British government of the day made key decisions differently in the late 1960s and early 1970s, nearly three decades of vicious sectarian conflict could have been avoided.[3]

We can liken trying to avoid a contingent conflict to trying to cross a busy road in the absence of a crossing place, a difficult task which can, in principle, be performed in such a manner as to leave one unscathed. Each of the six key events listed above was, in effect, a car which the British government somehow contrived to collide with as it attempted to traverse the busy road of NI in the late 1960s and early 1970s, ending up battered and bruised by the side of the road with no convenient route back home. The point here is not to argue that crossing that road was or should have been a trivially easy task, or that the British government should have done better. Those considerations are irrelevant here. Our point is that the task was almost certainly possible *in principle*, and that the Good Friday Agreement, signed in 1998, was the culmination of the tragically circuitous route that the province took to a state of relative peace and order.

The Problem with Muslims

Let us suppose that Muslims in the UK remain exactly as they are but that the British government discovers a magic wand that, waved once a day, ensured that all terrorist attacks planned by Muslims would fail, ignominiously and invisibly. Given that 'violent extremism' has now been so thoroughly defeated, can we rest easy and assume that all will now be well between British and Muslims in the UK?

The answer is no. There are four aggregate characteristics/behaviours of Muslims that make it inevitable that they will eventually force European peoples into violent conflict with them, that make them, in short, toxic to Western societies: their criminality (including terrorism), their parasitism, their sedition, and their subversion. All these characteristics manifest themselves with remarkable consistency, whether we look at Pakistanis in the UK, Turks in Germany, Algerians in France, or Moroccans in the Netherlands. And none of these characteristics is amenable to being materially affected in any way by anything the British, Germans, French, or Dutch may do. As such, the hostility that European peoples feel towards their rapidly-growing Muslim populations is not only an entirely reasonable response to the characteristics of these populations, but is remarkable only in that it has taken so long to become so prevalent.

Returning to the UK, we have likened the situation pre-Troubles to a road-crossing problem. The situation we face vis-à-vis our mushrooming Muslim population is akin to being on a conveyor belt that leads directly into a crusher. We can stay on the conveyor belt and be fed into the crusher, or we can get off the conveyor belt and avoid the crusher, but we cannot

---

[3] Of course, they could also have been avoided if the IRA had refrained from behaving violently, but that is not germane to our analysis, and was hardly to be expected of an organization committed to physical force republicanism anyway. The emergence of the Troubles in the late 1960s presented what would become the PIRA with an unexpected opportunity to push for a united Ireland, and were presumably, in that sense at least, not seen by them as something to be avoided at all.

stay on the conveyor belt and avoid the crusher. We cannot negotiate our way past the crusher, for then it would not be a crusher. *We have to get off the conveyor belt*, and all other options are meaningless. In plain English, continuing to allow the colonization of the urban UK by a hostile, criminal, religiously-motivated horde — that displays nothing but contempt for us and our way of life even as it enjoys the huge subsidies it extracts from us — can only lead to violent conflict, a conflict which is emerging at a greater or lesser pace in all European countries similarly afflicted. There are no clever decisions to be made here, no political contortions that can lead us all, hand in hand, into the multicultural paradise supposedly awaiting us on the other side of the social disintegration now so evident throughout Europe. There is only a steady descent into tribal violence, exploding cities, and the destruction of democratic politics as we currently understand it.

The confusion between a contingent conflict and an organic conflict, between road-crossing problems and crusher-avoiding problems, can be seen in the way in which otherwise intelligent people scratch their heads as they try to determine what has gone 'wrong' in the Netherlands with respect to Muslims and Muslim integration into Dutch society. Things seemed 'OK' back in, say, the 1980s. What has gone 'wrong,' people ask, in the last decade or so to have propelled first Pim Fortuyn and now Geert Wilders to positions of influence?

Imagine a man who sits at a table in front of a large pile of salt. He wets his finger, dips it into the salt, and licks the salt off it. What effect does this have on him? Not a great deal, as the human body requires some amount of salt and has a certain tolerance even for elevated levels of it. But what happens if this man repeats the operation over and over again, taking another small portion of salt, and then another? We can say with certainty that if he continues to sit at the table eating salt, he will start to feel unwell, as salt in excess is poisonous to human beings. If he is so foolish as to continue eating salt past the point of starting to feel sickened by it, he will develop a desperate desire not to consume any more at all. If he ignores this desire and keeps eating, eventually he will die.

The Netherlands is directly analogous to a man eating salt at a table. For several decades now, the Dutch have sat at their table dipping their finger into their pile of salt and licking away, and they have gone well beyond the point of starting to feel queasy. If they continue to eat the salt of Muslim immigration, they will sicken and die. If they resolve not to eat it any more, they have at least a chance to return to health.[4] But they cannot be 'clever' about the way they eat it, taking care to properly 'integrate' it into their bodies. Eventually one must stop eating poison. To conclude that salt is not poisonous because the first small portion did not result in one's death is to misunderstand the matter. The poison of Islam, in the form of Muslims themselves, has accumulated in the body politic of the Netherlands to such an extent that it is starting to kill it. That is the long and short of what is going 'wrong' in the country of Huygens and Vermeer.

Given that the entire approach of every single mainstream political party in every single European country afflicted by the cancer of Islam is predicated on the notion that we are confronted with a contingent conflict (and therefore a road-crossing problem) rather than an organic conflict (and therefore a crusher-avoiding problem), the distinction we make

---

[4] That the Muslim population of the Netherlands will continue to grow due to higher fertility rates even if Muslim immigration is prohibited is a complication that cannot be addressed here.

between the two is a crucial one. If we are right, then the actions of mainstream politicians throughout Europe with respect to Islam and Muslims have been not only useless, but actively harmful in that they have allowed the real problem to metastasise, largely unaddressed, in the background.[5]

Geert Wilders of the Netherlands, Filip Dewinter in Flanders, Pia Kjærsgaard in Denmark, Siv Jensen in Norway, Jimmie Åkesson in Sweden, Timo Soini in Finland, Heinz-Christian Strache in Austria, Thilo Sarrazin in Germany, Oskar Freysinger in Switzerland — all these people understand that their countries are on a conveyor belt leading directly into a crusher, and are pushing their way into the political mainstream past the bovine functionaries who have inhabited it for so long. But no one, no one at all in mainstream British politics, seems to have any real grasp of what we are facing. Alone amongst the countries of Western Europe, Britain jumps crazily back and forth on its conveyor belt, trying to avoid imaginary cars while the jaws of the crusher smash back and forth, closer with every second.

One of the advantages of this new understanding of the problem is that we have now devised a crucial yardstick for determining whether or not the government of any given country has both the understanding and the will to grapple with the problems imposed by Muslims. The single most important thing that any government can do to combat the evils of Islam and Islamization is to *stop letting more Muslims in*. Failing to do this will render all other efforts in this regard fundamentally meaningless, so any government not doing it is *fundamentally useless with respect to Islam*. This is not to suggest that any government doing it has solved the problem entirely, but it is obviously far easier, logistically and politically, to prevent additional Muslims coming into one's country than to throw out all the Muslims who are already there. Halting Muslim immigration is therefore not only the key indispensable step, but the easiest, which is why we insist that anyone not taking it must, perforce, be useless.

It is too early to try to say what the current Conservative-led government will accomplish in its time in office. We observe with gratification that it appears to be making serious attempts to shunt our immigration policies onto a non-suicidal bearing, both generally and, implicitly, with respect to Muslim immigration as well. We note with tepid approval David Cameron's rather feeble and qualified speech attacking multiculturalism *à la* Labour. And we witness with dismay, but not surprise, the continued unwillingness of anyone in mainstream British politics to make any criticisms of Islam *qua* Islam. What do these developments add up to? They add up to a decidedly mixed bag, painting we British, sadly, as the slow learners of Europe, at least insofar as we as a people are encapsulated in our political elites. In terms of our original assumption of a steady march towards our Muslim Troubles, it suggests that we have erred slightly on the pessimistic side (as we originally acknowledged we might), but are still faced with a slower, more gradual march to a broadly similar outcome.

We are tempted to argue that the British political establishment has misread, and to a significant extent still does misread, the situation with respect to Islam as a contingent conflict precisely because it has only fairly recently managed to help extricate our country

---

[5] There will doubtless be those who do not accept our claim that we are heading into an organic conflict, but these people have some explaining to do. If the proper 'integration' of Muslims is a road-crossing exercise rather than a crusher-dodging exercise, why are *all* Western countries with large accumulations of Muslim immigrants failing to cross the road in question? Why is this particular road *uncrossable*?

from another contingent conflict, and is learning the wrong lessons from history. However, the utter failure of any other European country that has undergone significant Muslim immigration to avoid this error suggests that the cause of the problem is more deeply rooted still. Either way, we have now established that, absent extreme measures on the part of government to defuse this conflict in advance (measures we are assuming will not be implemented), conflict is inevitable. There is simply no way of peaceably reconciling the interests of European peoples and their rapidly growing Muslim populations, interactions between whom are almost always zero-sum games at best. This is the basis of our description of these emerging conflicts as organic rather than contingent.

IV. The Focus on Terrorism

Before we launch into a discussion of the likely characteristics of our Muslim Troubles, we will take a minor detour to build on the previous chapter by further explaining why, though the likely severity of our Muslim Troubles can legitimately be debated, we consider some sort of violent conflict to be inevitable. Here, we will examine something that highlights just how hopeless the response of our political establishment has been to the problems that Islam and Muslims have created for us in Britain.

One of the most crippling problems to date with the debate on Islam in the UK has been the focus on terrorism. This focus is slowly shifting, but it still lingers, extending a baleful effect over attempts to deal with the real problem, which is the presence in the UK of large and ever-larger numbers of Muslims. Continued Muslim immigration into European countries will lead ineluctably to widespread, violent, tribal conflict that will rip those countries apart, and potentially result in the deaths of tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of people throughout Western Europe. Yet, in the UK, our ability to openly discuss these vital matters has been badly compromised by a stated desire on the part of those in government to prevent terrorism, which desire is itself largely insincere. It is too early to pass judgement on the Conservative-led government in this regard, but preventing terrorism was so far down the list of priorities of the Labour government as to astonish.

This is a strong claim, and one that can only be demonstrated through rigorous argument. Much rubbish is spoken about Muslim terrorism, but we shall cut a swathe through it all here and strip things down to basics. Given that most Muslim terrorism is, or is at least intended to be, suicidal in nature, let us assume that, to a reasonable approximation, all Muslim terrorists or would-be terrorists either commit one successful suicide terrorist attack (e.g. the 7/7 bombers) or attempt to do so and are then caught and incarcerated (e.g. the 21/7 bombers). The number of successful acts of terrorism perpetrated in the UK by Muslims every year therefore equals, by definition, the *M*uslim population of the UK (*M*) multiplied by the fraction of this population *A*pproving of terrorism in the UK as a political tool (*A*), multiplied by the fraction of *this* population that *T*ries, with however much or little dedication, to conduct an act of terrorism every year (*T*), multiplied by the fraction of *this* population that *S*ucceeds (*S*). If one wishes to reduce the number of such attacks, one must try and reduce some or all of these values. As we have defined the matter here, there is simply no other way of doing it.

The *N*umber of Muslim terrorist attacks (*N*) taking place in a given year must then be:

$$N = M \times A \times T \times S$$

So, in 2005, our equation would have looked something like this:

$$N = 2,400,000 \times 0.1 \times 0.01 \times 0.00167 = 4$$

These four people were, of course, the 7/7 bombers responsible for the 2005 bus and Tube bombings in London.

Let us consider the four parameters in slightly more detail. *A* and *T* are in essence,

psychological parameters that pertain to the way Muslims interpret the demands of their religion and events in the world around them. Virtually by definition, they are the hardest of the four to measure, to understand, or to adjust. Countless reams of excruciating guff have been written on the subjects of winning hearts and minds, of empowering the moderates to take on the extremists, of midwifing the Islamic Reformation, and of winning the debate between secularism and fundamentalism. However, despite the great cogitation that its creators presumably indulged in, Prevent, the flagship counter-radicalization programme of the Labour government, has now been kicked to the kerb, derided by all and sundry as useless at best and counterproductive at worst. This is a crucial point: any attempt to mould people psychologically can have results quite the opposite of those intended, as the underlying psychological substrate of the human mind is simply not amenable to being manipulated in this matter. No even remotely rigorous or reliable method exists for altering the parameters A or T, and attempts to do so are the purest voodoo.

Parameter M, in contrast, has real and obvious meaning. Irrelevant debates about who is a 'real' Muslim to one side, it is clear that there are very many Muslims in the UK and that their numbers are growing very rapidly. The causes of this rapid growth are Muslim immigration and higher Muslim fertility. The latter of these two causes is difficult to control directly, but the former is straightforward in principle for a wealthy, technologically advanced island nation in the north-west of Europe. This means that M is a parameter over which the government can extend massive influence over, particularly in the long term.

Parameter S bundles together a number of different factors but derives most obviously from the competence and resources of the security establishment *relative to the terrorist threat*. A fixed-size security establishment will not be able to keep S (and therefore successful terrorist attacks) at zero year after year in the face of a growing threat (which we can consider to be equal to M x A x T). As S cannot be adjusted directly, but only by creating a security apparatus to try and keep it as low as possible, we take the *E*fficiency of the security apparatus as being E, and define $S = 1 - E$. Now, as long as E can be kept equal to one, no successful attacks will occur in any given year. As the terrorist threat mounts, keeping E equal to one will become harder and harder and require an ever greater degree of funding and expertise. Note that E will vary discontinuously from year to year as a function of luck, the competence of Muslim terrorists, and the competence of the security apparatus of other countries, and that N itself will therefore vary discontinuously.

We now have a basic grasp of our parameters. A and T cannot be measured, understood, or adjusted with any meaningful degree of control at all, and attempts to reduce them may well backfire. S can be adjusted only indirectly and without complete control through pouring resources into the security services, and hoping that they can keep the value of E from dropping below 1. M, on the other hand is subject to a very significant degree of what we shall call *trajectory control,* in that the actions of government (especially a ruthless government) can extend huge influence over its long-term trajectory, for better or for worse.

How then, did the Labour government attack the problem of Muslim terrorism? We have noted that, central to the entire government effort to prevent 'violent extremism' was Prevent, a desperate and embarrassing effort to reduce A and T by giving Muslim youth table tennis facilities and other such nonsense. Meanwhile, Blair and then Brown continued to allow Muslims to flood into Britain through family reunion and other mechanisms (which

was actually *expanded* when they came to power in 1997), and be subsidized to have large families by the British taxpayer. This put Muslims (which is to say, *M*) onto a massively mushrooming trajectory, which they are only now starting to be dislodged from by the Conservative-led government. No mention of Muslim terrorism by anyone in the Labour government (or the police under their control) that we are aware of ever addressed this simple point. *M* was simply out of bounds, utterly beyond the pale. The Muslim terrorist threat, defined by us as *M* x *A* x *T*, was somehow unrelated to one of its three parameters, *M*. Trajectory control of *M* was relinquished to Muslims themselves, whose predisposition for importing close relatives to procreate with has been driving it up rapidly.

Let us consider the significance of this. If *M* doubles over a given period of time, then halving, say, *A,* results in *N* retaining exactly the same value as it had to begin with. In other words, the apparently impossible task of reducing by half the fraction of the Muslim population of Britain approving of terrorist attacks against Britain, even if achieved, would be cancelled out completely if the Muslim population had doubled over the same time period. *M* is currently thought to be about 2.9 million, up from about 1.8 million in 2001, and presumably from approximately 1.5 million in 1997, when Labour came to power. This is a near doubling of *M* over the 13 years of the Labour government, a development which would negate huge successes with respect to *A* and *T* even if they could be achieved, which they cannot.

What this means is that the only hope for preventing Muslim terrorism is to focus on keeping *S* as low as possible, which means keeping *E* at a value of 1. Certainly we must give thanks for a security service that appears, by and large, to do an extremely good job of preventing Muslims who want to kill us from killing us. But, as members of the security service would be the first to acknowledge, there is simply no way in which they can expect to reliably interdict every single such attempt in perpetuity. That the number of successful Muslim terrorist attacks in the UK so far should be so low stems substantially from factors inherent to the Muslim population of the UK rather than from the intrinsic brilliance of MI5 or Special Branch. Should these factors themselves evolve, and Muslim terrorists obtain any of the formidable strengths of the PIRA, we will be in a very different situation.

If, then, a government claims to be terribly concerned about Muslim terrorism, yet wilfully ignores the only parameter (*M*) it has any significant control over to focus on two parameters that it has no control over (*A* and *T*) and one that it has a hard-to-evaluate influence on (*S*), what are we forced to conclude about its sincerity other than that it has none? We do not claim here that individual Labour politicians did not care about the 7/7 bombings, or laughed them off as a minor inconvenience. We have no doubt that they were appalled by them and were desperate to prevent them being repeated, *but only within the constraints of a program of mass immigration which they had created and to which they were still fully committed*. Similarly, one could be desperately eager to lose weight within the constraints imposed by a nutritional program of eating an entire chocolate cake for breakfast every day. But what would an impartial observer make of such behaviour? How much importance would this observer conclude that a person eating a chocolate cake a day *really* attached to losing weight?

We are forced to conclude that, taken as a whole, the counter-terrorism efforts of the Labour government were about as meaningful as our hypothetical chocolate cake diet would be. Yet,

ostensibly in the service of this pathetic charade, we have spent years being told that we must hamstring our ability to address the true nature of the problems created by the Muslim presence in our country. What have we been forbidden to discuss, highlight, or criticize so as not to push the moderates into the arms of the extremists, to use the hackneyed expression that has replaced the thought processes of so many?

We cannot discuss the intrinsically violent and oppressive nature of Islam, as to do so would marginalize Muslims in the UK and push the moderates into the arms of the extremists. We cannot oppose Muslim immigration, as to do so would marginalize Muslims in the UK and push the moderates into the arms of the extremists. We cannot draw attention to the rank criminality of Muslims, as to do so would marginalize Muslims in the UK and push the moderates into the arms of the extremists. We cannot demonstrate against anything to do with Islam (the EDL springs to mind, and has been explicitly, and disgracefully, criticized on these grounds), as to do so would marginalize Muslims in the UK and push the moderates into the arms of the extremists. There is simply no end to the self-censorship required of us.

What are people really saying when they say these things? Assuming they are sincere, they are saying that the imperative to keep the parameters A and T as low as possible (despite the fact that we have no control over them) is so overwhelming in the fight to stop otherwise 'moderate' Muslims from deciding to try and kill us (!) that we must turn a blind eye to every other pernicious effect Muslims are having on our country, thereby implicitly accepting that we will be thrust into a tribal conflict that will rip our country apart and kill thousands of people. And this from the same people that are happy for M to become arbitrarily high and celebrate its growth as the dawning of a new age of man!

That preventing acts of terrorism is not the only responsibility of government is clear. If the British state had simply withdrawn from Northern Ireland in 1972 (by far the most murderous year of the Troubles), then the IRA would have had no reason to commit terrorist acts on the British mainland. However, few British people indeed would have supported such a course of action. Similarly, few would condemn the immigration policies of the Labour government vis-à-vis Muslims if there existed some massive compensatory benefit to us of the Muslim presence in this country. But as we have established in earlier documents, and as is painfully clear by now in a purely intuitive way to boot, Muslim immigration into Britain has been a catastrophe for the British people quite irrespective of the terrorist threat Muslims pose, due to the criminality, parasitism, and general unpleasantness of Muslims.

Whether or not any particular criticism of the Muslim presence in the UK or Islam in general really increases A or T is a virtually impossible-to-answer empirical question. But the answer is irrelevant. We *must* speak out about what Muslim immigration is pushing us towards, which is a violent conflict that will make isolated terrorist attacks look like small beer in comparison. Is it not better to face this reality, and, perhaps, a greater short-term threat of terrorism, than to stay on the conveyor belt and be fed into the crusher? But this, *not one single figure* in mainstream British politics has yet done. This is the scale of the problem, and provides an insight into how hard it will be to turn this ship around before it smashes onto the rocks of a violent, tribal conflict.

V. Towards Conflict

Though Muslim population growth in the UK will push us inexorably into violent conflict, our analysis must attempt to move beyond generalities and consider exactly how and when such conflict is most likely to break out. The pressure driving us towards conflict is steady and inexorable, but the escalations of that conflict will be discrete and sudden. Attempting to predict in detail what these escalations will consist of would be an exercise in futility, but considering what general form they are likely to take is an endeavour well worth the effort.

Whatever form the flashpoints of violent conflict between British and Muslims take, they will obviously not take place in the Scottish Highlands, or in deepest, darkest Cornwall. Conflict will flare first and most obviously in areas where large Muslim populations live side-by-side with large populations of the British. This means that there are three main areas where this conflict can flare up, and where it will doubtless be concentrated thereafter: the north-west of England, the West Midlands, and the Greater London area. We argue here that there are two main types of events that are likely to constitute the key triggering and escalating events in our Muslim Troubles: riots and terrorist attacks. We will consider each in turn here.

Riots

Just as the crucial developments that led to the deployment of the British Army in NI were the rioting on the Bogside housing estate in Derry and the rioting in Belfast that was a direct response to it, we feel comfortable in stating that the most obvious stepping stones on the path to outright violent conflict will be more or less lethal riots in the key urban areas we mentioned above. In other words, our Muslim Troubles are likely to commence when specific towns and cities obtain such large Muslim populations that the tension that has been brewing in them for such a long time bursts to the fore in riots which the police cannot control, which result in serious injuries, deaths, and people being forced from their homes, and which are so severe as to make it clear that the Rubicon has been crossed, and that the divide between Muslim and Briton is total.

Of course, we have already seen severe riots in many Muslim-heavy towns and cities in the north of England, but the 2001 riots were insufficient to ignite outright conflict between Muslims and British for a variety of reasons. Firstly, these riots were prior to 9/11 and the rapid escalation of tensions between Muslims and non-Muslims throughout the West that has ensued. Secondly, they took place before the rapid recent growth of a pan-European consciousness that our countries are, quite simply, being colonized by massive influxes of rapidly-breeding Muslims who have failed utterly in the task of turning their own countries into places worth living in. Thirdly, the areas in question were simply not Muslim enough in 2001. If, in 2031, similar riots break out again in, say, the north of England, by which time the Muslim population will be much larger and an extra twenty years' worth of hatred and fear will have been allowed to build, the results will certainly be very different. The key question is not whether such riots would push us over the edge into our Muslim Troubles, but whether we are even likely to get through to 2031 before they occur.

There are already a number of towns and cities in England whose Muslim populations are of

the order of 20%. Bearing in mind that the demographic profiles of Muslims and Britons are quite different, with Muslim populations having younger median ages, let us assume that areas like this already have populations aged 18 and younger that are already 30%–35% Muslim. As our key assumption, outlined earlier, was that the British government will fail to display the will required to pre-empt the conflict, we are also assuming that Muslim immigration will continue largely as it is conducted at present. Accordingly, the Muslim populations and the young Muslim populations must be expected to continue to rise very quickly. Of course there is no scientific way of determining when we enter the danger zone for a complete disintegration of civil order, but the extreme tensions over the last couple of years in Luton and the emergence and growing profile of the EDL suggest that it is being approached fairly quickly in the UK, as in so many places throughout Europe. We will assume here that a 2:1 ratio of Britons to Muslims, and the approximately 1:1 ratio young Muslims to young Britons that will accompany it will certainly precipitate this situation (which is not to suggest that it could not happen earlier). Again, precise predictions are impossible, especially given that white flight is already accelerating the conversion of certain towns and cities in England into Muslim-dominated zones. Here we will, in a slightly arbitrary fashion, establish a time twenty years from now, in 2031, as being that point in time at which at least some towns or cities in England are tipping over into becoming majority-Muslim in their young populations, and in which riots of the sort we described above could happen at any time. In other words, we claim here that our Muslim Troubles must start by about 2031 at the very latest as long as our underlying assumption of 'no change of course' holds true.

Terrorist Attacks

The wild card in this consideration of how the conflict will start is the possibility of terrorist attacks, perpetrated by either side, against the other. Such attacks will act as sparks, setting alight the increasingly pitch-soaked fabric of 21st century Britain. This is not completely inconsistent with our above claim that rioting will be the trigger, as terrorist attacks could turn out to be what sparks the localized violence bitter enough to descend into permanent conflict. But they are nonetheless a distinct phenomenon in their own right, in that sufficiently appalling terrorist atrocities could plunge us straight into our Muslim Troubles years before they would otherwise have been caused by 'normal' rioting.

Though Muslims would have to be the odds-on favourites to commit terrorist attacks of this sort, it would be foolish in the extreme to rule out the possibility of British paramilitaries of whatever sort deciding to, for example, car-bomb a mosque. We will have a great deal more to say on such matters in subsequent sections. Let it suffice for the moment for us to observe that, as we will see in a later section, the record of the loyalist paramilitaries in NI during the Troubles provides little reason to believe that those British who consider themselves British (excluding therefore the PIRA and other republican paramilitaries) would refuse to engage in such ruthless and murderous activities.

Of course, we have already suffered terrorist attacks and attempted terrorist attacks at the hands of Muslims. British people were shocked and appalled by the 7/7 bombings in 2005, but they did not threaten to tip us over into any sort of civil conflict. The reasons for this include all the reasons that the riots in the north of England in 2001 could not do so, but include the following separate reasons as well: a) they were carried out against relatively

impersonal targets in central London, and b) they did not target any one particular, geographically-rooted community which could feel as a consequence that its very viability was threatened and that would therefore be motivated to strike back. As demographic change proceeds and racial and religious tensions mount, the likelihood of British or Muslim paramilitaries targeting their neighbours and creating a situation reminiscent of the divide between the Protestant Shankill Road and Catholic Falls Road in Belfast will increase. Terrorist attacks on the religious, commercial, or residential hearts of specific geographic communities are far more likely to precipitate long-term violent conflict than repetitions of the 7/7 bombings.

****

The 2:1 Protestant-to-Catholic ratio in NI in 1969 was a very long way away from anything that currently obtains in the UK with respect to its Muslim population, which is still less than 5% of the whole. This being the case, some will undoubtedly be inclined to think that trouble is therefore a long way off. But we should think hard about which geographical units are of most relevance to our analysis. Which areas should we be focusing on? Individual towns and cities? Areas such as the Midlands? England? Which populations should we be comparing?

To compare the current Muslim population of the UK (just under 5%) to the Catholic population of NI when conflict erupted (about 33%) would be to miss the point. Those parts of Britain undergoing rapid colonization by Muslims are, taken by themselves, only small parts of Britain. But NI itself is only a small part of Britain. It is the *local* population balance that seems to matter, and NI was a good example of this. Would we say that the 500,000-strong Catholic population of NI in 1969 was only a tiny minority of the whole of the UK, and that violent conflict could therefore not break out between it and some other part of the population? Obviously not, as it is a historical fact that such conflict did break out. Why could something similar not happen in, say Birmingham? Why could conflict envelop an area such as NI, but not a city such as Birmingham, whose population is of the same order of magnitude as that of NI in 1969, or an area such as the north-west of England, whose population is considerable larger?

If, in this context, there is any major difference between the Troubles in NI and our forthcoming Muslim Troubles, it will be that the Troubles were seen largely as being a foreign conflict in a foreign land by most of the population of the mainland UK. The tolerance on the part of the British public and political class for violence in NI was therefore relatively high. An awareness of this reality was one of the factors that led the IRA to start bombing England in the early 1970s, and to strike again repeatedly in London and Manchester in the 1990s. Nothing like this will be the case when British and Muslims fall into low-intensity war with each other in and around the three key conflict areas of the north-west of England, the West Midlands, and Greater London. Most of the population of England will be either in, or close to, one of these war zones, a reality which will instantly confer an edge to the conflict quite different to that of the Troubles,[6] even ignoring its much greater scale.

---

[6] This is said from the perspective of an Englishman. The Troubles undoubtedly had quite enough edge already for those who happened to live in Belfast.

VI. An Introduction to Amateur Bomb-Building

Rioting and mob violence are, as we have already argued, likely to trigger and be prevalent at the outset of the conflict, but will not be especially lethal and will probably subside as the two sides hunker down in their zones of dominance and do their best to keep each other out. It is surely not too bold a prediction to state that any serious, long-term violence directed by either of the two sides at the other will therefore consist substantially of either the use of explosives or the use of firearms. A consideration of the former allows us to make some intriguing predictions with respect to key strategic and tactical aspects of our Muslim Troubles.

****

That explosives are likely to be used in a violent conflict in the 21st century is too obvious a point to be worthy of further elaboration in its own right. However, given that neither side in the conflict will have much access, if any at all, to regular supplies of military explosives or explosive devices, nearly all use of explosives will feature home-made explosives of some sort. The importance of this point cannot be overstated. In Iraq, for example, the improvised explosive devices used by insurgents seem to be constructed overwhelmingly out of the vast stores of standard munitions that either existed in Iraq at the time of the 2003 invasion or that have been smuggled in since. Artillery shells, tank shells, mortar shells, and anti-tank mines, which is to say, industrially produced explosive devices of great power and reliability, have been crucial to the lethality of the operations undertaken against U.S. and other forces.

In the absence of such explosive materials, Iraq insurgents would have been forced to produce home-made explosives to build such devices, which would have drastically reduced their ability to wage their irregular campaign. Those involved in our looming conflict will operate under precisely these sorts of restraints. Though military, industrial, or commercial connections may allow those on the British side to acquire a certain quantity of commercial or military explosives, steady supplies of such material can hardly be relied upon. Accordingly, the amount and type of explosives available to each side will be a function of the following: a) their degree of access to relevant chemical precursors, and b) their technical proficiency in producing the required explosive substances and detonating them. Let us consider each in turn.

Access to Chemical Precursors

Those with a grasp of the underlying chemistry (which we will *not* be discussing in detail in this document) and the barest familiarity with Google will quickly discover that all sorts of chemical precursors for home-made explosives are available online to whoever wishes to order them, certainly in retail quantities and sometimes in bulk. However, attempts on the part of parties not well-established in the chemical or agricultural industries to order large, or in extreme cases any, quantities of such chemicals will have a high probability of resulting in the suppliers contacting the authorities. This principle can be generally illustrated in the context of ammonium nitrate, which is by far and away the most important chemical substance in this context.

Ammonium nitrate, produced and sold in huge quantities as a general purpose fertilizer, can be converted into an explosive substance if it is mixed with certain other chemical substances.[7] Being available in huge quantities for a legitimate purpose, it has proven to be central to the bombing campaigns of various paramilitary groups, including the PIRA, as well as in one-off attacks such as the Oklahoma City bombing. Such bombings and bombing campaigns would be exceptionally difficult to carry out without it. A large car or truck bomb of the type that the IRA used to devastate parts of London and Manchester in the 1990s requires hundreds of pounds, if not tonnes, of explosive. If many such bombings are to be carried out as part of an ongoing bombing campaign, then clearly huge amounts of the relevant chemical precursors are required. Hence the key role of ammonium nitrate in this regard. There is simply nothing else that can be procured in sufficiently large amounts.

The importance of ammonium nitrate will likely prove a key operational difficulty for Muslims throughout our Muslim Troubles. Though access to it is not restricted *per se*, it is usually bought in bulk from agricultural suppliers who adhere voluntarily to a code of practice under which they report suspicious purchases or requests to the authorities. This code of practice did not prevent Bodle Brothers, an agricultural supplier in Burgess Hill, selling 600kg of it to an Algerian would-be terrorist in 2003, despite it being vastly too much for the allotment for which he claimed to need it. However, we assume that the powers-that-be have since applied a cattle prod to the nether regions of agricultural suppliers in general, and that said suppliers run a tighter ship now. Either way, a descent into violent conflict will necessarily result in far greater scrutiny of attempts to purchase such chemicals than exists at present, and being a Muslim will be the greatest red flag of all. The five men of Bangladeshi origin arrested taking photographs of Sellafield on the day Osama bin Laden was killed will no doubt attest to the way in which belonging to certain ethnic groups results in you being flagged for special attention fairly promptly. This suspicion will only heighten along with the violence we predict.

British paramilitaries are unlikely to suffer from such difficulties, at least to the same extent, for two reasons. Firstly, John Smith will not attract the same degree of attention as Mohammed bin Qassim when he phones up his local garden centre for a bag of ammonium nitrate. Secondly, British paramilitaries will doubtless already be recruiting farmers into their organizations (for a variety of reasons), and who in government will be able to keep track of the approximately one million tonnes of ammonium nitrate acquired for legitimate agricultural purposes every year? If 100kg of ammonium nitrate is passed from a farmer to a bomb-maker and ends up devastating a Muslim residential area in Birmingham, how will the security forces move to interdict such flows in future? This is, after all, only a tenth of a percent of a percent of a percent of all the ammonium nitrate used annually.

We must conclude that any British paramilitary organization worthy of the name will certainly be able to acquire substantial quantities of ammonium nitrate, through setting up some agricultural operation itself as a front if necessary. It will be completely impossible for even the most careful efforts of the security services to reliably derail attempts by these paramilitaries to obtain ammonium nitrate in significant quantities. Accordingly, as was true of the IRA, there will be no obvious limit to the number or size of the bombs they will be able to build assuming they have the required expertise in certain key regards.

---

[7] Strictly speaking, ammonium nitrate is an explosive in its own right, but is so insensitive as to make it virtually impossible to use on its own.

In parallel with this conclusion is another, equally important one: Muslim paramilitaries will not, in any remotely plausible scenario, ever attain the capability to conduct comprehensive bombing campaigns of the sort that the PIRA conducted during the Troubles. Both the maximum size and the number of the explosive devices they will be able to produce will be drastically curtailed relative to those of their enemies, the British paramilitaries fighting them.

We note here in the interests of being thorough that some Muslims do seem to believe they can produce car-bomb-sized explosive devices through the use of gas canisters as main charges. Attempted attacks in New York in 2010, Stockholm in 2010, and the UK in 2007 (all of which failed) demonstrate that there does exist the occasional Muslim terrorist of the opinion that these devices can actually be viable. However, their record to date in inducing these devices to explode is fairly underwhelming. It is certainly the case that, if one has a conventional explosive device, having gas canisters in close proximity to it when it explodes should create a bigger blast as the containers rupture, the gas rushes out with the shock wave, mixes with atmospheric oxygen, and ignites. A similar principle has been utilized by weapons developers in creating what are called fuel-air explosives, or thermobaric bombs. However, if one *can* produce conventional explosives, there is no obvious need to use gas canisters, as indeed the PIRA, and for that matter the loyalist paramilitaries, did not. And if one can *not* produce them, then one is left in the position of trying to pull oneself up by one's own bootstraps with the jerryrigged firework-and-gas-canister assemblies that have so far done little more than allow security services in the UK and other countries to cull the less technically adept parts of the Muslim terrorist community.

To summarize this section, British paramilitaries will certainly develop contacts that put them in possession of large quantities of virtually all the chemical precursors that bomb-makers could possibly hope for. This will allow them to conduct what we have called a PIRA-style comprehensive bombing campaign, in which all types and sizes of bombs are built and used. In contrast, Muslims will be restricted to building much smaller devices composed largely from retail quantities of more specific types of chemical precursors.

Production and Detonation of Explosive Devices

Those who conclude on the basis of the foregoing that anyone with access to ammonium nitrate can build a bomb, are, thankfully, correct only in the sense that such a mixture will, *in principle*, explode if one knows how to detonate it. Understanding this point requires a certain familiarity with how explosives work.

There are various taxonomies of explosives, but the one that concerns us here is as follows. Broadly speaking, explosive substances can be sub-divided into three different types: primary explosives, which are relatively easy to detonate with temperature, shock, or electric spark (e.g. nitroglycerine, lead azide, TATP), secondary explosives, which are less sensitive and safer to handle (e.g. PETN, RDX), and tertiary explosives, which are the least sensitive and hardest to detonate of all (e.g. ANFO, TNT). Primary explosives are far too easily detonated to be used safely in large amounts, but they have the explosive power necessary to detonate the more stable secondary explosives, which can in turn be used to detonate tertiary explosives. As such, the problem facing the would-be bomb-builder is how

to produce or obtain a set of explosive substances that allows him to create a sequence of explosions, that, concatenated into the tiniest fraction of a second, result in an explosion that satisfies his criteria.

Most ammonium nitrate-based explosives, and certainly those that are most likely to be produced by those who lack access to large supplies of industrial chemicals, are tertiary explosives and therefore require the use of both primary and secondary explosives to detonate.[8] This presents would-be bomb-builders with a problem fundamental to the nature of explosives themselves.

At some point in the bomb-building process, one *must* handle sensitive primary explosives that can go off very easily if exposed to the wrong type of stimulus. Those who cannot procure or produce secondary explosives will have no option but to rely purely on large amounts of primary explosive for the entire device, an exceptionally dangerous course of action when a single spark or jolt can result in detonation. It is thought that the notoriously sensitive primary explosive TATP[9] was used as the explosive in the 7/7 bombings. If so, this would be an example of creating explosive devices with primary explosives only, an incredibly risky undertaking and one that would require a great deal of care and at least a little luck to pull off.

If one does not wish to use such large amounts of primary explosive, one must rely on a secondary explosive either as the main charge or to detonate the main charge, and use the primary to detonate the secondary. But this requires access to the chemical precursors for the secondaries, the technical skills to produce them in pure enough form (which is not necessarily a straightforward undertaking), and the bomb-building skills to incorporate them, with the primary, into a viable device. Neither the experimentation nor the subsequent bomb-building are trivial matters, nor matters to be attempted by the slapdash.

This point can be better understood by considering the explosive repertoire of the PIRA. Technically proficient though it was, the PIRA was greatly enabled by the commercially produced Semtex (and presumably detonators, or primaries, as well) that it was provided with over the years by Gaddafi's Libyan regime. Used in medium-sized bombs (such as the one used to blow up the Grand Hotel in Brighton in 1984), as booster charges for large car bombs, and in home-made, anti-personnel coffee jar bombs designed to detonate on impact, Semtex made a great impact on the PIRA's military capabilities. A plastic explosive designed to combine the characteristics of explosive power, insensitivity to shock, and malleability, and possessing uniform and entirely predictable characteristics, Semtex is an ideal secondary explosive, and one of the most versatile explosive compositions in existence. The PIRA doubtless had the ability to produce secondary explosives itself, and would have done so when necessary. But this did not reduce the utility of its Semtex supplies. How much greater would the utility of such high-quality explosives be to inexperienced bomb-builders trying to cobble devices together in their bath-tubs?

If one browses the various improvised munitions handbooks, anarchist manuals, and Al-

---

[8] In principle, one could use primary explosives alone to do this, but one would have to use such large amounts as to create an unacceptable risk of *untimely* detonation.

[9] TATP is apparently referred to as the Mother of Satan in Muslim terrorist circles due to its exceptional sensitivity and the great danger that therefore accompanies its use.

Qaeda bomb-building manuals that the Internet so generously makes available to us, one could be forgiven for thinking that a few pints of urine, a couple of clothes pegs, and a bottle of sulphuric acid were all that were required to start one's own bombing campaign. Fortunately, as we have explained, the real world erects barriers that make this Blue Peter approach to terrorism problematic. We must observe, without wishing to appear complacent, that the bomb-building skills of the Muslim population of the UK, or Europe more generally, do not as yet seem to be particularly advanced. Though the 7/7 bombers were obviously well-trained enough to conduct a successful attack, the 21/7 would-be bombers were less proficient in this regard, with the detonators (i.e. the primary explosives) detonating but the main charges (i.e. the secondary explosives) failing to do so. The repeated failure of gas-canister car bombings is further evidence of technical ineptitude and restricted access to chemical precursors on the part of Muslim would-be bombers *at present*.

There will be other difficulties involved in amateur bomb-making. In contrast with military or industrial explosive systems, in which explosive substances and components have properties and interactions which are known with precision, amateur bomb-builders will be dealing with self-devised systems in which a) the purity of chemical substances, b) the amounts and relative positions of explosive components, c) the interactions between primaries, secondaries, and tertiaries, and d) the reliability of detonation systems will have to be tested to ensure that one has produced a viable explosive system. Accordingly, experimentation will be required, and it will be obvious that this will have to take place in isolated areas if terrorist plotters are to avoid detection by the authorities. Muslims are not only overwhelmingly concentrated in urban areas, but, as we have noted, already stick out like a sore thumb in rural areas unless they happen to be white converts. This increases the importance of such locations as Pakistan and Somalia to Muslim terrorists. However, visiting such places to receive training presents its own problems, which range from being flagged by the Pakistani, British, or American security services to having one's stay in the motherland cut short by a Hellfire missile. Moreover, the high failure rate of graduates of these camps in actually trying to build viable devices suggests that tuition therein is often not really up to scratch.

In closing, let us consider what light is shed on these matters by the attempted terrorist attacks in Stockholm in December 2010. There were two bombs in the attack. The first one was a car bomb consisting of a primitive explosive device (possibly containing fireworks) and a number of liquid petroleum gas canisters. The gas was ignited by the explosive device but did not itself detonate, and caused only minor injuries to a small number of passers-by. This must be considered a severe failure, and is indicative of the type of problem that will be faced by would-be terrorists who lack access to chemical precursors, the technical expertise to formulate them into a bomb, or, in all likelihood in this particular case, both.

The second bomb consisted of a set of six pipe bombs strung around the bomber's torso. The bomber was killed when one of the pipe bombs exploded prematurely, blowing a hole in his abdomen. A pipe bomb is essentially a very large and powerful firecracker, containing a black powder-type substance that explodes only if confined. These powders are extremely sensitive to temperature, shock, and static electricity, and this sensitivity is presumably what accounted for the premature explosion of one of the devices and the ignominious death of the Muslim terrorist who bore it. Whether the bomber went to heaven for his martyrdom, or hell for his suicide, will have to remain a secret between him and Allah. We confine our own

comments to suggesting that, from the perspective of those still on this mortal coil, this second part of the operation too must be considered a failure. Such are the difficulties of reliably producing and detonating explosive devices, difficulties which have confounded people far more capable than the recently-deceased Stockholm bomber, Taimour Abdulwahab al-Abdaly.

VII. Paramilitaries: General Considerations

Though the threat of Muslim terrorism is often compared to the one-time (and future?) threat of Irish republican terrorism, the notion that they are similar is an appalling conceptual error that needs to be eradicated here. It is imperative that readers understand the massive qualitative difference between these two types of terrorism. Despite a common perception that the PIRA were perfectly happy to blow up British civilians willy-nilly if, in their estimation, it served their needs to do so, the truth of the matter is that, overwhelmingly, they were exceptionally reluctant to inflict significant numbers of such casualties, and then only as collateral damage in operations aimed at police, military, political, or economic targets. This point may well prove to be difficult to accept for the British people most likely to be reading this document, but it is true nonetheless. Of course, communities on the receiving end of violence rapidly lose interest in the subtleties of what exactly those directing that violence at them do or not intend, or which bomb went off early and which on time. This is natural enough, but cannot be allowed to affect the analysis here.

Most of the most notorious PIRA bomb attacks of the Troubles, which is to say, those that killed the largest number of civilians, either did so due to poor planning and/or operational errors, or were not sanctioned by the PIRA command structure. By and large, they were PR disasters for the PIRA and damaged its ability to present itself as a non-sectarian organization with legitimate political goals that it pursued as a disciplined military force. Let us review some of the most notorious here to establish this key point.

- The La Mon restaurant bombing in 1978 was one of the worst PIRA atrocities of the Troubles, involving as it did an incendiary bomb that immolated twelve Protestant civilians. In what appears to have been a pattern for the PIRA, the phoned-in warning was delayed by the inability of the PIRA operatives in question to find a functional public phone box in time to provide a reasonable period for the building to be evacuated.

- The Omagh bombing of 1998 was not in fact perpetrated by the PIRA, which was now committed to peace by the Good Friday Agreement, but by the dissident group that came to be known as the Real IRA. Though the operational doctrine of the RIRA was essentially that of the 'classical' PIRA and would not have allowed the targeting of civilians in this fashion, the car bomb was left in a location different to that originally planned. This resulted in a confused warning, and civilians being herded *into* the actual blast by unsuspecting security forces. Hence the extremely high death toll of twenty-nine.

- The 1987 Remembrance Day bombing in Enniskillen, in which eleven civilians, most of them elderly First World War veterans, was a PR disaster for the PIRA. Gerry Adams himself said 'the Republican movement cannot survive another Enniskillen.' It is not entirely clear what happened, but it is thought that an army band (i.e. a military target) was the actual target, and that a mistake of whatever sort with respect to the timing of the explosion resulted in the civilian deaths.

- The two Birmingham pub bombings in 1974, which resulted in 21 deaths between them and would eventually result in one of the most notorious miscarriages of justice of recent British history, do not appear to have been sanctioned by the PIRA leadership

of the time. An insufficiently early warning for the first blast due, it appears, to yet another vandalised public phone, and a complete lack of warning for the second, contributed to the high casualty figure. Whatever exactly one concludes with respect to the intentions of the bombers, the Birmingham bombings were anomalous when viewed within the context of the PIRA's 30-year military campaign.

- The Shankill Road bombing of 1993 was an attempt on the part of the PIRA to decapitate the UDA by killing Johnny Adair and other leaders in their headquarters, which was situated above a chip shop on the Shankill Road. The bomb, carried into the shop by two PIRA members dressed as delivery men, had an eleven-second fuse designed to allow those in the shop to get out before it detonated. However, the explosion occurred prematurely, killing eight civilians, one UDA member, and one of the bombers. The UDA leadership was elsewhere at the time.

- The Bloody Friday bombings of July 1972 were a part of the commercial bombing campaign that the PIRA had been conducting since 1971. Twenty-two bombs went off in Belfast, killing nine people. Warnings were called in for the bombs, but the time given to evacuate the areas was utterly inadequate, with the PIRA vastly overestimating the ability of the security forces to coordinate an evacuation against twenty-two bombs in such a short space of time. It issued a belated apology in 2002.

The key point to be made here is that, however ruthless the PIRA might have been, it never took the killing of civilians as an operational goal in its own right. Civilian casualties were certainly accepted as collateral damage (and the PIRA's definition of civilians could be rather broad, including, for example, workmen working at British Army bases), but this tends to be true of all violent actors, military or paramilitary, and is certainly true of the British Army. The unwillingness to target civilians *per se* was founded on the following factors: a) a genuine repugnance on the part of many PIRA Volunteers and the PIRA leadership with respect to such activities, b) a keen understanding of how such activities eroded support for the PIRA amongst the Catholic populations of both NI and the Republic of Ireland; c) a doctrinal commitment to a non-sectarian conflict in which British forces were to be forced out of NI, which would then be incorporated into a united Ireland.

This is not, of course, to deny the mutual sectarian hostility that existed between Catholics and Protestants in NI, but simply to point out that the exercising of this hostility was not the primary motivating factor for the PIRA. The PIRA set off thousands of bombs during the Troubles, but only the very smallest fraction of them have become notorious for having killed large numbers of civilians. This is not the behaviour one would expect of an organization which took the killing of civilians as a key objective. Truck bombs of the sort that devastated English cities in the 1990s could have killed hundreds of civilians if the PIRA had detonated them with such murderous intent.

Some may object to this characterisation of the PIRA's violence on the grounds of the sectarian killings that it engaged in from the early 1970s onwards. However, this sectarian killing campaign was instigated largely by the loyalist paramilitaries, was viewed with repugnance by many PIRA members, and was the source of bitter divisions in the PIRA leadership over what was considered a distortion of the organization's long-term goals. This tit-for-tat killing spree ran at its fiercest from 1972 to 1976, when, threatening to escalate to new heights, it was scaled back by mutual consent on both sides. In the late 80s, when the

loyalist paramilitaries ratcheted their killings up again, the PIRA refrained from retaliating on the same scale. The reasons for this are complex, but included an awareness that sectarian killings would damage the electoral appeal of Sinn Fein, the political wing of the PIRA, and that it was politically useful to be seen as the victim of sectarian terrorist violence rather than the perpetrator.

Irrespective of exactly how one interprets IRA violence, the contrast with Muslim terrorism and violence could hardly be starker. Muslim terrorism essentially consists of killing as many civilians as possible, with infrastructural damage and consequent economic damage thrown in for good measure if possible. This is not to deny that Muslim terrorists also target political and military figures, but they do not seem to have any *preference* for these targets. Furthermore, these targets are often well-guarded and hard to strike, and this, combined with the Islamic willingness to strike the softest of soft targets, means that they usually do.

The point has been made before by others, but the only discernible limiting factor on the terrorist violence that Muslims are prepared to do is *capability*. If they can kill ten people, they will, but if they can kill a hundred, they will do that instead. If they can kill a thousand, that would be preferable again. The talking heads who reiterate endlessly that we have dealt with terrorism before in the form of Irish republican terrorism, and that Muslim terrorism is not the only type of terrorism we face, always seem to ignore the fact that Muslim terrorists will kill as many of us as they can, men, women, and children. No similar terrorist threat has ever been faced by this country.

One of the most important single things to understand in the context of the brewing conflict between Europeans and Muslims is that Islamic terrorists either do not operate under moral constraints, or operate under constraints so loose that we, from our cultural perspective, can scarcely recognize them as restraints at all. Those Muslims motivated to kill in service of their religion seem to have very little in the way of a reluctance to kill civilians. Whether this lack of restraint derives directly from their religious doctrines or not is a matter that others can concern themselves with. Here, it suffices for us to observe that the type of mass civilian death toll the PIRA tried to avoid during its own armed campaign is precisely what Muslim terrorists strive for. Accordingly, and unsurprisingly, their terrorist attacks regularly cause civilian death tolls orders of magnitude beyond anything the IRA was responsible for, intentionally or otherwise.

The most obvious example of this would be the attacks on the World Trade Centre in 2001, which killed approximately 3,000 people, but there are many others that serve to demonstrate that Muslim terrorism takes the mass infliction of such casualties as its core operating objective. The Bali nightclub bombing killed about 200 people, mainly tourists. The Madrid subway bombing had a similar death toll. Whether we look at the U.S. Embassy bombing in Kenya, the attacks on Bombay in 2008, the Beslan school attack in Russia in 2004, or the Baghdad church bombing in 2010, we see that the basic objective is always the same: kill as many civilians as possible, simultaneously damaging economically vital infrastructure if possible, in attempts to horrify the relevant governments into doing what one wants them to do.

This will have great significance for our violent conflict with Muslims, in that atrocities of this sort tend to be responded to in kind in a tit-for-tat fashion. Loyalist and republican

paramilitaries were quite conscious and explicit about the retaliatory nature of their attacks, often killing similar numbers of people to the numbers of their own communities who had been killed in the attacks they were retaliating for. Where will this eventually lead if Muslim terrorists in the UK storm a school and try to recreate the Beslan massacre on British soil?

Let us condense the argument to a single point here. The long string of torture-murders carried out in the 1970s by the UVF unit that came to be known as the Shankill Butchers was arguably the single most appalling episode in the Troubles. The murders were particularly disturbing in that most of them were finished off with the application of a razor-sharp butcher's knife to the throat of the victim, cutting through the neck all the way down to the spinal column. These murders were committed by what was, in effect, a UVF franchise led by a psychopath who had already demonstrated that the UVF leadership could not control him, and who was content to act without regard for UVF policy and without the knowledge of the UVF leadership.

These frightful murders, the low point of the Troubles in terms of their sheer bestial brutality, were not only well within the boundaries of what Islamic terrorists seem to allow themselves, but very similar to what appears to constitute a key operational option for these people. The beheading, on camera, of those unfortunate enough to fall into their hands, is something we have come to expect from Muslim terrorists, and that this material should be used in recruitment attempts tells us something about Muslim psychology and the opinions of Muslim terrorists as to what will excite and motivate their fellow Muslims.

****

This mention of the Shankill Butchers takes us conveniently back to the differences between Irish republican terrorism and loyalist terrorism. British readers are far more likely to know of the existence of the PIRA than they are of the existence of the Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF) or the Ulster Defence Association (UDA), the two main loyalist paramilitaries, but these latter are no less relevant to the likely course of events in our Muslim Troubles. We can start to see why this should be so by considering what was arguably the single most effective terrorist attack of the Troubles: the Dublin and Monaghan bombings of May 1974.

We will be discussing these bombings in more detail later on, but mention them here as well as evidence of the sheer ruthlessness of the UVF. Three car bombs in Dublin and one in Monaghan went off within a short period of time, killing a total of 33 people. Taken as a single attack, this death toll made them the single most lethal outrage of the Troubles, and one which deliberately targeted civilians without any warning at all. There is no bombing conducted by the PIRA that was directly comparable to them. Indeed, the contrast with the PIRA's approach to bombings, especially in later years (prioritizing economic damage, and delivering very careful warnings) is striking, and extremely instructive. We take them as strong supporting evidence for the following claim: that the loyalist paramilitaries were more ruthless than the republican paramilitaries.

Why should this have been the case? Three obvious reasons present themselves, and all are potentially instructive with respect to the conflict we are likely to end up in with Muslims in the UK. Of course, it is possible that there are deep cultural reasons that loyalists were more ruthless than republicans during the conflict, but we are unaware of them, and feel that

much can be explained without recourse to such explanations.

The first reason for the greater ruthlessness of loyalists is that the UVF and the UDA[10] were not able to identify the republican paramilitaries they would most like to have struck at. Thus, when NI seemed to be disintegrating in 1972, and when the possibility of being dragged into a united Ireland seemed very real, they were left with a choice between leaving matters to the security forces (who, to put it mildly, were not exactly on top of the situation in the early 70s), or to strike at Catholic civilians in an attempt to pressurise the PIRA into bringing a halt to its own campaign. Of course, it would have been far more effective to kill PIRA members themselves, but how were paramilitaries without effective intelligence-gathering arms to accomplish what was often a very difficult task for the British state itself? The PIRA could target the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC), the Ulster Defence Regiment (UDR), and the British Army and maintain a stance to the effect that it was waging a war against the British state. But there was no equivalent option for loyalist paramilitaries, hence their attacks on civilians.

The second reason, which would have been especially pertinent from the late 70s onwards, is that the PIRA understood by then, at least at leadership level, that its early 1970s objective of forcing British forces out of NI through physical force alone was untenable. What this meant was that any conceivable withdrawal of those forces would have to take place, eventually, on the basis of a process that was at least partly political. This in turn could not happen if the PIRA was seen by the British as a viciously sectarian murder gang, as it would have been impossible for the British government to negotiate with such a force. When loyalist sectarian killing flared up again in the late 80s, PIRA members were expressly forbidden from retaliating in kind for this reason. However, there were no similar restrictions on the behaviour of loyalist paramilitaries, who were fighting not to overturn a status quo, but to preserve it. For most of the conflict, they had little interest in presenting themselves as being a reasonably 'civilized' political force with whom one might do business, or for whom one might vote.

The third reason was that there was a strong strain of non-sectarian thinking in the PIRA and its supporters that, though not universal or always observed, was obviously widespread and genuine. The PIRA was fighting for a British withdrawal from Ireland, subsequent to which NI would be incorporated into a united Ireland. This would obviously entail the Protestant population of NI becoming the fellow Irish citizens of the rest of the Irish, north and south of the border, a development hardly likely to result in a harmonious state of affairs if Protestants had good reason to believe they would be subjected to homicidal antipathy by those fellow citizens. This is not to suggest that there was no sectarian *feeling* amongst PIRA members, only that an ideological opposition to sectarianism was a strong force amongst PIRA leaders. In contrast, the UVF and UDA were battling to keep NI in the UK and to keep Protestants in a dominant position therein. They were not trying to win friends amongst the Catholic population, and had no particular need to be esteemed by them.

All of these factors contributed, we can be reasonably confident, to the way in which the

---

[10] The UDA was a legal organization for most of its existence, unlike the UVF. However, its paramilitary arm, the Ulster Freedom Fighters (UFF), was proscribed. The UFF was essentially a badge of convenience used by that relatively small part of the UDA that actually carried out bombings and shootings. Writings on the Troubles will sometimes refer to an attack as having been conducted by the UDA and sometimes as having been conducted by the UFF, but they can be considered equivalent for our purposes, in that the UFF was a part of the UDA.

ruthlessness of the loyalist paramilitaries seems, on the whole, to have outstripped that of the IRA. The purely sectarian killing campaigns that the UVF and UDA launched in the early 1970s and that peaked around 1976 consisted largely of the killing of civilians identified as Catholics in whatever fashion. Though the paramilitaries in question often described their victims as 'IRA men,' to themselves and others, it was clear at the time that this was almost entirely a fig leaf for outright sectarian murder.

****

In the light of the foregoing considerations, can we make any predictions as to the type and severity of the violence likely to be perpetrated by paramilitary organizations in our own conflict? We feel we can, though sadly none of them provide any grounds for optimism.

Two observations offer themselves at the outset: a) Muslims engaged in politically-motivated violence seem to have virtually no psychological barriers to the mass killing of civilians, and b) British paramilitaries will be in a position much closer to that of the loyalist paramilitaries during the Troubles than the republican paramilitaries, and must therefore be expected to be exposed to a similar set of incentives and pressures with respect to their own violent activities. Taken together, these two factors make it highly probable that any prolonged conflict between British and Muslim paramilitaries will descend, perhaps quickly, into the outright indiscriminate killing of those perceived to be on the other side.

During the Troubles, both sides directed their violence at adults, particularly men, when possible. Sectarian killings usually targeted men, and children were only ever injured or killed by bombings, which are indiscriminate by their very nature. Even the most notorious sectarian killings, in which workmen were taken off buses and shot (the Kingsmill massacre, carried out by the PIRA) or discos machine-gunned (the Greysteel massacre, carried out by the UDA), either killed men or targeted the type of establishment likely to be occupied by men (pubs, etc., which were a preferred target for 'spray jobs'). Never did either side ever target a school, or a group of women. The Irish National Liberation Army (INLA), a small and exceptionally violent republican paramilitary group, did carry out a shooting at a Pentecostal church in County Armagh in 1983. However, this was apparently not sanctioned by the INLA leadership, and there were no other such attacks on churches by either side that we are aware of throughout the entire conflict.

British paramilitaries are largely of the same cultural DNA as the paramilitaries that were party to the Troubles and could be expected to conduct themselves similarly if faced with similar opponents. However, Muslims have a cultural DNA all their own, as we have already shown, and this bodes ill for our Muslim Troubles. Though it is probable that, in the early stages of the conflict, British paramilitaries will make at least some attempts to focus their attacks on adult Muslim males, any indiscriminate attacks on British targets that include large numbers of women and children will likely shred whatever restraint British paramilitaries may have felt inclined to exercise in this regard. We observe that the three reasons given for the greater ruthlessness of the loyalist paramilitaries above will all obtain in our Muslim Troubles: British paramilitaries will find it difficult to identify key figures in Muslim paramilitaries, British paramilitaries will not be aiming for a negotiated settlement with Muslims in which they must present themselves as being 'civilized,' and British paramilitaries will not be looking to a political future in which they and Muslims cooperate

amicably subsequent to the creation of a new political reality. Rather, British paramilitaries will consider themselves, accurately in our opinion, to be resisting the dispossession of their people by a hostile, religiously-motivated tribe that can create only violence, savagery and madness. Psychological restraints on their violence will therefore be weak to begin with, and must be expected to disappear entirely if Muslims act in the way that they always seem to.

VIII. Paramilitaries: Core Objectives

We have considered how the descent into violent conflict is likely to take place, and attained some familiarity with how Irish republicanism terrorism compares with loyalist terrorism on the one hand and Muslim terrorism on the other. Thus prepared, let us consider what we can expect of British and Muslim paramilitaries when our Muslim Troubles begin in earnest.

****

In the early stages of the conflict, violence is likely to be spontaneous, disorganized, and relatively low in fatalities due to the lack of availability of weapons and the vigorous riot control efforts of the authorities. However, once the Rubicon has been crossed and it has become clear to both sides that any sort of peaceful coexistence is impossible, cooler heads on both sides will start asking themselves what their long-term objectives should be and how they are most likely to be achieved.

We should first dispense with that which is relatively trivial and easy to predict and describe: the likely nature of Muslim violence towards the British. Muslim terrorist violence is so commonplace these days that its basic nature is perfectly clear. It is not complacent to suppose that Muslims will direct a type of violence at the British very similar to that that they already direct at people who provoke their ire. Muslims will be looking mainly to consolidate geographically, establishing zones within which they have control, within which the police cannot operate, and through which people considered to be outsiders cannot pass. They will accomplish this by rioting and attacking the police as and when they try to enter 'their' areas. Meanwhile, hard-line Muslims will undoubtedly work to enforce their own versions of sharia law within these enclaves. These efforts will be complemented by a heightened degree of terrorist activity of the type Muslims are already engaged in.

In short, Muslims will simply be doing more of what they are doing already, and trying to do it more consistently and with greater and more permanent effect. Far more worthy of detailed analysis is the likely nature of the violence of the British paramilitaries which have not yet emerged and whose activities are therefore, at present, the great unknowns ahead of us. The only obvious precedent we have in this regard is the loyalist terrorism we have already glanced at. During the Troubles, there were two paramilitary 'teams': republican paramilitaries (most obviously the PIRA, but also the OIRA, INLA, etc.), whose aims were to bring an end to British rule in NI and bring about a united Ireland of whatever sort, and loyalist paramilitaries (most obviously the UDA and UVF), whose aims were to keep NI in the United Kingdom and maintain Protestant political dominance there.

Core Objectives of British Paramilitaries

We point out here that we are focusing primarily on the early and middle stages of this conflict. The permanent departure of the bulk of the Muslim population of the UK may well be the ultimate strategic objective of many British paramilitaries, but it is not something that they can reasonably work towards in the short or, probably, even the medium term, so we will put it to one side here and ask what plausible short- and medium-term objectives British paramilitaries will likely establish for themselves. The only way to try and do this is to:

a) assume that they will adopt sensible objectives, b) assume that we have the insight required to determine what would actually be sensible objectives, and c) to conclude that British paramilitaries will therefore adopt the strategies we consider to be sensible. Of course, this is a great arrogance on our part, but we cannot proceed without it.

What then, would constitute a viable, reasonable set of strategic objectives for a British paramilitary organization or organizations to formulate after a descent into the widespread ethno-sectarian violence we predict here? Most obviously, it would include the following:

- Geographical consolidation

- Establishment of the principle of retaliation

- Assassination of key Muslims considered hostile

- Assassination of key non-Muslims considered hostile

- Establishment and display of technical expertise required to pull off 'spectaculars'

We will take these five objectives as being core objectives, the absolute bare minimum that any self-respecting broad-reach paramilitary organization could settle for in the early stages of a conflict. We will explore each in turn.

1) Geographical Consolidation

At the outbreak of our Muslim Troubles, we will have an archipelago of Muslim-dominated areas of towns and cities loosely strung out across the Greater London area, the West Midlands, and the North West of England. Some of these areas will be in a state of outright hostilities with the surrounding British populations, some relatively peaceful but in a state of high tension and on the verge of hostilities. There is a crucial point here that must be understood if one is to have any grasp of the basic strategic situation that will obtain between British and Muslims: if one cannot extend numerical control over the enemy population in a tribal conflict of the type we are headed for, then extending geographical control over that population becomes a matter of overriding importance. In other words, if one cannot wave a magic wand over the Muslim population of the UK and make it disappear, then one must confine it to certain areas of the country, outside of which the ability of its members to contaminate and degrade the lives of the British people is reduced virtually to zero. Growing Muslim numbers combined with a lack of geographical control will create such an intolerable situation that it must and will be violently rejected sooner or later.

Let us divide the whole of the UK up into three non-contiguous zones, Zones A, B, and C. Zone A refers to all those locations out of which, in a tribal conflict, Muslims could not be driven by force without driving them out of the UK, such as parts of London, parts of Birmingham, Bradford and so on. Muslims could not meaningfully flee these places for other destinations in the UK as all other destinations (Penzance, Canterbury, the Scottish Highlands, etc.) would only leave them even more exposed. Zone A is concentrated in the Greater London area, the West Midlands, and the north-west of England.

Zone B refers to areas out of which Muslims could meaningfully be driven without being

driven out of the UK, but within which they have sufficiently large numbers, geographically concentrated to a sufficient extent, that they are not an atomized presence whose people, homes and businesses can be attacked on an isolated basis. There will be countless towns and cities across the country whose Muslim populations are such that they meet this description, such as Cardiff, Bristol, and Nottingham. These places form Zone B, which exists in a scattered, pinprick fashion across virtually the whole of England, and parts of Scotland and Wales.

Zone C consists of every other part of the UK, where Muslims exist not at all or only in very small numbers, and are of necessity scattered throughout the surrounding population in terms of where they live and work. They do not exist in large enough numbers to dominate neighbourhoods, and cannot seal themselves off from the outside world to any significant extent at all. Zone C, by definition, includes everywhere in the UK outside of Zones A and B, and accounts for the overwhelming majority of the land mass of the country.

Geographical consolidation, in a nutshell, consists of forcing Muslims in Zone C to Zones A and B, and, eventually, Muslims in Zone B to Zone A. We note that Muslims in Zone C are, by definition, few and scattered. Furthermore, they will often be running catering businesses that serve the public in the area they live in, and that are open to being disrupted by anything from a brick through the plate glass front window to an arson attack staged in earnest. Restaurants tend to take a disproportionate fraction of their revenue on just a couple of days of the week, so disruption on these days would be the most obvious way of driving them out of the area in question. This could probably be done without actually having to hurt or kill anyone, which would be useful from a propaganda point of view.

If Muslims in Zone C prove resistant to this sort of coercion, then attacks on their homes or persons will likely be resorted to in order to up the stakes. Again, readers should bear in mind that we are talking here about rural areas, with low concentrations of CCTV cameras and other elements of the surveillance state. A small group of dedicated and disciplined people, familiar with the strengths and weaknesses of the Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) system and similar law enforcement tools, and with the discipline to maintain a degree of discretion about their activities, could probably exert considerable relocation pressure on Muslims across hundreds of square miles of Zone C. If they were prepared to use violence up to and including the lethal as and when they deemed it necessary, then it is hard to see how isolated Muslims could continue to function at all in that part of Zone C to which the paramilitaries had turned their attentions. Would one really fancy the chances of a hypothetical Pakistani trying to run a curry house in Swaffham, Norfolk (population 6,935 according to the 2001 census) when the hard men of that good county had committed themselves to burning said curry house to the ground by hook or by crook, with its proprietor inside if necessary?

We say again that it is hard to see how the police could respond to a team of the type we have already described. We are not talking here about a bunch of drunken yobs putting the odd brick through a window after a hard night's drinking. We are talking about ruthless and organized people who are part of larger organizations with specific, even nationwide, strategic objectives, one of which is the complete expulsion of Muslims from Zone C. Short of having a permanent police presence outside every Muslim home and establishment, which is obviously impossible, it is difficult to see how the police could take any effective

action at all.

As we will discuss in more detail later, a descent into tribal violence between British and Muslims will so overwhelm the apparatus of state that trying to protect isolated Muslims in Zone C is likely to prove a project that the state will abandon quickly. This will render these operations relatively cost-free for the British paramilitaries engaged in them. Given that they will require little in the way of technical or operational expertise (contrast with, for example, the PIRA's mortar attack on Downing Street in 1991), there will be no obvious operational barriers to engaging in them, and they will probably attract people we shall euphemistically refer to as freelancers as well.

As a consequence of the foregoing considerations, the Muslim presence in Zone C must be expected to fall very quickly if British paramilitaries seriously apply themselves to bringing it down. What of Zone B? This is the hardest zone to define, but let us take Cardiff as being the most obvious Zone B location in Wales. Cardiff has a population of about 340,000 people, of whom 11,000–12,000 seem to be Muslims. The brick-through-your-window-and-then-a-petrol-bomb-if-you're-stubborn modus operandi of those pushing Muslims out of Zone C will almost certainly be ineffective in the context of a Zone B city like Cardiff. When Muslims are concentrated in certain neighbourhoods, their ability to keep an eye on those coming and going will obviously increase, as will their ability to riot in response to violence or intimidation. In addition, the greater concentration of CCTV and similar technologies in larger towns and cities will make the process more operationally demanding and prone to result in the incarceration of would-be geographical consolidators. This makes pushing Muslims from Zone B to Zone A a qualitatively different process to pushing them from Zone C to Zones A and B, and one that probably cannot be achieved without the ability to inflict damage widely and indiscriminately in Muslim areas of Zone B. To be blunt, this means bombing them, a matter we will discuss later. Suffice it to say here that pushing Muslims from Zone B to Zone A would be a much more difficult and bloody process than pushing them from Zone C to Zone B.

The relative costs and benefits of forcing Muslims out of Zone C and into Zones A and B, and, gradually, out of Zone B into Zone A will be such that it is hard to imagine British paramilitaries not doing it. This form of broad geographical consolidation will have massive effects. It will make it clear to Muslims that Britain is not their country, and that that portion of it that they can freely access without fear of violence is actually very small. It will also have a huge morale-boosting effect for the British themselves, in that it will substantially bring to a halt the conversion of the urban UK into Pakistani, Bangladeshi, and Somali enclaves, and restricting the growth of Islam to those areas it has already most contaminated. Readers can consider this a quarantine if they so desire. Either way, it is the conversion of a vast swathe of the UK into a fully-fledged no-go zone for Muslims, which will be a huge step forward in its own right. It will also be a huge challenge to the authority of state itself, and one which will demonstrate its impotence.

If all Muslims were to end up in Zone A, then geographical consolidation would be complete. Muslim population growth will presumably result in them putting demographic pressure on currently non-Muslim areas in Zone A, but that is another matter. Getting Muslims out of Zone A and back to their countries of origin would, in principle, require massive paramilitary violence and/or the intervention of the state itself and is therefore

outside the scope of the essay.

2) Establishment of the Principle of Retaliation

This principle is largely self-explanatory, but is still one of the core objectives, and must therefore be discussed here. Most British paramilitaries would, given the opportunity, presumably focus their violent endeavours on those members of the Muslim community who were out to do the British people harm in some fashion. However, identifying and acting against these people is a task which taxes the resources of the security apparatus itself, and which is therefore certainly not going to be achievable by paramilitaries.[11] However, given that Muslims will certainly inflict violence upon the British, the matter of prevention arises, and it is virtually guaranteed that British paramilitaries will respond as loyalist paramilitaries did during the Troubles: by killing random Muslims.

Acknowledging the strategic sense in killing random civilians during tribal conflict is not the done thing during these times of relative peace and civility, but the underlying logic is as unassailable as it is brutal. If Muslims detonate a car bomb in the centre of London and kill 100 people, and if the perpetrators of such attacks cannot be identified in advance, then the only obvious way of trying to deter them from conducting similar attacks in future will be to have them understand that every time they kill one British person, they are also killing one or more Muslims. This is no different to what the loyalist paramilitaries were doing during the Troubles when they would kill randomly-selected Catholics.

How effective such a strategy would prove in deterring further killings is impossible to determine in advance. But the possibility that this strategy might not succeed does not render it ill-advised or foolish. Given that wars tend to have losers, there is always *some* group of people whose strategies are being proved inadequate in some sense. During the Pacific War, the Japanese strategy was to launch lightning attacks throughout south-east Asia, secure a huge resource base, and build up a strong enough naval deterrent to inflict such casualties on an American counter-attack across the Pacific as to force America to seek terms rather than fight the war to a conclusion. The fact that this strategy failed does not mean that it did not make any sense. It simply means that it did not *work*, which is not necessarily the same thing.

Exactly how far retaliatory killings go will be dependent on how many British people Muslim paramilitaries can kill, and therefore, substantially, on the efficiency of the security service and the vigilance of the British public. It is clear that, in principle, there is no limit to the amount of violence that could be perpetrated to obtain this strategic objective.

3) Assassination of Key Muslims

Britain already contains all sorts of Muslim organizations and individuals who are, to a greater or lesser extent, outspoken in service of their religious tribalism and at the expense of Britain and the British people. From Anjem Choudary (whose probable violent demise no great foresight is required to predict) to the Muslim talking heads who tell us that drawing

---

[11] We ignore here the possibility of collusion between security services and British paramilitaries, which could, in principle, result in those paramilitaries being able to target specific Muslims to a much greater extent.

cartoons of Mohammed should be banned on grounds of community cohesion, Britain during our Muslim Troubles will be a breathtakingly target-rich environment even for those British paramilitaries who have a hands-off policy with respect to 'normal' Muslims. Like a child in a sweet factory, the main difficulty will be in deciding where to start.

Ruthlessly cutting down those Muslims who are seen as being hostile, subversive, or seditious will serve to impress upon Muslims that the days of multicultural genuflection to their sensitivities are over. Though the numbers of people assassinated in this manner would probably be relatively low compared to the numbers who could be killed in spectaculars (discussed below) aimed at mass civilian targets, the psychological and morale effects would be huge. Note also that should it be the case that the British government responds to the violence we predict by looking for a 'partner for peace' in the Muslim community to make concessions to, the assassination of the key Muslim players will have a salutary effect in persuading said government of the obstacles such a road is likely to present them with. Partners for peace are of little use if they are dead, and their deaths will likely serve to impress upon both government and Muslims the foolishness of attempting to further undermine the British people and their way of life.

4) Assassination of Key Britons

Following on closely from the previous objective, the assassination of key British traitors and collaborators will be an obvious goal for British paramilitaries. Such ruthless folk as the paramilitary types we envisage here will have little compunction about killing people perceived to be on the other side, most obviously politicians, public intellectuals, far left activists, and journalists. Activities of this sort will help impress upon the British public as a whole that British paramilitaries believe themselves to be in a war, and that war requires that traitors and enablers of the enemy be acted against ruthlessly.

5) Spectaculars – Technical Expertise and Display

Though the core objectives do not include attempts to persuade government to act in any particular manner, they do include the demonstration, to government and other interested parties, of the capacity to act in such a manner as to utterly disrupt the normal function of society in Muslim areas, and the inability of the government to do anything to prevent this from happening. This will in turn allow the paramilitaries in question to put a great deal of pressure on government to act in the required fashion later on, when specific actions are required of it.

When we talk of spectaculars, we are, of course, making reference to the spectaculars pulled off by the PIRA in the 1990s in London and Manchester. These huge bombings, at the Baltic Exchange in 1992, Bishopsgate in 1993, and Canary Wharf and Manchester in 1996, caused devastation in the areas where they took place, some causing damage to the tune of hundreds of millions of pounds. In keeping with our earlier observations about IRA strategy, these bombings did not kill many people, especially when one takes into account their huge size: three people were killed at the Baltic Exchange, one at Bishopsgate, none in Manchester, and two at Canary Wharf. Their main objective was to cause financial damage and disrupt the everyday function of the areas they targeted.

We have already mentioned geographical consolidation, which is, of course, essentially a euphemism for ethno-religious cleansing. In this context, we discussed the relative ease of pushing Muslims from Zone C to Zone B, and the relative difficulty of pushing them from Zone B to Zone A. This objective would probably have to be achieved, at least in some cases, by car bombings, as Zone B Muslim areas are, by definition, too large and robust for isolated attacks on single targets to be able to uproot them with consistency. Of course, these attacks would have the potential to kill large numbers of Muslim passers-by if conducted without warnings. This large-scale killing is not one of the core objectives (except in the hypothetical case in which it takes place as a retaliatory attack), so we assume that British paramilitaries will try and avoid it at the stages of the conflict we are describing here. Nonetheless, this objective and the geographical consolidation objective may end up dovetailing with the use of car bombs against Muslim residential or commercial areas either at night or with warnings to limit casualties.

IX. Paramilitaries: State Response

An Outline of the Problem

If the collapse of civil order accompanying the onset of our Muslim Troubles is on the scale that we predict, deploying the British Army will be the only way the government can try to restore a semblance of order in the worst-afflicted areas. Though the police will of course be playing a supplementary role, by themselves they will be utterly overwhelmed by the scale of what confronts them, just as the RUC was overwhelmed by the rioting in Belfast and Derry in the summer of 1969.

According to standard counter-insurgency doctrine (which seems to derive substantially from British military experience around the world), there should be one soldier or policeman on the ground for every fifty people in the population throughout which the insurgency is taking place. The population of Northern Ireland during the Troubles was about 1.5 million, a number which necessitated 30,000 troops and/or police. At the height of the violence in the early 1970s, 21,000 soldiers of the regular army were deployed in Northern Ireland. They were supplemented by the RUC, which had 8,500 members at its peak and a reserve of 4,500, and the UDR, whose strength grew from about 1,600 in 1970 to 6,000 (3,000 part-time and 3,000 full-time) in 1990. Taken together, these three forces satisfied the 1-to-50 troop-to-population ratio that counter-insurgency doctrine apparently calls for in pacifying an area, during the height of the violence in the early 1970s.

However, the situation is more complex than this summary makes it appear. A tour of duty in NI for a regular army regiment was six months, after which it would be rotated out and to other duties in other parts of the world. This means that each regiment would spend only one fifth of its time in NI. More sustained exposure to counter-insurgency or other high-intensity duties would have placed unsustainable burdens, in terms of morale and psychological strain, on soldiers. What this means is that sustaining 21,000 soldiers in counter-insurgency operations requires 105,000 soldiers in total to be rotated in and out of the insurgency zone as described. The regular army currently has about 106,000 soldiers, which means that a violent conflict across a population of 1.5 million (roughly equivalent to the populations of Birmingham, Bradford, Burnley, and Oldham today) would be the upper boundary to the type of counter-insurgency campaign the regular army could fight, if supplemented *à la* Troubles by equivalents to the RUC and UDR that allow the 30,000 troop-equivalent figure to be made up. In other words, the current regular army would be at full stretch dealing with the Troubles at their peak.

How do things stand at present? As we have stated, the regular army has 106,000 soldiers. It can, in principle, be supplemented by the 33,000 members of the Territorial Army, and the 134,000 soldiers of the reserve for a total of 273,000 troops. Under standard counter-insurgency calculations as described above, this would allow a counter-insurgency force of 54,600, capable of fighting a standard counter-insurgency in a population of 2.73 million people. Our key assumption in this document (erring on the pessimistic side though it probably is) has been that our government(s) will keep us on a steady course towards Islamization until a crisis occurs. We have argued that this crisis cannot be more than twenty years away, so let us assume that it is exactly twenty years away. The Muslim population of

the UK has risen by about 60% in the last ten years, to 2.9 million people. If we extrapolate this growth trend for another twenty years, there will be approximately 7.4 million Muslims in the UK. If we assume that the core conflict zone contains this population and a British population twice as large, then the conflict zone will contain about 22 million people. A counter-insurgency operation fought in this zone would require 440,000 troop-equivalents, which would necessitate a 2.2 million-strong force. We have already shown that the entire British Army, including reservists and the Territorial Army, has only 273,000 troops, almost exactly one eighth of the required number. If we assume that the logistical and psychological advantages of fighting so close to home (i.e. *in* our home) would allow troops to spend one half of their time in theatre rather one fifth (six month tours of duty alternating with six months elsewhere), then we would still have only 136,500 troop-equivalents out of the desired total of 440,000, or about 31% of the whole.

This line of reasoning makes it clear that a violent conflict spread out through those areas of the UK populated by the 22 million people we mentioned above will massively overwhelm any conceivable efforts of the state to control it. This will not only facilitate the emergence of paramilitaries, it will make their emergence absolutely certain. Indeed, government may accept, legitimize, and cooperate with at least some of the more organized paramilitaries that do emerge in an attempt to retain some influence over them.

Deployment of the British Army

The horrendous difficulties the state will encounter in trying to restore and maintain order notwithstanding, the army is still the only tool it will have at its disposal when it attempts to do so. It therefore behoves us to discuss how it might go about doing so, at least to the extent that it can.

One of the peculiar truths of the Troubles was that the regular Army, certainly from about late 1974 and the start of the PIRA's temporary ceasefire onwards, saw very little in the way of actual combat with republican paramilitaries. When this year-long ceasefire broke down in early 1976, the war moved quickly from its earlier insurgency phase (during which the PIRA sought to force British forces out of NI outright through relatively open warfare) into its 'Long War' phase (during which the PIRA adopted more 'classic' terrorist/guerrilla tactics to inflict attrition on British forces over the long term). Engaging in open gun battles with soldiers was no longer a PIRA objective. As a consequence, the duties of regular soldiers now consisted largely of patrolling, manning checkpoints, and standing guard. During the commission of these duties they would occasionally be attacked by bombers, snipers, and the like, but very rarely engage in shooting matches with them. Nearly all of the PIRA volunteers killed by British security forces after this transition were killed by the SAS, 14 Intelligence Company (of whom more later), or the RUC.

In essence, the main role of the regular army was to deny the PIRA the ability to move and operate with ease and impunity. Taking the fight back to them was something that required the unique abilities of special forces and proactive intelligence-gathering services: to carry out surveillance in republican areas (14 Intelligence Company's speciality), to bug houses of known republicans, to stage ambushes when intelligence of forthcoming attacks was available (most notoriously at Loughgall in 1987, when the SAS shot dead eight PIRA men), to stake out weapons caches, and to capture or kill terrorists who went to retrieve weapons

from them. Broadly speaking, we expect a similar pattern to emerge with respect to the deployment of army units during our Muslim Troubles, with the regular army used to patrol and man checkpoints, and with special forces used to conduct intelligence-led surveillance and armed operations.

Regular Army

Army patrols and checkpoints will be located and conducted, of necessity, in urban areas with large Muslim populations. Muslims being what they are, this will undoubtedly be seen as a war against all Muslims, the army laying siege to Muslims, an attempt to exterminate Muslims, or some combination thereof. In contrast, relations between the army and the British public must be expected to be largely peaceful. No conceivable British paramilitary would take the targeting of the army as an objective, not only, or even primarily, because it would be strategically idiotic, but because they will simply not countenance inflicting casualties on it. This does not mean that there will be no expressions of anger or frustration in the streets about actions the army might take, but that they are unlikely to turn to violence in either direction.

To the extent that the regular army comes into violent conflict with either side, it is overwhelmingly likely that it will be with the Muslims, who will probably take to the streets to confront the army quite quickly, rioting, burning, and, as the conflict progresses, shooting and bombing as well when they can. Given the opinions that those in the British Army are likely to have of Muslims in general, and given the violence and hostility they are certain to experience from Muslims, they are unlikely to interact smoothly with them even in the absence of violence. Irrespective of the multicultural guff that senior figures in the army will undoubtedly be spouting, the sympathies of the troops and junior officers will, of course, lie entirely with their own people, and their hatred of Muslims will grow by the day.

British soldiers on the ground in Northern Ireland, after the honeymoon period between them and the Catholic population ended in the spring and summer of 1970, developed a fierce hostility towards the nationalist population of NI that was returned in spades. If this was true during the Troubles, how much truer will it be during our Muslim Troubles? All of the hard fighting that the British Army has taken part in in the last twenty years has taken place against Muslims. There is an entire generation of young soldiers coming through who have never fought anyone else, and who will be painfully well aware of the fact that the Muslim 'Britons' they face on the streets would have been at best ambivalent about, and at worst psychologically on the other side during, those conflicts. The hostility shown returning British soldiers on the streets of the UK will not be quickly forgotten.

The likelihood of collusion between elements within the British Army and British paramilitaries is so high as to be a virtual certainty. Collusion can mean many things, and operate at many levels, but the illicit supply of weapons, ammunition, equipment, and intelligence to British paramilitaries by troops on the ground is a sure thing, and something that it will be impossible for more senior officers to clamp down on even if they want to, which is by no means a certainty itself.

More generally, the numerical inadequacy of the British Army relative to the size of the task confronting it (even in the most optimistic scenario) will force it to deploy at only a small

fraction of the locations it would otherwise like to. Zone C will be written off by the army early on, if they pay any attention to it at all, and the army presence in much of Zone B will probably be marginal. Only Zone A, in the Greater London area, the West Midlands, and the north-west of England, is likely to see troop numbers even roughly proportional to the scale of the problem. This will have great significance for the British paramilitary core objective of geographical consolidation we discussed earlier. Whether or not British paramilitaries can push Muslims from Zone B to Zone A is one of the great unpredictables of the conflict. If the British Army is largely restricted to operating in Zone A, this objective is probably attainable, and the state may well be forced to facilitate the process to reduce the violence used to bring it about. If the army can maintain a presence in Zone B, then events will be much harder to predict.

Special Forces

There were two main units of special forces used in the Troubles, as we have already noted: the SAS, and 14 Intelligence Company. The SAS was used against republican paramilitaries on intelligence-led missions that required relatively small numbers of men to operate under difficult or unusually demanding circumstances. Reading about the Troubles leaves one with few illusions in this regard: when it comes to lying, soaking wet, in a field for days on end waiting to shoot an IRA man, the SAS have few equals. More interesting though, from our point of view is 14 Intelligence Company, which was just as crucial to the fight against the IRA, albeit in a very different way.

During the early years of the Troubles, army attempts to gather intelligence in republican areas were a fairly hit and miss affair. The need to put matters on a more rigorous footing led to the creation of an undercover army company trained specifically for the task of putting under surveillance republican paramilitary members in nationalist areas of NI where uniformed soldiers and policemen could not operate. This company, 14 Intelligence Company (also known, and subsequently referred to here, as the Det) was to prove its effectiveness time and time again. However, there will be no equivalent in our Muslim Troubles, a point the explication of which will shed some light on the nature of the conflict that awaits us.

One of the most intriguing details regarding the training regime of the Det is that which pertains to their training in the Ulster Irish accent. Though the Det recruited widely across the whole of the armed services, its recruits were mainly from outside of Northern Ireland, and this of course was clear from their accents. As such, they had attain at least some ability to pass themselves off as being men (or women) of Ulster, but it is hard to believe that many of them were particularly accomplished in this regard. Insofar as one can discern from reading about their exploits, most appear to have limited themselves to a few grunts when some sort of response was absolutely called for, as being identified as an Englishman with a gun in a republican area was a good way to end up in a ditch in South Armagh a day later, bound, gagged and shot through the head.

This was a surmountable operational difficulty presented by the linguistic differences between people who were visually indistinguishable. But when we consider the nature of our Muslim Troubles, we see immediately that operating undercover in this fashion is not going to be possible to any significant extent. Nearly all of the Muslims in the UK are

something other than white, and nearly everyone in the British army is white. This means that putting together a Det-style army unit to go and prowl around in Muslim areas will be impossible, as there will be no significant pool of suitable people in the army to recruit from for the purpose. It will surely not be beyond the ken of Muslims to see that mysterious white converts to Islam who start coming into their areas may not be exactly what they seem. This is what we will call the *mutual impermeability problem*, a problem which will bedevil the efforts of all parties to the conflict one way or another. It will be one of the biggest and most significant differences between the Troubles and our forthcoming Muslim Troubles.

Let us explore this point a little further. During the Troubles, it was impossible to tell who was on which side simply by looking at them, which is to say that the parties to the conflict suffered from the *mutual permeability problem*. This problem, the mirror image of the mutual impermeability problem, sometimes had remarkable consequences. Loyalist hit squads targeting republican paramilitaries would take over houses in nationalist areas and tell the occupants that they were the IRA to gain their cooperation. Johnny 'Mad Dog' Adair of the UDA would go jogging in nationalist areas to gather intelligence until his personal notoriety reached such levels as to make this impossible. IRA members would take workmen off a bus and have to ask who the Catholics were and who the Protestants were before opening fire. INLA members could walk into a Protestant pub, plant a bomb, and walk out again. The Shankill Butchers would pick up victims in Catholic areas of Belfast only, as they had no other way of identifying them. A great deal of the violence during the Troubles, and the way it was carried out, only makes sense if one bears in mind the mutual permeability problem.

In contrast, the protagonists to our Muslim Troubles will suffer, as we have said, from the mutual *im*permeability problem. As such, we can be sure that one of the most effective weapons against the PIRA will not be available in the army's attempts to reconnoitre Muslim areas and put Muslim paramilitaries under surveillance. This will increase the dependence of the army and security services on informers within those communities and the use of technical and electronic surveillance, all of which have their own drawbacks.

<center>**********</center>

After the descent into violent conflict, there will be vast swathes of the country that have no unusual military presence at all, and that will be free zones for British paramilitaries to move, train, and organize as they deem appropriate. Only 'normal' police attention will be brought to bear on them. This will allow these areas to play a role similar to the one which the Republic of Ireland played for the PIRA during the Troubles, allowing them to operate with a minimum of scrutiny. Of course, the RUC could not operate at all in the Republic, and it was difficult if not impossible for the British government to have terrorist suspects extradited to the UK, two advantages that British paramilitaries will not have during the conflict in their own hinterlands. Nonetheless, they will still enjoy huge freedom of movement and action in this area, and the police will find it very difficult indeed to disrupt it. The more vicious the conflict becomes, the less willingness there will be a) on the part of local people to report suspicious events, and b) on the part of the British police to act against British paramilitaries anyway.

A key difference between the Troubles and our Muslim Troubles is that there will be no

hinterlands, no rural areas, in which Muslims can operate with a minimum of attention being paid to them. There will certainly be no equivalent of the Bandit Country of South Armagh, which the South Armagh PIRA turned into a virtual no-go zone for the British Army for most of the Troubles, through the attentions of the South Armagh sniper and others. It will be as if every single rural area in NI had been utterly dominated by loyalist populations and paramilitaries, republicans had been entirely boxed into ghettoes, there had been no Republic of Ireland to act as training ground or sanctuary, and republicans would have been immediately identifiable as such if they were so foolish as to venture out into the countryside to try and test a bomb. This will be quite a disadvantage for Muslim paramilitaries, to put it mildly.

X. Political Implications

So far we have limited our consideration of matters political to the assumption that the state will vacillate its way into and through at least the initial stages of the conflict. However, there is a little more to say on the subject of the mainstream political response to the conflict we predict and explore in this document.

Western European nations have been implementing for several decades, more or less consistently, policies which have the inevitable consequence of turning once-homogeneous countries into much more heterogeneous ones, racially, religiously, culturally, and linguistically. We have been encouraged to believe that, not only has this been a good thing, it is bigoted and evil not to believe that it has been a good thing. Calamitous change has thus been justified by the gossamer banalities of multiculturalism, whose orthogonal relationship with reality is now dawning on the worried architects of the culturally-enriched states of modern Europe.

As the slow motion train crash that is Europe's experiment with Muslim immigration moves on to its inevitable conclusion, we continue to see a sharp polarization between those Europeans who wish, for whatever reason, to continue the experiment and those who wish to bring it to an end. As each European country collapses into its own Muslim Troubles, there will be no cover, politically speaking, for those politicians and public figures who span us tall tales all along about the wonders of the multi-faith Shangri-las we were building.

To put it at its bluntest, one cannot present oneself as the person to save one's country from the horrific tribal violence that it has recently descended into when one has spent the last however-many decades cramming as many people of the hostile, enemy tribe in question into that country and describing all opposition to those efforts as racist, bigoted, or worse. We will examine in a later section the way in which the Troubles only came to an end when key decision-makers in the paramilitary organizations on each side decided that they were prepared to lay down their arms to try and reach a negotiated peace. Here we will simply stress the significance of this point: if paramilitaries continue to fight, no government can force a peace. And it is utterly inconceivable that any British paramilitary organization would cease hostilities in this fashion if it believed that the political figures attempting to mediate that process were implicated in the mass immigration, multiculturalism, and Muslim appeasement that had led to the conflict in the first place. As such, any government or person so implicated will be utterly ineffective as a mediator.

In the Netherlands, there exists a politician, Geert Wilders, and a political party, the Dutch Freedom Party, committed to defending the Dutch people and their country from the disaster it has been plunging toward for the last several decades. Whatever unpleasant things some might believe of Mr. Wilders, few would doubt that he means what he says about defending his country and way of life. We are not interested here in trying to predict what will happen in the Netherlands, but we will suggest that any Dutch paramilitary that may emerge to defend the Dutch people as and when the state fails to do so will presumably consider Wilders to be a man worth doing business with, a man who might be worth listening to if he asks them to lay down their guns and let the state take over in meeting the Muslim threat.

One of the greatest dangers we in Britain face with respect to our forthcoming Muslim

Troubles is the possibility that all such potential actors will already have discredited themselves in the eyes of British paramilitaries. This is one of the great evils of our electoral system. If we look at the populist right-wing parties throughout Europe that are espousing nationalism and opposing Islam, Islamization, and Muslim immigration, we observe that they are, overwhelmingly, new parties that have only been able to flourish because the electoral systems of their respective countries are based on proportional representation. To take the most obvious example, Wilder's Freedom Party has attained the influence it currently enjoys because the re-tribalization of Dutch politics made inevitable by Muslim immigration is shunting large numbers of angry Dutch people (which is to say, Dutch-Dutch people) to his party. Even if everyone else in the country considers him to be Lucifer incarnate, his party can simply content itself with taking its share of the vote and seeing the whole of Dutch politics start to dance to its tune.

None of this can happen in the British system. The Dutch Freedom Party won about 16% of the vote in the 2010 election, which gives it a great deal of power. In contrast, winning 16% of the vote in a UK election renders one irrelevant apart from in those very rare cases where a hung parliament opens up the possibility of a coalition government. In the 2005 general election in the UK, the Liberal Democrats won 18.3% of the vote, which gave them 52 out of 646 seats and rendered them essentially impotent, as it did every party other than Labour, who won a significant majority. In other words, a party can win nearly a fifth of the vote in a general election and still attain neither outright power, nor a place in a governing coalition, nor even the slightest possibility of a place in a governing coalition for the simple reason that no such coalition is required.

This is an electoral system that could have been designed to kill off political innovation and ensure the mainstream parties are almost unassailable in the great big coin-toss that happens once every few years in the UK. UKIP, the closest equivalent to the Dutch Freedom Party in the UK, won 16% of the vote in the European election in 2009. Granted, the European elections are often used to register protest votes, so this result should not be taken as meaning that 16% of the British public considers UKIP its preferred party across the board. Nonetheless, despite their popularity clearly being far greater than their 3% of the vote in the 2010 general election would suggest, they have yet to win a single seat in the House of Commons. As a consequence of this lopsidedness in British elections, debates vis-à-vis Islam and Muslim immigration in mainstream British politics take place entirely within the confines of what the three main parties are comfortable with. No party can storm the pitch from the sidelines, breaking taboos the way Wilders does in the Netherlands, because those who do break taboos, like the BNP, simply do not have to be responded to by anyone with a chance of winning.

Of the three main parties, the only one that could reasonably be expected to start trying to turn the British ship of state around before it crashes onto the shores of our Muslim Troubles is the Conservative Party. Now, as by far the strongest party in a coalition government after thirteen years in the wilderness, it is starting to strut its stuff with respect to the terrible problems we face, and its stuff is not especially reassuring. To be sure, David Cameron has indicated that he will not be prepared to tolerate certain of the things that Labour turned a blind eye to, and the government has already started to make far-reaching changes to the immigration system, the single most crucial area of policy. But there is no public recognition from the Conservatives of the breadth or depth of the problems Islam and

Muslims pose us in Britain, and this is what is crucial. Perhaps David Cameron is well aware of what we face, but does not feel he can talk about it. This may seem like a wise course of action to him at present, but can only discredit him and his party later on. One cannot feign ignorance of an iceberg, crash into it, and still insist that one is uniquely qualified to deal with the ensuing catastrophe, because, truth be told, one had seen it all along. This will not convince anyone of one's qualifications for dealing with the problem, least of all those who have committed murderous acts of violence on behalf of paramilitary organizations.

In short, the Conservatives are in danger, not imminent danger, but danger nonetheless, of discrediting themselves as a party capable of understanding and dealing with the threat we face. We are, of course, obliged to take into account the fact that they are part of a coalition and are therefore somewhat constrained in what they do. Even so, it is far from obvious that they are up to the challenge of charting the dramatic change of course that would be required to put clear blue water between us and the ever-closer hulk of our Muslim Troubles, which lie directly ahead.

It will come to be seen as a historic misfortune that the window of opportunity for dealing with the threat our Muslim population poses us without massive violence happened to coincide with a juncture at which our main centre-right party was busy trying to convince the UK electorate that it was no longer the 'nasty party.' However peripheral non-entities such as Baroness Warsi may be to the real power in the Conservative Party, the mere fact that Cameron has felt the need to parachute them into such prominent positions as party chairman shows how hard the Conservatives are trying to be all things to all people. Could we imagine Geert Wilders dragging some token Moroccan into his party to convince people that he was tight with the believers?

Is it a coincidence that the only European country to have seen the rise of a robust, successful, anti-Islamic street movement like the EDL is also the only country to have no mainstream political party that has woken up to the threat of Islam, not Islamism, not radical Islam, not extremist Islam, but Islam itself? We cannot say for sure, but it seems likely that opposition to Islam will emerge by hook or by crook, and that if it does not do so through electoral politics, it will have to do so some other way. Whether it likes it or not, the EDL is already on course to become the UDA of our Muslim Troubles. There are undoubtedly UVFs waiting to emerge as well. Is this what our political masters want?

There are presumably people in the Netherlands who believe that Wilders is a threat to their democracy. But this is a mistake. Wilders is the last hope of their democracy, as a democracy that destroys the possibility of peaceful, political self-correction, will make inevitable violent, apolitical self-correction, and kill democracy itself in the process. Wilders is the last chance the Netherlands will have to avoid blood on the streets. And the window of opportunity is closing even for him.

XI. The Two Insanities

We have already stated our core assumption that the British government will, by and large, be wholly ineffective in the face of the violent conflict that breaks out between British and Muslims and seek merely to contain it. However, there are crucial issues pertaining to the government response that must be considered beyond this assumption. The violent conflict that we predict in this document is not something that can be solved in any obvious sense by any government. But there are still certain potential courses of action that different parts of the apparatus of state can take within the constraints of our earlier assumption that are of relevance here.

Broadly speaking, the long-term objectives of British paramilitaries in the conflict will include at least the following:

- to prohibit Muslim immigration

- to prohibit the granting of citizenship/permanent residency to Muslims already in the UK and bring about the repatriation of, at the very least, those non-citizen Muslims in the country

- to protect British people from Muslim violence and depredation

- to ensure the deportation of Muslims deemed incompatible with British society, be they British citizens or not

- to ensure that Muslims are no longer able to have their existences significantly subsidized by the British taxpayer

We have already discussed the permissible types of violence from the points of view of the different actors in the conflict. But this analysis was based on an assumption that the government of the day will not act in a manner which simply allows the Muslim colonization of the UK to continue. In other words, we are assuming that certain of the objectives of the British will be achieved very quickly, just as the NI and British governments moved quickly to address the core grievances of the Catholic population of NI when the Troubles broke out (though to little avail, at least in terms of pre-empting further violence). More specifically, we are assuming that the British government will not engage in either of what we will refer to here as the Two Insanities.

In the First Insanity, the British government treats the violence between British and Muslims as if were some strange bump in the road on the way to the creation of a multicultural paradise and *keeps on allowing Muslim immigration to occur*. Should the government actually be so imbecilic as to adopt this course of action, then it will become clear in short order to British paramilitaries that the key causal factor in the Islamization of Britain remains unchallenged. Furthermore, in the context of violent conflict, such immigration will legitimately be construed by these paramilitaries as the effective collusion of government in the reinforcement of the Muslim side. If even the outbreak of widespread violence as already described cannot jolt the British government from the suicidal stupidity of allowing Muslim immigration, then British paramilitaries may well conclude that they have no option but to take their violence to new levels to impress upon the government that its behaviour is unacceptable.

In the Second Insanity, the British government understands that a continuation of Muslim immigration makes utter disaster inevitable, and moves to shut it down completely. However, upon trying to do so, it discovers that, due to a combination of the actions of the judiciary, the EU and its various institutions, and international agreements of whatever sort, this action 'cannot' be taken. In this case too, we could expect new levels and types of violence from British paramilitaries.

With respect to the probability of either of the Two Insanities occurring, we suggest that the ability of government to make a clean break with the madness of the last several decades and recognize the brute incompatibility of Britain and Muslims can by no means be taken for granted. To be sure, there is a growing recognition right across Europe that something has gone very badly wrong as a result of Islamic immigration, and the causal relationship between admitting Muslims to one's country and having those Muslims contaminate and destroy that country is too obvious to escape the attention of even the political class forever. Leaving to one side the hard leftists committed to revolution through the mass importation of Third World peoples of whatever provenance and Muslims in particular, there will be very few in this country who actively desire a descent into Balkan-style violence. Nevertheless, the record of the democratic systems of European countries to date in pre-emptively defusing the ticking time-bomb of Muslim immigration is so astonishingly poor that we should not take too much for granted in this regard, and must therefore consider the possibility that one or other of the Two Insanities will be indulged in by the respective actors with effects we will now consider in more detail.

Ultimately, Muslims can only be kept out of the UK by government, as government is entirely responsible for our borders. No amount of violence short of the absolutely genocidal could conceivable remove the threat of Islam as long as Muslims are allowed to pour into the country. Therefore, government has a crucial role to play in resolving matters to the satisfaction of British paramilitaries. If it will not play this role willingly, it will have to be forced to do so through violence of a type and on a scale so extreme as to threaten a collapse into utter chaos and outright civil war. Of course, violence of this type will be one of the few ways British paramilitaries have of persuading Muslims to simply leave Britain, and could eventually end up being resorted to for this reason alone. But only one of the Two Insanities will make it a virtual certainty. There is already a growing awareness across Europe that Muslim immigration could be better described as Muslim colonization. Once British paramilitaries and the British people in general are blooded by the violence involved in civil conflict, escalating the violence to the levels described here will not be considered nearly as outrageous as it seems at present, even if we ignore the likelihood of Muslim atrocities against similar targets on our side.

We have already discussed the types of bombing campaigns that British and Muslims are likely to be able to engage in, and have concluded that only British paramilitaries will be able to build and utilize large car and truck bombs in any significant numbers. As we have suggested, such devices will be deployed in the conflict we have thus far imagined even in the absence of the Two Insanities, but predominantly to cause damage and disruption to Muslim communities without causing mass casualties. The most obvious parallel here would be the PIRA bombing campaign in England in the 1990s, which aimed to cause economic damage and disruption without inflicting the civilian casualties of, for example,

the Remembrance Day bombing at Enniskillen.

The issue here is whether or not there is likely to come into existence a perceived necessity to use these devices against Muslims *en masse*, be it at a mosque, in a Muslim residential area, or a Muslim commercial area. Of course it is possible that intrinsic ruthlessness and indiscriminate Muslim suicide bombings of British targets will already have combined to create a willingness on the part of British paramilitaries to engage in such attacks. However, their relative scarcity in the three-decade conflict of the Troubles suggests that such total ruthlessness is somewhat more alien to the peoples of the British Isles than it is to Muslims in general. Whether or not such devices are used in such a manner by British paramilitaries therefore becomes a pivotal point, and one that will be critical in determining the nature of the conflict.

Earlier, we made reference to the Dublin and Monaghan bombings as being the single most ruthless act of the Troubles, as well as the single most lethal. Taken together, they killed 33 people, and these people were not killed by mistake, because a bomb went off too soon, or because a phone box was out of order. The bombs were intended to kill large numbers of civilians without warning, which is precisely what they did. The UVF, which carried them out, did not carry out similar bombings in the Republic of Ireland at any other time in the conflict. Why then did they carry out this one?

To understand the Dublin and Monaghan bombings, one must understand the backdrop against which they took place. In 1973, the British and Irish governments implemented what they hoped would be a political solution to the Troubles, which were going through their most violent years. Broadly speaking, the contours of this agreement, referred to as the Sunningdale Agreement for the English town where it was signed, were such that: a) a power-sharing agreement between nationalists and unionists would be introduced in Northern Ireland, and b) a Council of Ireland would be created to allow for consultation and cooperation between NI and the Republic of Ireland on matters pertaining to transport, trade, and the like. This was widely perceived by loyalists to be a step towards a united Ireland, and, though it had majority support from NI political parties at first, the support it enjoyed from unionists waned as 1974 wore on. Furthermore, it was bitterly opposed by the loyalist paramilitaries, and a massive strike was organized by the UDA in May 1974 to derail it.

As the UDA was bringing NI to its knees with strike action, the UVF was taking matters into its own hands slightly differently, via the bombings we have already mentioned. One must suppose that the UVF was trying to impress upon the Irish government that it considered its participation in the Council of Ireland under the Sunningdale Agreement to be an intrusion into the affairs of Northern Ireland. It is striking indeed to think of how the aborted Sunningdale Agreement and the successful Good Friday Agreement were so similar in so many ways that the Good Friday Agreement was referred to as 'Sunningdale for slow learners' by the Deputy Leader of the SDLP at the time. Yet the former still evoked within loyalist paramilitaries the will to commit the worst single atrocity of the Troubles.

The perceived threat of Sunningdale led the UVF to engage in such extreme violence against civilians, despite the fact that, over twenty years later, it would acquiesce to something similar (albeit under different circumstances). This being the case, could anyone seriously imagine that British paramilitaries, seeing their country devoured from within by

that part of the global ummah imported and subsidized by an idiot government, would refrain from eventually derailing that process of colonization through massive, indiscriminate acts of violence against a community they had come to consider an existential threat to Britain and its people?

On the basis of the foregoing considerations, we predict that the Two Insanities are virtually certain to persuade at least some British paramilitaries to escalate the violence in the manner we have described here. Indiscriminate bombings of Muslim civilian targets are a virtual certainty without the promptest and most effective action by government to shut Muslim immigration down completely in the early months of our Muslim Troubles.

XII. To the Broad Sunlit Uplands?

We have so far focused our attention on the nature of the early stages of the conflict into which we are doomed to be plunged thanks to the witlessness of our political class and the hostility of at least parts of it to the British nation. Now we turn our attention to the end of the conflict, and ask ourselves what it might look like.

Broadly speaking, there are only two ways in which a violent conflict can come to an end: a) a peace negotiated between two sides who consider themselves to be essentially undefeated but no longer interested in fighting a war, for whatever reason, or b) a peace whose terms are dictated by one side, the victor, to the other side, the defeated. Needless to say, this is a simplification, but it is one that is useful for our purposes here.

The best example of a negotiated peace for our purposes would be, of course, the Troubles. Arguably, the Troubles were not a two-sided conflict, but an unorthodox three-sided conflict in which two sides, the British state and loyalist paramilitaries, fought one, the PIRA, and all three had to agree to stop the fighting for it to come to an end. A good example of an imposed peace would be that which the Japanese were forced to accept at the hands of the U.S. during the Pacific War, which was an unconditional surrender and the military occupation of Japan.

If our government continues to implement immigration policies similar to those at present, and the British people are forced into a violent conflict with the Muslim population of the UK within the next twenty years, it is very difficult to see how they could possible lose it. The only advantage Muslims would have in this conflict, if advantage it be, is that they will start it with a greater willingness to inflict indiscriminate civilian casualties. However, atrocities of the sort that they will be so keen to inflict on us will very quickly result in counter-atrocities, as has been the case in every conflict in the history of the world, so this will quickly even out, for better or for worse. Bearing in mind our earlier conclusion, to wit, that British paramilitaries will be able to conduct a comprehensive bombing campaign while Muslims will be sorely restricted in this regard, it is difficult to see how Muslims could possibly prevail.

Assuming then that conflict is inevitable and that the British cannot lose it if they fight it in earnest, the question then becomes: will there be even the possibility of a Troubles-type conclusion to our Muslim Troubles, or will we have to aim for a Pacific War-type conclusion, which would entail the utter crushing of Muslims, their subsequent unconditional surrender, and our dictation of terms to them? We believe the answer to this question is that there can be no equivalent to the Good Friday Agreement this time around. As such, once they commence, our Muslim Troubles will have to be fought until, one way or another, by far the larger portion of the Muslim population of the UK has left and the relatively well-integrated remainder understands that it remains under the watchful eye of a government which will immediately act against troublemakers in the most draconian fashion. This is a bold predictive claim, and one we must now try to justify.

****

Given the sheer violence of the Troubles, the depth and breadth of the sectarian hostility

53

they evoked and reinforced, and the decades they lasted for, their most remarkable feature is, perhaps, that they ever came to an end at all. How did this happen?

The British and Irish governments had been trying to find a negotiated solution to the conflict for decades, which is precisely what they tried and failed to do in 1973–1974 with the Sunningdale Agreement. Though the IRA came close to defeat in 1976, its reorganization under a new leadership in 1977 gave it the structural robustness to wage a long-term, low-intensity war against British forces in Northern Ireland. Whether or not peace could be achieved was therefore a function of whether it and the other paramilitaries in the conflict could be persuaded to lay down their arms. We have made this point already, but reiterate it here: the paramilitaries were the key decision-makers. Without the ceasefires of the three main paramilitaries, the PIRA, the UVF, and the UDA, the killing would have continued, inviting retaliation and counter-retaliation. The paramilitaries that did not go on ceasefire until after the agreement passed, the INLA (which split from the OIRA in 1974) and the LVF (which split from the UVF in 1996), were deadly on occasion, but too small to derail the peace process. This is the only reason it succeeded.

What this means is that the Good Friday Agreement not only had to convince at least 70% of the population of Northern Ireland to vote in favour,[12] but also had to convince the main paramilitaries to abandon violence. How does one craft a compromise between two sides to such a violent conflict, a compromise in which both feels it is getting more than it is giving up, when both sides feel themselves to be undefeated and still possess the means to wage war? What political alchemy made this possible?[13]

By the early 1990s, there was a growing recognition on the part of on both sides of the conflict that the only alternative to killing each other in perpetuity would be a political solution that, by its very nature, would require compromise. The Troubles had already lasted for about 25 years, and had blighted the lives of the people of Northern Ireland for all that time. There had long been a realization at leadership level in the PIRA that forcing a British withdrawal from NI by force of arms alone was not a realistic strategy. Violence in the

---

[12] It also had to convince 70% of the population of the Republic of Ireland to do the same, but the outcome was never in doubt there, and 94% voted in favour.

[13] It is important to remember that there is no guarantee whatsoever that the peace that today prevails in Northern Ireland will last. Though dissident Republican groups such as the Continuity IRA and the Real IRA are believed to lack the military muscle to engage in extended bombing campaigns, the recent murder of policeman Ronan Kerr with an undercar bomb shows that they are attempting to return to violence on a large scale.

Even if such groups are not capable of forcing a return to the war, this is not the long-term threat to peace in the province. The long-term threat to peace is the demographic reality that the Catholic population is steadily increasing as a fraction of the whole, and that this population is, of course, overwhelmingly nationalist. In the next twenty years or so, Catholics will come to outnumber Protestants in Northern Ireland for the first time ever.

The principle of consent was one of the cornerstones of the Good Friday Agreement. Under this principle, all parties to the agreement recognized that the constitutional status of Northern Ireland could only change with the consent of a majority of the population. This was one matter entirely while Protestants were in the majority, but primary schools across the province are apparently already educating a generation that is majority Catholic, making the coming into being of a Catholic majority a matter of if, not when.

The inevitability of a Catholic majority is not some sort of unpredicted bug in the system. On the contrary, just as Michael Collins argued that the Anglo-Irish Treaty signed at the end of the Irish War of Independence would give Ireland not freedom, but the freedom to achieve freedom, republicans in Northern Ireland obviously calculated that the Good Friday Agreement would grant them not a united Ireland, but a sure-fire means to attain it. This goes some way towards explaining why republicans were, by and large, persuaded to vote in favour of the agreement. What unionists will do when faced with this reality cannot be predicted.

province had peaked in 1972, drastically declined in 1977, and stayed more or less at that level ever since. By the early 1990s, preparations had been in the works for a long time to move the PIRA in the direction of constitutional politics, though news of this radical plan was not communicated to PIRA volunteers until it was well-developed and had real momentum behind it.

For their part, loyalist paramilitaries were also moving in the direction of politics, with senior figures in the UVF and UDA trying to determine if there was a way in which the killing could stop. However, it must also be acknowledged that loyalist paramilitaries went through a resurgence in the early 1990s that saw them kill relatively large numbers of Catholics, Sinn Fein politicians and their family members, and republican paramilitaries. Some years in the early 1990s, they out-killed the PIRA for the first time ever. They had effectively demonstrated that they could terrorize the Catholic community of NI just as effectively as the PIRA could terrorize the security forces and the Protestant community, and this is thought by some (including the loyalist paramilitaries in question) to have contributed to a sense on the part of the PIRA that the time had come to bring the conflict to an end.

<div align="center">**********</div>

If we consider our Muslim Troubles in this light, we see more clearly than ever before what an unmitigated disaster Muslim immigration is dragging us towards. Every single one of the foundations of the Good Friday Agreement will be absent in our Muslim Troubles. As we put it in our previous document:

> *The Good Friday Agreement of 1998, which brought an end to the Troubles as commonly understood, essentially resulted in nationalists being granted a fairer share of political power, and unionists being provided with a guarantee that a united Ireland could only be brought about with the consent of a majority of the people of Northern Ireland. This is how these two different peoples of Northern Ireland have found a way, at least for the last twelve years, of living together in relative peace. But this cannot happen in the event of a conflict between the British and their Muslim fifth column. Indeed, every single part of this compromise in the Good Friday Agreement would be meaningless at best, absurd at worst, in the context of a possible violent conflict of this nature.*

> *As we have already established, the Muslim community of Britain is parasitic with respect to both financial and social capital, criminal and subversive, aggressive and rapidly growing. Its characteristics in these regards are not things it could alter even if it wanted to. Moreover, we cannot grant Muslims the vote, because we have already given them the vote. We cannot give them a fair slice of the economic pie, because they already suck out far more than they put in, consuming wealth created by others with nary a word of thanks. We cannot guarantee them that they will not be incorporated by force into our country, as they are already trying to*

*get every mother's son in here themselves, by hook or by crook,
with the express purpose of being incorporated into it, at least in
some sense. And we cannot grant them political influence
commensurate with the contributions they make to British society,
as their contributions to British society are all severely negative,
and the political influence they already have is entirely undeserved
and increasingly resented by the indigenous population.*

...

*It will be clear to the British people in the case of tribal conflict
between them and their Muslim fifth column that defeat will result
in the disappearance of their civilization, their way of life, and their
existence as a people. Accordingly, they will have to win it, which
means they will have to do what needs to be done to win it, which
means they will have to do a great many violent and unpleasant
things, things that, though quite inconceivable to many at present,
will seem right and obvious to most when the nature of the conflict
has become sufficiently clear.*

Let us expand upon this here. Firstly, though nationalists and unionists have reconciled themselves to the legitimacy of each other's traditions in NI, it cannot be said of the UK that there are two traditions, the British tradition and the Muslim tradition, both equally valid in their own right. It can only be said that there is the British tradition, and the cultural psychopathy of the various Muslim peoples who, having escaped their own miserable countries, are now busy recreating them in microcosm in Britain. This latter is not a 'tradition' whose legitimacy we will have to, or even could, acknowledge. It is antimatter to our matter and, sooner or later, we will have to take steps to ensure that it cannot annihilate us. Enjoying a glass of beer at the village pub on a Sunday afternoon and kicking the daughter-in-law down the stairs because she burned the chapattis are not two facets of two equally valid traditions of the British Isles. They are behaviours of the British people and our Muslim fifth column respectively.

Secondly, it is observed across Europe that, among the main factors driving hostility between Europeans and Muslims is the overwhelming criminality of the latter. We will not revisit this matter in detail here; rather we will content ourselves with the observation that a peace that allowed degenerate Muslim peoples to continue to inflict the multitudinous costs of their crime on any given European people is a peace that would evaporate fairly quickly. In many countries, this appears to be the key driving force behind the rapidly escalating European-Muslim conflicts. Unfortunately, a criminal population cannot simply decide to stop being criminal in the way that a paramilitary organization can decide to stop shooting people. Muslim populations throughout Europe are characterized by contempt for us, contempt for our laws, contempt for the rigours of our prisons, low psychological barriers to the use of violence, and feeble, if not downright non-existent, educational and professional achievements. Such peoples cannot suddenly stop being what they are, and only an exceptionally draconian crackdown by the state could conceivably dampen their criminal ways. This crackdown would be far too one-sided for the Muslim side to accept it as part of a political solution to violent conflict. Reading about the sheer everyday thuggishness of

Muslims in countries such as Sweden, the Netherlands, and Belgium, one sometimes gets the impression that every other young Muslim male would have to be locked up to restrain the pathologies of these communities as wholes. This would be internment, not a step towards peace.

Thirdly, there would have to be a drastic scaling back of the extent to which Muslims could have all the good things of this world provided for them by the British taxpayer. Saying, in effect, 'you will continue to massively subsidize people you are currently at war with' will be a good way to break off negotiations between the British government and British paramilitaries. But saying 'you will no longer receive any significant transfers of wealth from the British taxpayer' to Muslim paramilitaries will condemn their communities either to lives of the most appalling urban squalor or an undignified return whence they came. Northern Ireland is small enough that the entire population can be somewhat subsidized by the UK as a whole, which is something that already happens with Scotland, Wales, and parts of England. But there does not exist in Britain the financial wherewithal to throw money at millions of increasingly hated Muslims in perpetuity. Historically, the victor in a war *receives* an indemnity from the vanquished. It will be quite a thing if undefeated British paramilitaries are expected to see their communities *pay* one instead.

Fourthly, the rate of growth of the Muslim population is so rapid that any 'peace' between it and the British would have to act to curtail this growth very quickly and even, in all likelihood, partially reverse it. In the absence of the overwhelming paramilitary violence that is already ruled out through our stipulation that we refer here to a peace agreement, this latter would only be achievable through a large-scale repatriation program that put significant pressure on Muslims to return to their countries of origin. A peace that let the Muslim population continue to colonize the UK, more or less quickly, would be of no utility to British paramilitaries uninterested in allowing the enemy to rest, recuperate, reinforce, and then reinitiate hostilities when it was in a better position to do so. A peace that ends the conflict without addressing the demographic time-bomb of Islam is a peace that could only thrust one's children's generation into a far more desperate and destructive conflict. Who would accept this and why?

The only peace that British paramilitaries would be likely to accept in return for laying down their arms would be one that allowed them to resolve the four issues above to their satisfaction. In other words, this negotiated peace would have to curtail and at least partially reverse Muslim immigration, pull the rug of the welfare state out from under the feet of Muslims (despite the fact that, by and large, they cannot function without it), ruthlessly clamp down on their criminality, and acknowledge and reinforce the absolute cultural supremacy of the indigenous people of Britain, referred to in happier times simply as the British. But this is not a negotiated peace at all! Rather, it is the peace that would follow the crushing victory of the British paramilitaries and the defeat of their Muslim enemies, who will find themselves being promptly deported *if they are lucky*. Our attempts to sketch the outline of a negotiated peace have instead demonstrated why none could exist.

Any conceivable peace process mediated between British and Muslim paramilitaries will be about as fruitful as the Israel-Palestine peace process, which is to say it will be very heavy on process, but deliver decidedly little in the way of peace. There simply does not exist a negotiated end to the Israel-Palestine conflict that could satisfy a critical mass of the key

actors on both sides of that conflict. The same will be true of our Muslim Troubles.

<center>**********</center>

In closing, the author begs the indulgence of his readers here as he inserts a personal anecdote into this document. Driving through Ireland not so very long ago, he picked up a hitch-hiker in County Donegal. This hitch-hiker, his Scottish accent notwithstanding, was an Irishman who was obviously a staunch member of what could be called the republican tradition. As we passed through the small town of Dunfanaghy, he told me that it had a large Protestant population. Indeed, his attitude seemed to be that it had virtually been taken over by Protestants during the Troubles, the Protestants in question coming across from the Six Counties, as my hitch-hiker would have put it, to get away from the violence for a while. Apparently they bought up holiday homes in the town, thereby spurring on a new wave of construction which had, in his opinion, ruined the place.

If one reflects upon it, this is quite a thing to them to have done. The nationalist people of Northern Ireland are, overwhelmingly, those members of the historic Irish nation who ended up north of the new border after the partition of Ireland. Though the reality of partition has undoubtedly fashioned in them a consciousness that their brethren in the Republic of Ireland cannot entirely share, it has hardly turned them into two unrelated peoples, unconcerned by each other's woes or sufferings. On the contrary, it is precisely the continuing sense of shared nationhood that has led the push for a united Ireland. Yet, somehow, unionists engaged, at least in some sense, in a violent conflict with nationalists north of the border felt happy travelling south of it to buy up homes in a country populated entirely by those who were, historically speaking, more or less the same people they were in conflict with in Northern Ireland. Is this not indicative of the fundamental compatibility of the peoples in question, and, however much it might irk both sides to read it, their similarity?

Now, when a vast swathe of the urban UK descends into tribal violence, would any British person ever say, 'Oh well, at least we will be able to get away from it for a while *by buying a holiday home in Karachi*'? Ignore for a moment the logistical difficulties involved in heading off to Karachi for the weekend and focus on the psychological implications. Not only is Karachi a truly horrendous-sounding place, but it is *full of Pakistanis*. Why, precisely, would any British person wish to escape our Muslim Troubles by fleeing to the country that is the single biggest source of those Muslims?

Not a single one of the good things that exists in Britain could possibly exist in Pakistan, and not a single one of them will survive in any area of the UK that comes to be dominated by Pakistanis. The spread of these people in the UK represents the complete obliteration of everything that the British people have built over their thousands of years of history. This is why there can be no political compromise to bring our Muslim Troubles to an end. All compromise will be an option worse than war. Compromise is precisely what we *are* engaged in at present, and it is the increasingly intolerable nature of this compromise that will drive us to war. Why then would we pull back from that war to re-establish a state of affairs already judged inferior, and that would simply result in a return to war, further down the line, with a Muslim population grown larger and stronger in the meantime? Anything short of outright victory will be pointless, and British paramilitaries will presumably be clearsighted enough to realize it.

XIII. Note on Sources

The factual claims made in this document are not considered controversial enough to warrant rigorous documentation, which would add little of value. To the extent that any of the content herein proves contentious, it is likely to be the interpretative and analytical claims based on those factual claims, and these, of course, are the author's own and must be assessed on their own merits.

Nonetheless, to point interested parties in the right direction, we make a note here of the sources we relied upon for such understanding of the Troubles as we have managed to obtain.

Big Boys' Rules, Mark Urban
Brits, Peter Taylor
The Dirty War, Martin Dillon
Fifty Dead Men Walking, Martin McGartland
The Informer, Sean O'Callaghan
INLA: Deadly Divisions, Henry McDonald and Jack Holland
Killing Rage, Eamon Collins
Loyalists, Peter Taylor
Mad Dog, Johnny Adair
Mad Dog: The Rise and Fall of Johnny Adair and 'C' Company, David Lister and Hugh Jordan
The Operators: On the Streets with Britain's Most Secret Service, James Rennie
Provos: The IRA and Sinn Fein, Peter Taylor
A Secret History of the IRA, Ed Moloney
The Shankill Butchers: A Case Study of Mass Murder, Martin Dillon
Stakeknife, Martin Ingram
Unsung Hero, Kevin Fulton
Watching the Door: Cheating Death in 1970s Belfast, Kevin Myers
25 Years of Terror: The IRA's War Against the British, Martin Dillon

Those who wish to know more about explosives are invited to do their own research online. But remember: you are being watched...