

# **THE ENGLISH RIOTS – HISTORY IN THE MAKING**

**Shaykh Dr. Abdalqadir as-Sufi**

I watched with dismay but not surprise at the anarchic riots over the English cities only noting that there had been no riots in the Northern Kingdom.

Since ‘breaking news’ is a synonym for ignorance I waited to see what, in reality, had happened. It became clear and it presaged a future of hope.

Firstly, then, let us put it in perspective. Riots in England were part of a much wider phenomenon. After almost half a century four Arab dictatorships erupted in mass riots. Their simultaneity sufficient proof that it was not a response to individual tyrannies. Why, then, have they waited so long? In the European mainland, Greece, Spain and Portugal saw riots in major cities and France had been erupting throughout the tenure of its sub-epileptic Hungarian dwarf President.

This allows us to recognise that the cause was not in the undoubted dreadfulfulness of each country’s corruption and injustice. There had to be a systemic cause, common to each miserable nation. Of course, we all know the cause, and no one more than the politician, finally

exposed as a helpless and obedient slave of an unelected tyrannical class of bankers. Carl Schmitt, Europe's greatest sociologue, had pointed out that power lay not with a governing entity but with that force which ruled over the laws in a final determining judgment.

Flash back to the last U.S. Presidential election. An unjust and fantastical war against a politically undefinable non-entity, terror, had helped bankrupt the nation. Seen as a political disaster, the opposition party called for 'change' and invoked the democratic fantasy that people could change things, declaring, 'Yes, we can.' Which meant no, you can't. Duly elected to political office the new President promptly re-appointed the financial class bosses who had caused the crisis in the first place.

This obliges us, further, to note that the collapse and bail-out of the banking elite was not followed by punishments in turn followed by new radical reform legislation of finance. No. It was followed by the oligarchs' counter-attack. A counter-attack on people. The masses. Once called citizens, now called debtors. The bankers declared that they, far from being responsible for the imploded mathematic of usury, were its victims. 'The people', irresponsibly, had borrowed too much from them. Now it was pay-back time. The bankers had suffered enough.

They did not ask for the debt to be paid. They knew that was impossible as it was too enormous. In all reasonableness they insisted that the guilty political class had over-borrowed and over-spent (Blair and Brown, the 'Jarndyce and Jarndyce' of English wealth), so now at least the time had to come to pay – THE DEFICIT!

#### THE DEFICIT

The measures suddenly imposed – changing the masses into the guilty party and the bankers into the innocent victims of non-payment – led to the understandable outrage of the educated class which now had to pay for the failure of the system's elite at the price of tolerable existence. Inevitably, when the educated mass demonstrated in rage at what was being taken from them – education, housing, medicine – the under-class simply ran riot and looted and stole what they had never been given. At that moment

Athens, Cairo, Madrid, Tunis and Lisbon were identical with London, Birmingham and the English cities.

This recognition revealed that the crisis was the crisis of capitalism and a banking system that had nationalised itself, obliging 'government' to borrow on behalf of its mass population, rendering them debtors to the unelected rulers of global existence, the bankers and corporation owners. The point of eruption came not in an anarchic situation, rather, it had been prepared for by a decade of laws removing old hard-won freedoms, which assured that the mass could be more easily monitored.

Tacitus wrote: "Corruptissima re publica plurimae leges."

When the republic is at its most corrupt the laws are most numerous.

At this point we can observe the lamentable performance of the political class, as parliament, and as ministers. Cameron blustered, above the storm, threatening ruthless response. A significant group of citizens were redefined as thugs. This splits society in two. One group to blame, the other victim. This ploy hides the responsible party, the political class. Cameron had become Assad. Zero tolerance.

As he blustered about water-cannons and mass arrest, as he interfered with the process of law, instructing the magistrature, the police for their part coolly noted that they were on the one hand ordered to act tough, and on the other hand, the offending 'DEFICIT' had slashed their budgets and salaries, rendering them helplessly ill-fitted to the police role in civic unrest edging on civil war.

Now that the dust has cleared let us survey the scene.

The political class insisted it was something they defined as 'pure criminality' – in other words it was not political. They were not to blame. The discourse in Parliament was lamentable. The TV pronouncements of ministers and shadow-ministers were as dismal as those of the Prime Minister. In a strange way it was none of their business.

Some leading bankers were even panicked into grants for social charities. Philanthropy is still the last refuge of the usurer.

These miserable creatures, the politicians, fortunately do not make up a significant part of English society. No. Something important

happened in the banker-induced riots of England. Something has changed the deep political character of a people. Three young Muslim Englishmen were brutally run down on the road and killed. The father of one of the victims stepped forward and spoke. He was powerful, majestic and calm. He did not scream for punishment or zero tolerance. He ordered, I repeat, he ordered the people to be calm. He denied the outraged people even a right to revenge. Eloquently, his face shadowed by grief, he told the people to stay home till the storm was over. He saw the hand of destiny in the tragedy and he accepted it with nobility. He praised Allah.

Stunned and humiliated by the quite different and higher level of the mourning father, the politicians tried to 'steal' the moment with a maudlin, hand-holding, dancing populace festival of nauseous multi-cultural socialism. It was simply rendered irrelevant. In the foreground a Muslim prayer for the dead set honour and dignity to a prayer-line of the English Muslims of Birmingham while respectful Christian sympathisers watched and learned.

A new social order was emerging. It did not involve the politicians and it did not include – but deferred – the bankers.

The coherent society emerged as the Muslim Englishmen and their respectful Christian neighbours. The harassed and under-funded police force. The indefatigable under-funded fire-fighters.

To this, if I may say, crowning the event, stood the Monarchy.

Before I confirm this new situation, I would like to remind you that H.R.H. the Prince of Wales visited Afghanistan. It was not like Blair, Brown and Cameron, in flack-jackets over shirts, goggle-eyed with fear, it was as a Prince, Colonel of a Regiment in military gear. He laid a wreath and he addressed the men. They did not have to listen to the politicians' lie that they defended the freedom of our way of life (Jonathan Ross and Alan Sugar?) He spoke to them, man to man, about their fallen comrades and his concern for their families at home. It mattered.

After the riots, Prince Charles and the Duchess of Cornwall visited people in the area. Met with the police. His son Prince William and his new wife visited the families of the tragic killings. They also met police and firemen. Later, the younger Prince Harry also visited the

rescue forces. Prince Charles himself wrote to the grieving parents. A bond was struck between the Monarchy and the people, and the people had at their heart a loyal and civically mature new generation of cricket-loving Muslims.

In this light the Muslims, too, must see the dead British soldiers in Afghanistan not as an enemy but rather as fellow-victims of a political system run by a ruined society in disintegration, the USA. It is their war, not ours. The political class has held us all hostage to it.

It is now possible to glimpse a future after the current unravelling fabric of banking capitalism finally is discarded.

An end to the usury-finance system is itself a move from the disaster of abstracted structuralism to the formation of human inter-related patterns at whose head is a person, not a further system or committee.

Monarchy, as Napoleon observed, is the only protection of the people against the financiers. Monarchy is not a symbolic function empty of power. It grants the final and activating rule to one man. It has been the way of England and Scotland back from the time of their emergence from Roman occupation.

Scotland, as Monarchy, we can date from the foundation of the Kingdom of Alba by Kenneth MacAlpin in the ninth century.

England emerged as nearly unified by Alfred the Great in the same century. However, there followed in England nearly 200 years of warfare against massive incursions by the Nordic Vikings (called Danes) both military and as settlers.

The under-class of nationalist thugs are quite unaware that English character has been built on waves of foreign occupation – bringing genetic good news to an island under-stocked with DNA!

My school song taught us:

“Celtic and Saxon, Pictish and Norman

Have mingled the strain that has made us today.”

England emerged as a unified Kingdom of laws, culture, and only later as language, with the invasion and conquest of William the Conqueror in 1066. The Normans were not ‘French’ except in idiom,

they were the North Men from the great Norwegian-Danish incursions from Rügen in the Baltic to Hardanger Fjord in the North Sea.

Properly speaking we do not have Monarchy today, only its shadow reminder. Monarchy is personal rule. It is NOT dictatorship like Hitler's, or Assad's. That is the democratic transformed into one-man-rule, but answerable to nobody. For example, people, Parliament and Cabinet opposed the Iraq war, imposed by the mentally unbalanced Blair under U.S. control. Monarchy is utterly dependent on good counsellar influence and even control.

The failure of the Earl of Essex's coup d'état handed over Elizabeth's shaky rule to the Cecils. Their rule by committee began the tragic unravelling of Monarchy under the Stuarts, ending with the 'enthroning' of the Cecils and friends in an oligarchic rule which was blown to pieces by the Industrial Revolution and its last phase – industrial war, from Boer War to World War to W.W.2., spluttering to its end in Korea, Vietnam, Iraq and finally Afghanistan. In this catastrophe of the last century Britain went from great-power to shipwreck. The Cecilian political class, deprived of aristocratic calibre by the attrition of the Great War, found itself led by lesser and lesser figures, helpless to stop capitalism and its plunge into nihilism. After the early 20<sup>th</sup> century paralysis of Asquith, Lloyd George and Clemenceau came the final lethal expression of politics, Hitler, Churchill, Stalin and Roosevelt. Both Hitler and Churchill ran the war from a bunker. In the bankruptcy of senatorial or parliamentary power the financial class took over and rapidly evolved the instruments and institutions of lending and borrowing. They finally took over the investment process itself.

As politics, 'Shock and Awe' meant the obliteration of an ancient city and its heritage. It also saw the reduction of the political class to abject obedience. The reward granted to the politician after obedience was a place on the Board. Wolfowitz went from War Minister to Head of the World Bank. Finance ruled.

Since this system is already in freefall one should start to look to a post-political future. I do not mean anarchy. It already threatens our great cities.

I mean – Monarchy. Christian European Monarchs, who know that they must and can live with a Muslim citizenry with full rights.

Henry VIII had taught the European Monarchs that the enemy of Monarchy was Roman papacy. The papacy of banking, let it not be forgotten, is based on Rome with its enclaves, cardinals and edicts, devoid of women.

Look at the situation. Look what the politicians have given the masses. People you would certainly not have sit at your table – Sarkozy, Merkel, Berlusconi!

Italy has a legitimate King, of the House of Savoy.

Germany has the Glenalmond-educated and quite splendid Prince Georg Hohenzollern.

France (at last) has the young Louis XX, as he already claims to be.

The other lesser European nations, Norway, Sweden, Belgium, Holland and Denmark have legitimate but untested Monarchs in place.

At the wedding of Prince Albert in Monaco, as the guests trooped in, someone cogently remarked, 'It's a monarchic Job Centre.' They will soon be employed! Britain is fortunate in having this ancient legitimacy of rule. Remember the committee power of the Pax Cecilia ended at the Cenotaph. The soon inevitable collapse of Parliament before the ruthless people-enslaving demands of the unelected bankers must inevitably lead to civil uprising. Civil war is abhorrent, especially to Muslims.

As an un-reconstructed Jacobite, whose ancestor led the central charge along with McGillivray at the Battle of Culloden, I realistically, as did my kinsman Sir Walter Scott, support the present Hanoverian House of Windsor.

The demise of present-day party politics, lashed to the Titanic of usury-banking, will inevitably see a collapse of the dollar/euro system of usury-based lending.

Alongside the return to a Monarch facing a Great Council of Military, Academics, Business and civic leaders will be encountered the issue of real money. The last ecology!

This was the issue which marked the emergence of England, it will certainly be the one which may rescue its demise.

In 744, Offa declared himself 'Rex Totius Anglorum Patriae,' although his power only stretched to the Humber. His rule was marked by successful trade. He struck coins of silver, he called them pennies. He struck gold coins copied from the Caliph of Baghdad. On one side was King Offa's face. The other side, minted in Mercia, declared in Arabic: 'There is no god but Allah, Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah.'

The future may belong to a Christian King, profoundly aware of his Muslim subjects, protecting his people and his currency.

There is life after banking, as there has only been slaughter in it. For a King to survive, new to power, he has to create a new elite. Properly speaking, there is today no aristocracy, since there is no class responsible to a local community and its land. However, a new set of leaders have to be established, honoured, married into, and given a voice. That voice has already been heard, with majesty and gravity at a mass funeral in the heart of England.

\* \* \* \* \*