

AL-AFGHANI AND THE BRITISH SUBVERSION OF ISLAM

Monday, August 29, 2005
by Pierre Beaudry

« And also at the time of the raging of my thoughts in this fight, the life of Peter the Hermit passed before my perception : The zeal of that indigent hermit and the resolution of that poor monk ; how he took a cross on his back and traversed deserts and mountains and entered city after city of the Franks, and in every kingdom he raised the cry : « On to battle » ; so that he became the cause of the Crusades and the kindling of those horrendous events. The flame of emulation was lit in my heart, and the devotion and skill of the Khurasanian made life and ease forbidden for me. »

al-Afghani, {*A letter to Sultan Abdul Hamid on Islamic unity*}.

1. AL-AFGHANI : THE ISLAMIC PUPPET OF EVELYN BARING

The primary characteristic of al-Afghani is Satanism. During the second half of the nineteenth century, Iranian Gnostic, Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani (1838-1897), produced a monumental piece of sophistry, a total fallacy of composition in the form of a pseudo-religious movement called Pan-Islamism, which made believe to millions of people around the world that there existed an irreconcilable opposition between what was called {*Eastern democracy*} and {*Western democracy*}. As a consequence, a war to the finish had to be engaged between apparent opposing factions of respectively the East and the West, that is, between a false opposition between {*spirituality*} and {*materialism*}, thus, justifying the current War on Terrorism.

The truth of the matter is that, behind this Afghani imposture, stood Evelyn Baring, Lord Cromer (1841-1917), of the infamous Dope Inc., Baring Brothers opium banking interests, whose role was to secure the globalization policy of the British Imperial scenario of war, throughout Asia, and thus, justify Rudyard Kipling's lie whereby “ {*Never the East and the West shall meet*}”.

As this report will show, this so-called Afghani idea of Pan-Islamism was nothing but a British Intelligence inversion of the 10th century crusade of Peter the Hermit, with the barbaric addition of a modern synarchist form of Theocracy, a Muslim copycat version of the Saint-Yves d'Alveydre's dusty old oligarchic mantra of European divine rights of Kings to be applied to the Islamic divine rights of Mullahs.

From the Pan-Islamism standpoint, Afghani's influence was considerable throughout Turkey, Egypt, Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, and India. His political aim was to destroy the different Muslim nations with their traditions, and create a new « Islamic nationalism. » The Pan-Islamic movement of Afghani was the synthetic Muslim precursor and equivalent of the synarchist Count Coudenhove Kalergi's pan-European movement of the early part of the 20th century. In both cases, the result was to create a ferment for the destruction of sovereign nation-States, and the establishment of a New British Imperial World Order.

Afghani's call for a Pan-Islamic movement was nothing short of a subversion of Islam and a means of undermining Egypt's nationalist movement, make Turkish reforms benefit the British Empire, and prepare Iran's Constitutional and Islamic revolution against America. In one word, Afghani's political goal was to use Islam as a battering ram alternatively against the British and Russian Empires, and destroy the Ottoman Empire. In all of these different countries, Afghani acted as a British agent and a theosophist freemason agent of the Synarchy International, helping to usher in a new World Order based on a vengeful holy war, an interminable clash of civilization. This puts Afghani directly in the community of agreement with such neo-cons luminaries as Zbigniew Brzezinsky, Bernard Lewis, and Samuel Huntington of today.

According to an on line report by Ibrahim Kalin, Afghani's Pan-Islamic doctrine had a wide ranging influence on Muslim revolutionary

leaders throughout continental Asia. Kalin identified, among others, « Muhammad Iqbal, Muhammad Ali Jinnah and Abdu'l Kalam Azad in the Indian subcontinent and Namik Kemal, Said Nursi and Mehmet Akif Ersoy in the Ottoman Turkey. Later in the 20th century, Afghani became a major source of inspiration for such revivalist movements as the Muslim Brethren of Egypt and the Jama'at-i Islami of Pakistan. In many ways, Afghani continues to be hailed by various Islamic activist groups as an important example of the activist-scholar type in the Islamic world. Afghani had also a deep impact on many Egyptian thinkers including Muhammad'Abduh, Rashid Rida, 'Ali 'abd al-Raziq, Qasim Amin, Luffi al-Sayyid and Osman Amin. » (Ibrahim Kalim, {*Sayyid Jamal al-Din Muhammad b. Safdar al-Afghani (1838-1897)*}, January, 2004.) Today, those leaders are all, one way or another involved with the emergence of the Islamic terrorist networks.

Very early on, Afghani had constructed for himself a profile image of being the hero of anti-western civilization and especially of anti-British Imperialism. Afghani was not a religious man, he was a sophist, and thus, he created for himself a revolutionary enemy image by means of which he attempted to avoid being identified as an Iranian Shi'i, or as an Afghan Sunnie. In fact, he was neither a Shi'i nor a Sunnie, he was a sophist fraud, and this is why he chose the name of Afghani, to make it appear that he was from Afghanistan, simply to throw the scent of Iran off of his clothes, as he travelled around the world. In 1868, a week before leaving Kabul, Afghani wrote the following statement in rhymed prose showing how he intended to confuse people about the fugitive image he was making of himself :

«The English believe me a Russian (Rus).
 « The MuslimS think me a Zoroastrian (Majus).
 « The Sunnis think me a Shi'i (Rafidi).
 « And Shi'is think me an enemy of 'Ali (Nasibi).
 « Some of the friends of the four companions have believed me a Wahhabi.
 « Some of the virtuous Imamites have imagined me a Babi.
 « The theists have imagined me a materialist.
 « And the pious a sinner bereft of piety.
 « The learned have considered me an unknowing ignoramus.
 «And the believers have thought me an unbelieving sinner.
 « Neither does the unbeliever call me to him.
 « Nor the Moslem recognize me as his own.
 « Banished from the Mosque and rejected by the temple,

« I am perplexed as to whom I should depend on and whom I should fight.
 « The rejection of one requires affirmation of the other.
 « The affirmation of one makes the friends firm against its opposite.
 « There is no way of escape for me to flee the grasp of one group.
 « There is no fixed abode for me to fight the other party,
 « Seated in Bala Hisar in Kabul, my hands tied and my legs broken,
 I wait to see what the Curtain of the Unknown will deign to reveal to me
 and what fate the turning of this malevolent firmament has in store for me. »
 (Translation by Nikki Keddie, Op. Cit., p. 54.) This only goes to show to
 what extent Afghani carefully crafted his identity as a sophist.

These lies raised the question of whether it was possible to draw an objective biography of Afghani. History professor, Nikki Keddie, raised that question, as a *{test of truth}*, in a very interesting way. She wrote : « A potential biographer of Afghani is faced with two extraordinary difficulties. First, most of the material for his biography is found most readily in accounts emanating from Afghani and his disciples, whereas these accounts should in fact be subject to doubt and skepticism. To take only the most obvious instance, Afghani in Sunni surroundings maintained that he was born and raised in Afghanistan, yet it can now be shown that he was in fact born in the village of Asadabad, near the town of Hamadan in Western Iran. » (Nikkie Keddie, *{Sayyid Jamal ad-Din « al-Afghani »}*, University of California Press, 1972 , p. 3.)

During the last decades of the nineteenth century, Afghani's Pan-Islamic activities generally coincided with the time table of the British geopolitical strategic of the « Great Game » of subverting and breaking up nations-states throughout Southwest Asia and of Central Asia. This is exemplified primarily by the Russo-Turkic War of 1877-78 ; the imposition of the Congress of Berlin terms against Turkey, in 1878 ; the occupation of Tunisia by the French, in 1881 ; the coup against Egyptian Khedive, Ismail, in 1879 ; the British occupation of Egypt, in 1882, the failed attempt at getting Afghani to negotiate with the Sudanese Mahdi, for the life of Gordon Pasha in Khartoum, in 1885, etc. All of these events paralleled al-Afghani's calls and mobilizations « from the top » for a holy war in North Africa, Southwest Asia, and Central Asia. In one word, Afghani's Pan-Islamic intention was a united movement for war, which was run by the British Intelligence Services with the collaboration of French Intelligence.

2. A SHORT TIME LINE OF AFGHANI'S LIFE

Some accounts say that Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani, generally known as Afghani, was born of a Turkic-speaking Shi'ite family in a small Azeri town near Hamadan, some say he was born in Asabadad, Iran, and still others say Jamal-ad-Din was born in Shair Garh, Kunar, Afghanistan. In fact Afghani, himself, blurred his own origins deliberately so as not to prejudice his Pan-Islamic cosmopolitan purpose. The truth of the matter is that, according to the most serious scholar on the political life of Afghani, Nikki R. Keddie, Afghani was an Iranian.

In the 1850's, Afghani studied in the Iraqi shrine cities of Najaf and Karbala, under the esoteric influence of the Shiite Mystic school of Shaykh Ahmad al-Ahsa'i, a gnostic theosophist in the tradition of Martinism of Joseph de Maistre, Saint-Yves d'Alveydre, and Papus. This gnostic influence will open doors for Afghani to the freemasonic lodges of Paris, London, and New York. Throughout his life, Afghani reportedly defended the esoteric ideas of Shaykh Ahmad al-Ahsa'i.

In 1863, after the death of the King of Afghanistan, Amir Dost Muhammad Khan, a civil war developed between his sons and grandsons. After the new King, Afzal Khan died, in 1866, Afghani allied himself with the younger brother, Prince A'zam Khan, and became his prime minister in 1867, during which he unsuccessfully negotiated with the British for the independence of Afghanistan. The rule of King A'zam Khan was to last only a year. In 1868, the crown passed to Sher 'Ali Khan, the original heir designate. After his ouster, Azam Khan had to flee to Iran, while Afghani exiled himself in Iraq.

In 1869, forty days after his arrival in Iraq, Afghani went to Istanbul to work on his Pan-Islamic project. He was received by Prime Minister 'Ali Pasha. It was in Istanbul that Afghani was identified publically for the first time as an enemy of Islam by the orthodox religious leader, Hassan Fahmi Effendi, who succeeded in getting the government to force him out of the country. He had been labeled as a « heretic. »

One of the reasons Afghani was considered a « heretic » was due to the fact that he advocated a modern interpretation (hermeneutics) of the Qur'an. Afghani was giving an Islamic spin taken from his Neoplatonic mysticism, and which was made to appear truthful for a given period of time. For example, whenever a literal meaning came up in the Qur'an, Afghani would provide an interpretation for Modern Times as opposed to an interpretation for Medieval Times. As a result, the universal truth of all religious dogmas was put into question. In other words, the truth of the Qur'an evolved and changed with time, while the universal truth of scientific knowledge did not change with time. For Afghani, the truth of the Qur'an also varied depending on whether one spoke to a Westerner, or to an Easterner.

From 1871 until 1879, Afghani was in Egypt for a period of 8 years. It was during that period that Afghani recruited his main student Mohammed Abduh, and both began organizing the youth of the University of Al-Azhar, which would later intersect the Nationalist movement against British imperialism. It is reported that the Egyptian Prime Minister, then, Ryiad Pasha, gave him a ten Egyptian pounds a month stipend, as a token of respect. This is when he began seriously organizing his Pan-Islamic unity aimed at uniting India, Afghanistan, Turkey, etc., against the Russian Empire. (See below : Afghani, {*A letter to Sultan Abdul Hamid on Islamic unity.* })

For several years, the Afghani-Abduh team created a number of newspapers, such as {*Misr*}, in Cairo and Alexandria, {*Al-Tijara*}, and an English newspaper, the {*An-Nhala*} in London. He founded a nationalist political party, {*al-Hizab al-Watani*}. From 1876 to 1879, Afghani became the Grand Master of the Masonic Lodge of Alexandria. All of Afghani's political activities of that period were recorded in a book (?) written by his student assistant, Abduh. In 1877, Afghani joined the Scottish Rite freemasonic {*Eastern Star Lodge*}, which was used as an occult base for his operations, in affiliation with the {*Grand Lodge of England*}. Professor Keddie reported : « Afghani's interest in freemasonry may have been in part religious but was much more political. It may be, as M. Sabry says, that it was a British vice-consul, R. Borg, who attracted Afghani to the Eastern Star Lodge. The 1977 date often given for his masonic affiliation may relate to the Eastern Star affiliation and his attachment of Egyptian disciples to that lodge. The lodge, with Afghani as its leader, was to become an important political instrument in the growing Egyptian crisis of 1878 and 1879. »

(Keddie, Op. Cit., p. 93.) As we shall see below, Abduh was also a freemason brother in the same Lodge with Lord Cromer, at the time of the British invasion of Egypt in 1882. On August 27, 1879, Afghani and his disciple Abu Turab were arrested, then, were exiled from Egypt a month later. Again, Afghani was kicked out of the country reportedly because of his liberalism and his organizing against the traditional institutional authorities of Islam.

The reasons Afghani was expelled from different countries were not religious, but strategic in character. In every country he visited in the East, that is, Afghanistan, Egypt, Iran, Turkey, it was as if there were pre-arranged British- Intelligence timings, according to which Afghani was made to come into public view as a heretic, and then kicked out of the country. In each case, as Mohhammad Abduh followed up in Egypt, Afghani had key left-behind followers who would consolidate his factionalizing strategic actions. The pattern was like a pre-established script for a holy war. As Keddie reported : « What gives the account some verisimilitude, aside from uncritical acceptance of Afghani's words, is the unusual propensity to seek out people in high office at the same time as he was plotting violent revolutionary, or anti-British activity, so that he was sometimes expelled, once his plans were discovered, by the very people with whom he had had amicable contact . » (Keddie, Op. Cit., p. 7.)

During 1880-1882, Afghani travelled to India where he organized both Muslims and Hindus into a war against the British Empire. In 1881, He published a {*Refutation of the Materialists*}, and, before leaving India, he visited Afghanistan and distributed his book on the {*History of Afghanistan*}. Those were the only two books that Afghani published while he was alive. He also wrote on the importance of learning modern science and philosophy, which he later denounced during his debate with French positivist philosopher, Ernest Renan. He started new journals, {*Mu'allim*}, and {*Mu'allim-e-Shafiq*}. It has been reported that when he left India in November of 1882, Afghani travelled to America, allegedly, with Madame Blavatsky. At this point in time, there is the unexplained blank of a short period in which Afghani was to have visited America, from late 1882 to early 1883.

In his article on {*The Masons and the Moors*}, the masonic reporter, Mehmet Sabeheddin, says that Afghani had been the teacher of Madame Blavatsky. Sabeheddin wrote : « Certainly, Madame Blavatsky's teacher,

Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani, who was raised in Afghanistan, fits the description of a Master Adept. His life is described as a mysterious one that led through lands as far apart as India and America. Received by heads of state in Istanbul, he moved in both underground radical circles and the highest centers of powerful European and Oriental capitals. »

Mehmet Sabeheddin makes the claim that Afghani was the co-founder with Blavatsky of the New York Theosophical Society, and that he was also the founder of Moorish Science in America, in 1882. However, Moorish Science was officially attributed to the American, Timothy Drew. It is unclear as to whether Drew had any connection with Afghani. Sabeheddin wrote :

“ Noble Drew Ali (born Timothy Drew) early in the 20th century took a job as a merchant seaman and found himself in Egypt. According to one legend, Noble Drew Ali made a pilgrimage to North Africa where he studied with Moorish scholars and received a mandate from the king of Morocco to instruct Americans of African descent in Islam. His association with the ruler of Morocco is significant when we recall the historic relationship between this Moorish country and the early United States.

“At the Pyramid of Cheops his followers believe he received initiation and took the Muslim name Sharif [Noble] Abdul Ali; in America he would be known as Noble Drew Ali. On his return to the United States in 1913 he had a dream in which he was ordered to found a movement ‘to uplift fallen humanity by returning the nationality, divine creed and culture to persons of Moorish descent in the Western Hemisphere.’ He organized the Moorish Science Temple along lines similar to Masonic lodges, with local temple branches and “Adept Chambers” teaching the esoteric wisdom derived from the secret circle of Eastern Sages, the Master Adepts of Moorish Science.” (Mehmet Sabeheddin, {*The Masons and the Moors*}, in New Dawn Magazine, GPO Box 3126FF, Melbourne VIC 3001, Australia.)

In January of 1883, Afghani was recruited « personally » by Wilfrid Scawen Blunt in London. From that moment on, he became a non-official British agent, with Blunt as his controller. In London, he wrote a couple of articles against the British rule in Egypt to bring attention to himself, and to leave big paw tracks of his anti-British sentiments for British Intelligence and his followers to take notice of.

By January 19, 1883, Afghani travelled to Paris where he joined the Grand Orient Lodge of France. This is the period in which Afghani debates Ernest Renan at the Sorbonne, on the subject of the Islamic role in science and philosophy, which proved to be the very center-piece of his British Intelligence usefulness. As I will indicate in the following section of this report, it is from the position taken in his debate with Renan that Afghani established the epistemological parameters of the irreconcilable conflict between Western Civilization and Islam. It was at that time that the British Foreign Office began to officially collaborate with French Police in monitoring the actions of Afghani.

In 1884, Muhaamad Abduh joined Afghani in Paris, where, together, they created the Journal *{The Indissoluble Bond,}* (Jami'at al-'Urwat al-Wuthqa), that became the first Paris-based Islamic publication to openly attack Western civilization. The title is taken from a reference to Satan in the Qur'anic verse that says: “*{So, whosoever disbelieves in the devil believes in Allah, he indeed lays hold on the firmest handle which shall never break.}*” In his short biography of Afghani, Anwar Moazzam described the contents of this Journal: “It published articles and comments reflecting as a whole the views of Afghani. Some of the important themes and subjects discussed were: domination of the West over the East, particularly that of England over the Muslim lands and India; Mahdi of Sudan; Russian threat to Afghanistan; Islamic teachings; importance of modern sciences; Islamic theological and ethical concepts of social and political significance; comparative study of Christianity and Islam, and the rise of the Christians and decline of the Muslims; Free will and Pre-Destination; Vices and Virtues; dynamism of Qur'anic teachings; criticism of Muslim monarchs; Islamic unity *{Wahdat al-Islamiya}*, etc.” (Anwar Moazzam, *{Jamal al-Din al-Afghani, a Muslim intellectual}*, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi, 1983, p. 137-138.) Just this outline reads like a British Intelligence program for preparing “a pretty little war.”

In 1884, W.S. Blunt deployed Afghani to Tunis for talks with the British government there on finding means of solving the problem of British involvement in the Sudanese Mahdi uprising. Among other things, Afghani was deployed to negotiate with the Mahdi in order to save Charles Georges, General Gordon Pasha, who was then besieged in Khartoum. [Note that the year 1884 was chosen to coincide with the Muslim centennial year of 1300 A.H. a date at which Muslim Messiah (Mahdi) was expected to come.] The talks failed and Blunt redeployed Afghani in preparation for an alliance

between England, Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan against Russia. Keddie gave a brief outline of who were the high-level British crowd that deployed Blunt. She wrote:

“{The continued strength of the Sudanese Mahdi, culminating in his capture of Khartoum and the death of General Gordon in January 1885, provided a background for attempted negotiations on the Sudanese question by Great Britain in which Wilfrid Blunt tried to involve Afghani. Blunt had ties, through birth and background, with important men in both the Liberal and Conservative parties. He was a friend of Sir Edward Hamilton, Gladstone’s private secretary when he was Liberal Prime Minister. Blunt was also friendly with Randolph Churchill, who had opposed the British occupation of Egypt, regarding which he had presented in Parliament many changes based primarily on Blunt’s evidence of British wrongdoing. Blunt knew Sir Henry Drummond Wolf, diplomat and Member of Parliament, who along with Churchill was a member of a Parliamentary group of Conservatives known as the Fourth Party, which sometimes criticized the foreign policy of the Liberal government on grounds more radical than those of their fellow Conservatives.}” (Keddie, Op. Cit., p. 229.)

In 1886-87, Afghani met with Nasiruddin Shah, in Iran, but the King was suspicious of his « fearless manners » and his far-reaching reforms, and forced him to leave the country.

In May of 1887, Afghani travelled to Moscow, a visit which had been organized by his Russian publisher-friend, Katkov, the editor of the {*Moscow Gazette*}, who he had met in Paris. This trip did not appear to be controlled by Blunt, because Keddie reported that several people from the British Foreign Office, including Lord Cromer, in Egypt, were inquiring about him and were worried about his activities in Russia. The main thing to report in Russia is the fact that Katkov introduced Afghani to Maharaja Dalip Singh, the son of the British deposed Ranjeet Singh, in 1849. Both Afghani and Singh were reportedly working together in preparation for an Indian revolt against the British. Afghani left Russia for Munich in the middle of 1889.

In Munich, Afgnani met with the Iranian Prime Minister who deployed him back to Russia, this time, for the benefit of the British and the Shah, and for the purpose of explaining to the Russian government the

reasons why the British had a right to establish a National Bank in Iran, and navigation rights on the Karun River. Afghani was being set up because when he returned to Teheran, with the Russian response, the Prime Minister refused to see him. After Afghani had taken asylum at a friend's house, the Shah and the British had him arrested and kicked him out of Iran, in January of 1891.

From his exile in Turkey, Afghani then organized the Iranian Mujtahid, Hasan Shirazi, against the British Tobacco Corporation and the tobacco concession given to the British by the Shah of Iran. This led to a successful mass movement that ended up forcing the cancellation of the concession. Afghani had proven that he could organize a mass movement against British rule.

In the summer of 1892, Afghani arrived in Istanbul, where he was welcomed by the Sultan and the religious leaders of Turkey. He spent several years organizing his Pan-Islamic unity movement and stepped up his campaign against the Shah of Iran to the point that the Shah was assassinated by one of Afghani's followers, Mirza Rida Kirmani, on May 1, 1896. Afghani had been accused of being the mastermind behind the assassination, but was not arrested. The British were then in a better position to blackmail him into doing their biddings. Then, Afghani's relations with the Sultan began to deteriorate one more time, and he was finally disgraced. He attempted to leave Istanbul, but the Sultan had him under some sort of house arrest. Afghani tried to get the British to help him, but without success. He died on March 9, 1897.

3. KILLING « FOR THE GLORY OF RELIGION »

« {*Power is never manifested and concrete unless it weakens and subjugates others.*} » Al-Afghani.

In Paris, Afghani had contacts with notorious figures such as publisher Georges Clémenceau, writer Victor Hugo, and the positivist philosopher, Ernest Renan. The encounter with Renan was the most crucial, because after Renan had met with Afghani in March of 1883, he initiated a polemic on « Islam and Science », which was published in the *{Journal des*

Débats }, on March 29, 1883. After that, a more thorough profiling « mise en scene » was set up at the Sorbonne where Renan had a public debate with Afghani, on May 18, 1883. The debate was used to prove two things : one, that the Islamic religion was anti-scientific and anti-philosophical, and therefore, anti-materialist, and inferior to Christianity ; the second was to profile Afghani and determine his degree of usefulness for British Intelligence in Asia. Renan, working wittingly or not on behalf of both British and French Intelligence Services, was in charge of monitoring every aspect of Afghani's behavior, and recorded every tic of his personality. Renan had forcefully professed that Islam was hostile to scientific progress and to philosophy. This was made to look like a major affront against Afghani and the Muslim world, but, Afghani's actual agnostic response was in total agreement with Renan. Afghani had come well prepared, when he replied to Renan:

« *{And since humanity, at its origin, did not know the causes of events that passed under his eyes and the secrets of things, it was perforce led to follow the advice of its teachers and the orders they gave. This obedience was imposed in the name of the Supreme Being to whom the Educators attributed all events, without permitting men to discuss its utility or its disadvantages. This is no doubt for men one of the heaviest and most humiliating yokes, as I recognize ; but one cannot deny that it is by this religious education, whether it be Muslim, Christian , or pagan, that all nations have emerged from barbarism and marched toward a more advanced civilization.}* » (« Response of Jamal ad-Din al-Afghani to Renan, » in *{Réfutations}* }, pp. 176-177.)

This was an unbelievable admission of deliberate bestial degradation of Muslim people, and none other than a *{Soldier of Satan}* could have concocted a better « reason » to manipulate popular ignorance, in the name of religion, and justify leading its people to the slaughter of a religious war. This was an actual denial of the *{Prometheus principle}*. Under the pretext that the Muslim faith had not been able to elevate its people from the level of the beasts, then, their enslavement had to be made complete. This was precisely the manipulative justification for the Jihad that the British were looking for and were hoping to find in Afghani. Moreover, Afghani went even further in agreeing with Renan, and with the British colonialists in saying that Christianity was a more advanced religion, because it had a head start, and that consequently Islam was lagging behind. Afghani added:

« {All religions are intolerant, each one in its own way. The Christian religion, I mean the society that follows its inspirations and its teachings and is formed in its image, has emerged from the first period to which I have alluded ; thenceforth free and independent, it seems to advance rapidly on the road to progress and science, whereas Muslim society has not yet freed itself from the tutelage of religion. Realizing, however, that the Christian religion preceded the Muslim religion in the world, by many centuries, I cannot keep from hoping that Muhammadan society will succeed some day in breaking its bonds and marching resolutely in the path of civilization after the manner of Western society...I plead here with M. Renan, not the cause of the Muslim religion, but that of several millions of men, who would thus be condemned to live in barbarism and ignorance.

In truth, the muslim religion has tried to stifle science and stop progress. }» (Keddie, Op. Cit.,)

Thus, the internal logic of religious sectarianism that Afghani professed, the induction of « intolerance », became the fuel for permanent religious war. Noticably, Afghani was using the same fallacy of composition that Cardinal Richelieu had used against the Protestants of France, during the Thirty Years War, when he argued that the Catholic Church was the « true » Church because it was the oldest. Here, Afghani did not propose to bring scientific and technological progress to Islam, but to brutalize his people by having them hate and fight against the idea of science and progress in their own minds. Afghani was prepared to march his people even further into the bowels of hell than his British imperial masters did, and in terms that could only be echoed by Joseph de Maistre's executioner. Listen to those « no uncertain tones » of Afghani:

« {A true believer must, in fact, turn from the path of studies which have for their object scientific truth...Yoked like an ox to the plow, to the dogma whose slave he is, he must walk eternally in the same furrow that has been traced for him in advance by the interpreters of the law. Convinced, besides, that his religion contains in itself all morality and all sciences, he attaches himself resolutely to it and makes no effort to go beyond...What would be the benefit of seeking truth when he believes he possess it all ?...Wherefore he despises science [...] Here the responsibility of the Muslim religion appears complete. It is clear that wherever it became established, this religion tried to stifle science and it was

marvelously served in its designs by despotism . » (Keddie, Op. Cit., p. 192.)

This successful manipulation of the « true believer » was precisely what Renan wished to have Afghani respond to, and get at, within the rigged debate. Why ? Because then, Renan was able to confront the « true believer » with its radical opponent, « positive science. » Thus, with the fallacious opposition « true believer » versus « positive science », the fallacy of composition is established by Renan who had then lured his prey into his web. Renan stated:

« {The Human mind must be free of all supernatural belief if he wishes to work on its essential work, which is the construction of positive science. This does not imply violent destruction or brusque rupture. The Christian does not have to abandon Christianity nor the Muslim Islam. The enlightened parties of Christianity and Islam should arrive at that state of benevolent indifference where religious beliefs become inoffensive. This has happened in about half of the Christian countries, let us hope it will happen in Islam. Naturally on that day, the Sheikh [Afghani] and I will agree in applauding... } » (Keddie, Op. Cit., p. 197.)

There you have it. This is where the synarchists reach the satanic level of « *{benevolent indifference}* » upon deciding who lives and who dies. And, Afghani added even more to the argument of Renan, by justifying the Western Imperialists in waging war against Islam because of its regrettable rejection of science and technology. Renan added :

« {Sheikh Lemmal-Eddin seems to me to have brought considerable arguments for my two fundamental thesis – During the first half of its existence Islam did not stop the scientific movement from existing in Muslim lands ; - in the second half it stifled in its breast the scientific movement, and that to its grief.} » (Renan, {Œuvres Complètes}, Vol I, p. 960-965.)

At that point, Professor Keddie remarked, with a certain degree of intellectual indignation, the fact that Afghani did not have to give more ammunition to Renan by choosing « to attack the Muslim religion » of the more recent centuries. In reality, by accusing Islam of « stifling science », Afghani was reenforcing the axiomatic opposition between belief and

knowledge (see last part of this report) which is required for the benefit of religious warfare.

As a result of all of this, it is interesting to note how Renan gave British and French Intelligence the very profile of Afghani that they expected to hear, and that Afghani was only too willing to offer them. In fact, both Renan and Afghani did exactly what the Synarchy International wanted them to do, and that was, to oppose religion (irrational) and science (rational) in such a way as to set the terms of the debate within those phony parameters. Renan concluded his study with the following racist description of his newly discovered « specimen »:

« {There is nothing more instructive than studying the ideas of an enlightened Asiatic in their original and sincere form. It is by listening to the most diverse voices coming from the four corners of the globe, in favor of rationalism, that one becomes convinced that, if religions divide men, Reason brings them together ; and there is only one Reason. [...] }

« Few people have produced on me a more vivid impression. It is in large measure the conversation that I had with him that decided me to chose as a subject for my lecture at the Sorbonne the relations between the scientific spirit and Islam. Sheikh Jemmal-Eddin [Afghani] is an Afghan entirely divorced from the prejudices of Islam ; he belongs to those energetic races of Iran, Near India, where the Aryan spirit lives still so energetically under the superficial layer of official Islam. He is the best proof of that great axiom which we have often proclaimed, namely, that religions are worth the same as the races that profess them. The liberty of his thought, his noble and loyal character, made me believe, while I was talking with him, that I had before me, restored to life, one of my old acquaintances – Avicenna, Averroes, or another of those great infidels who represented for five centuries the tradition of the human mind. For me there was an especially vivid contrast when I compared this striking apparition with the spectacle presented by the Muslim countries this side of Persia – countries in which scientific and philosophic curiosity is so rare. Sheikh Jemmal-Eddin is the best case of ethnic protest against religious conquest that one could cite... }» (Keddie, Op. Cit., p. 196.)

Little wonder that Wilfred Blunt was so happy with his pupil Afghani. How can British Intelligence object against an « enemy » who wishes to

keep his own colonial people in bondage, and is willing to kill them to prove himself right ?

4. HOW BRITAIN IMPOSED A USURIOUS BANKING SYSTEM ON EGYPT AND THE ISLAMIC WORLD.

One of the most insidious British means of control over a colonial country is to impose the banking game of usury. In the early 1880's, British banks were attempting to take control of Egypt, by consolidating their position against the corrupt bureaucracy that prevailed under the rules of the predecessors of Sultan Abdalhamid, in Istanbul, and during the mismanagement period of Khedive Isma'il in Egypt. At the beginning of 1881 (?), the Turkish Sultan sought advice from the Ottoman Pasha of Tunisia, and convened a discrete conference in Istanbul, with the inclusion of representatives of creditor countries, in order to settle the financial crisis of Egypt and to reorganize the debt of the country without foreign interference from both France and Great Britain.

In 1882, when Isma'il was removed from office in Egypt and was replaced by a new Khedive, by the name of Tawfiq, the British decided to make their move. The British Minister of Trade, Joseph Chamberlain, a top imperial man, saw the possibility to secure the interests of the British bankers and aroused the nationalist movements to provide the necessary spark for a revolt against the government. At the same time, on September 13, 1882, the British attacked Tell-el Kabir, defeated the Egyptians, then attacked Alexandria and took Cairo. Though the Sultan was still the recognized authority in Egypt, he was in no position to kick the British out of the country.

Then, Captain Evelyn Baring, the head of the infamous dope bank, Baring Brothers Bank, was sent to Egypt. According to historian Abdullah Luongo, this representative of the Baring family was sent to Egypt as the High Commissioner on Debt and was appointed British Consul-General in Egypt. From 1858 until 1867, Baring had been Aide de Camp of the High Commissioner to Corfu and later to the Governor of Malta, Sir Henry Storks. He became private secretary to his cousin Viceroy « Drug » Lord Northbrook (Thomas George Baring), the British ruler of India, from 1872 to 1876, and later financial advisor to Viceroy « Drug » Lord Ripon (1880-

83), also British ruler of India. Evelyn Baring defended the government of India by exporting Indian opium to China as a means of « balancing the budget ». After nine years in Egypt, Evelyn Baring became Lord Cromer, in 1892, a true to form Victorian Imperialist and Edwardian Proconsul, who had proclaimed himself the ruler of Egypt until 1907. It was Cromer's imperialist view that the fundamental divide between the East and the West could only be decided by military intervention. Afghani was entirely in agreement with that war policy and gave no reason for his masters to doubt his commitment to it.

As Cromer put it himself, the Egyptians were too ignorant to rule themselves, so, in 1882, the British had to act in a benevolent manner, and bring civilization to the poor backward and ignorant people of Egypt. Cromer wrote: « *{But it may be doubted whether any instance can be quoted of a sudden transfer of power in any civilized or semi-civilized community to a class so ignorant as the pure Egyptians, such as they were in the year 1882. These latter have, for centuries past, been a subject race. Persians, Greeks, Romans, Arabs from Arabia and Baghdad, Circassians, and finally, Ottoman Turks, have successively ruled over Egypt, but we have to go back to the doubtful and obscure precedents of Pharaonic times to find an epoch when, possibly, Egypt was ruled by Egyptians. Neither, for the present, do they appear to possess the qualities which would render it desirable, either in their own interests, or in those of the civilized world in general, to raise them at a bound to the category of autonomous rulers with full rights of internal sovereignty.}*” (Quoted from Modern History Sourcebook: *{The Earl of Cromer: Why Britain Acquired Egypt in 1882}*, (1908))

In order to gain financial control over Egypt, Lord Cromer also had to take over control of the Islamic religion. For that purpose, Cromer personally selected Muhammad Abduh, the favorite student of Afghani, and promoted him to the status of grand Mufti of Egypt to serve under his command. The Grand Mufti is the head of the muslim religion who decides on questions of dogma and discipline. Since a grand Mufti was allowed to change the application of Shari'a Law, Cromer got Abduh to alter certain fundamental aspects in the language of the Islamic Law by means of which the British were able to establish the first Egyptian Bank that would allow the forbidden practice of usury.

As grand Mufti, Abduh was able to create a number of {*fatwas*} that would remove the interdiction of usury and allow free-trade interest rates to subvert the Qur'an. As historian Abdullah Luongo reported, « both al-Afghani and Abduh opened the door for the degradation and bankrupting not only Egypt, but also the entire Muslim world . » (Abdullah Luongo, {*To be Blunt : a Biographical Essay on Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, Imperial Adventures In the Muslim World, 1863-2003*}.)

This subversion was also made possible by the fact that Lord Cromer was the leading freemason in Egypt at the time, and he belonged to the same Masonic Lodge as Muhammad Abduh. (See Habib Siddiqui, {*The Turkish Experiment with Westernization*}, Al-Jazeera, December 26, 2004). Thus, on the financial side of the synarchist operation, both Afghani and Abduh succeeded in dividing the forces of the Ottoman Empire, took over the already bankrupt nation of Egypt, subverted the Qur'an, and replaced the Muslim monetary system by the British Empire free-trade corruption.

On the other hand, the British controller of al-Afghani was W. S. Blunt, who, himself, was notably controlled by Lord Randolph Churchill, the enibriated father of Winston. Like his own son, Winston, did after WWII, his father had also a direct hand in destroying continental Asia. So, the so-called anti-British Egyptian Independence supported by Blunt and Afghani, was merely a cover for guaranteeing a chaotic dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire and replacing it by a new Fabianized British Empire.

Such a synarchist operation was part of the « Great Game », in which the Russians were to dominate the Caucassus and the Balkans, France was to control the Western-North African region, and the British would get Egypt and the trade route through the Gulf area, Arabia, Iran, Afghanistan, and the Crown jewel, India. This meant that the Ottoman Turkish rule, which had control over a vast part of that Muslim territory, and especially Egypt, had to be broken up into pieces for the greater benefit of the British Empire.

During a period of ten years or so, Blunt would deploy Afghani successively to Egypt, America, England, France, Turkey, Afghanistan, and Iran for the single purpose of breaking up the Ottoman Empire with his so-called liberalization reforms and increase the power of the British Empire. In Iran, Afghani organized a state of rebellion against Nasir-ad-Din Shah, which ended with the assassination of the Shah by one of Afghani's supporters, Mirza Reza Kermani. As reported by historian, Martin Kramer,

Blunt was advocating « the severing of the Arabs from Turkish rule and the establishment of an Arab caliphate. Blunt was the first to challenge the traditional British support for the Ottoman territorial integrity in Asia, and he prompted a spirited debate in London. » (in {*The Forthnightly Review* }) What Kramer meant to say, in fact, was that this was a period where the British Empire was developing its anti-imperial Fabian outlook to reorganize the Empire and provide it with a new garb. Blunt was also instrumental in installing the Ibn Saud family as Kings of Arabia. It was Randolph Churchill who provided a British stipend to King Saud, for declaring {*Saudi Arabia*} an ally of Britain. During this entire period when Blunt was leading Afghani into systematic anti-Ottoman agitations, he was assisted by a former priest of the Syrian Catholic Rite, an Arab Journalist by the name of John Louis Sabunji, who became his paid agent and « oriental secretary ».

In His {*Secret History of the English Occupation of Egypt*}, Blunt reportedly discussed his far reaching activities in search of Islamic collaborators who would be able to create an anti-Ottoman Islamic Unity, Afghani and Sabunji were the two most visible ones.

After Lord Cromer had gotten him to become Grand Mufti of Egypt, Abduh's influence continued to grow in the shadow of Afghani, and he later became the teacher of Sheikh Ahmad Abd al-Rahman-Banna, the father of the founder of the Muslim Brotherhood, Hasan al-Banna. According to one of our contacts, Peter Goodgame, the British also funded the Muslim Brotherhood through the Suez Canal Company in Ismailiyya. (Peter Goodgame, {*The Muslim Brotherhood*}, www.redmoonrising.com Part I, The Roots of Islamic Terrorism, p. 4.)

5. AFGHANI'S "GREAT GAME" DEPLOYMENT AGAINST RUSSIA.

During his stay in Paris (1883-1884), Afghani was introduced to the Russian political figure and newspaper editor, Katkov, who was also fighting the British presence in Asia, and who invited Afghani to Russia. As a result of the Russian railroad having reached the Iran border, during that period, the British were making every effort to counter the Russian influence in Iran and Afghanistan. In 1888, Sir Drummond Wolf, a tough British imperial diplomat, was sent as Minister to Iran in order to counterbalance the

influence of Russia and make commercial deals with Nasir-ad-Din Shah for the benefit of British companies. In 1889, Wolf had succeeded in getting the opening of the Karun River for British Commerce, a tobacco concession and the right to build the First Free-trade Bank in Iran. Afghani wrote a strong article against the opening of the Karun River to the British and had it published both in Germany and in several Russian newspapers.

The negative Russian publicity upset the Shah who called for Afghani to leave Russia and join his interest instead. Afghani left Russia and met the Shah's party in Munich where he was invited to work for the Iranian government. I report the following sequence of events by quoting literally the former Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Afghanistan, Dr. Abdul Hakim Tabibi, because of the Byzantine manner in which these events are reported to have taken place. According to Dr. Tabibi, the situation developed in mid-1889, in the following manner:

“{Amin as-Sultan, the Prime Minister [of Iran], after a five hour meeting, asked Afghani, if he could go to Russia, and explain to the Russian authorities all the concessions that had been given to the British before he had taken office. The Prime Minister stated that he was ready, if the Tsarist government showed him the proper way to cancel all of those concessions, provided, there was no war, and a considerable financial payment was made on that account. Jamal-ad-Din went to Russia and did what was necessary to help Iran, assuring the Russians of the good intentions of ‘Amin as-Sultan’. When he returned to Iran to report on his mission, the Prime Minister refused to see him. This strange attitude was due partly to Nasir ad-Din Shah’s animosity towards Afghani’s demands for democratic reforms, and partly to his anti-British preaching, which put Drummond Wolf, the British Ambassador, back to work against him; this led to his banishment after Afghani had been seven months in the sanctuary of Shah Abdul Azim. The Shah took this unusual step of sending his guards to violate Jamal ad-Din’s sanctuary and arresting him on a cold and icy winter’s night while he was sick. He was escorted in chains to the Irano-Turkish border. This cruelty kindled fire, in the hearts of all of the followers of Afghani, culminating in the assassination of Nasir ad-Din Shah by Mirza R. Kirmani, a follower of Afghani.}” (Dr. Abdul Hakim Tabibi, {The Political Struggle of Jamal Ad-Din Afghani}, Arabic Publications Sa., Geneva, p. 17.)

In another report, historian, Iraj Bashiri, stated that Mirza Reza Kermani had been “commissioned to assassinate Nasir al-Din Shah,” in 1886. “Mirza Reza carried out his mission on the anniversary of the Shah’s fiftieth year of reign in the very sanctuary in which al-Afghani had been humiliated a few years before.”

It is important to note finally that Afghani was in the middle of the Great Game, within which he changed roles in accordance with the changes in the background, like a chameleon. Afghani had espoused the principle of Palmerton that said: “The British never have permanent friends or permanent enemies, they only have permanent interests.” So, one day Afghani supported the British Empire against the Russian Empire, the next day he supported the Russian Empire against the British Empire, and everyday, he played Pan-Islamism against the Ottoman Empire, as one man against all. In his letter to the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, in which he called for holy war against Russia, Afghani confirmed a typical form of self-serving satanic manipulation of religious belief : Nikki Keddie appropriately considered the following extensive excerpt (dated approximately 1877-78) to be representing the strategic “dream” of his war of Islamic Unity.

“{I shall strike the call, “Arise to battle”, and raise the sound, “O, sacrifice for Islam”. And I shall send the good eloquent ulama to all the people, to the valleys and the mountains, and I shall sponsor alliances with the princes and the nobles and warriors and khans. And in all religious sermons I shall make clear the advantages of zeal and ardor and will make a general call to the {milli} war to all, young and old, weak and strong. And I will send some of the experienced informed, and wise ulama secretly to Kokand and Bukhara to explain conditions for the people of those lands, and make them await the time and the hour of the arrival of the end of the period {muntazir-I vaqt va sa’t va hulul-I muddat- the exact terminology often used to herald the advent of the Mahdi (Messiah)}

“And after finishing the call in Afghanistan, I will go to Baluchistan with the greatest speed and call the people of the land, who are continually employed in brigandage and raiding and plunder, to [join] the general war, with religious exhortation and the lure of worldly profit, and will bring to bear on them the old tricks of diplomacy. And I will go to the Turkomans – those unfortunates who were always known for their bravery and daring, and celebrate in all tongues for bloodshed and rebelliousness, but recently have worn the hat of shame on their head and the shirt of

disgrace on their breast, and thrown their fame of so many years to the wind, and submit to the subjection of the commands of Russia – and I will call on them to revenge and incite the pride of their Turkish race, and carry the banner of Unity of Islam, on my shoulders, and call the religious war, and as usual, not overlook any stratagem or ruse, and plant the seed of order and zeal within them, always working with the wisest ulama. And I shall send missionaries of sharp tongue to Kashgar and Yarkand to call the believers of those lands to the unity of the people of the faith. And it is obvious that, when the people begin to fight, the amir perforce will enter the field without delay. Since I know the customs and the temperament of those people and have insight into their nature and habits, I have no doubt that all of the Muslims will attack the Russians enthusiastically. They will conquer the Russians on that side, and even altogether destroy them. And no one can deny the immediate advantages of such an event, and its far-reaching benefit, which in the unity of Islam and the union of the community (itihad-i islamiyyet va itifaq-i ummat). And along this when the people of Afghanistan, who are really the wall and buttress of India, attack Russia, the English will inevitably and forcibly devote their whole effort to the fight, and will be mired up to their necks and give up the thoughts of domination. [There is an ambiguity, probably deliberate, as to whether the Russians, the English, or, by implication, both, will be so distracted by this fight as to give up attempts of domination of the Muslims and Ottoman.]

«And if someone should object to his plan, saying : The people of Kokand and Bukhara and Shahr-i Sabz and the Turkomans, are they not the very ones who did not bring the ardor to resist the Russians, and who did not carry honor from the field, and who chose a dishonorable life over an honorable death, and committed that kind of dishonor, therefore what benefit can come from asking their aid ; I say that those wars that occurred were entirely for the sake of tyrannical amirs or oppressive governors ; and when does a man give his life to the sensual pleasures of this kind of amir and governor, and why should he place the foot of firmness and manliness into the field ? But, if they fight for the defense of religion and the preservation of the faith they would either have a crown of martyrdom on their heads or the robe of honor on their breasts. For in that time everyone for the sake of his beloved objective will seek to step into the battlefield and seek battle for the glory of religion. } »
(Afghani, {A letter to Sultan Abdul Hamid on Islamic unity}, quoted and translated by Nikki Keddie, in Op. Cit., pp. 133-138.)

6. ON THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN BELIEF AND KNOWLEDGE

At the age of 19, Afghani complained that he was obliged to study under a formalist and superficial Ulama (teacher), and according to historian Nikki Keddie, “came to understand that Ulama of each religious group were captive of inadequate doctrines, and that, after traveling for five years, he concluded:

”*{I saw that this world was only an unreal mirage and appearance. Its power was precarious and its suffering unlimited, hiding venom in every delight, and anger in every benefit. Thus, I was led to remove myself from the tumults and break all my ties of attachment. And thank God and all those who were near him. I was saved from the world of shadows and penetrated the UNIVERSE OF DEVOTION, resting on the sweetness of the cradle of lights. Today I have chosen for company the Prophet and his companions.}*” (Afghani, Heart (Afghanistan), 1886. Translation by Nikki Keddie)

This statement by Afghani could have been lifted straight from an autobiographical statement of Saint Martin, the founder of Martinism. It follows the same paradox of *{loving to hate}* that Beast-Man creator, Joseph de Maistre, had characterized in his executioner. It shows, also, that his state of mind was entirely in synchronization with the *{Ordre Martiniste et Synarchique}* of Saint-Yves d’Alveydre and Papus, who were in Paris at the time that Afghani traveled there. Because of these “Satanic-spiritual” affinities, there is every reason to think that there may have been some encounters between Afghani and the Martinists, but I have not found any documented evidence of it, as of this present writing. Furthermore, his mental state demonstrates that Afghani became a British agent because he required to be close to his source of hatred, that is the ambiguity Blunt/Cromer/Afghani. It was Blunt who confirmed personally to Afghani how evil the British were. In his *{Diaries}*, Blunt wrote: «*{...the British Empire is the greatest engine of evil for the weak races now existing in the world – not that we are worse than the French or Italians or Americans – indeed, we are less actively destructive – but we do it over a far wider area*

and more successfully. } » (Blunt, *{The Diaries}*.) This leads us to reexamine, one more time, the question of belief and knowledge.

The difference between belief and knowledge is a crucial question if we wish to understand Islamic ideology, because this is where Islamic ideologues have created a false division between the East and the West, between what they call Islamic Democracy and Western Democracy. It would be interesting to raise this question with respect to the recently proposed Iraq Constitution. By doing that, the Islamic revolution has had the pretention of succeeding where Charles Maurras and Action Française had failed, that is, Islamic ideologues are attempting to transfer the so-called Divine Rights of Kings onto the Divine Rights of the Islamic Priesthood.

In other words, the difference between belief and knowledge is expressed, here, in the difference that Afghani and Maudidi, have themselves made between what they called Islamic Democracy and Western Democracy. The difference is based on the Aristotelian fallacy that Afghani made between the belief in a God who exists outside of the Universe and the harmonic ordering of lawful changes brought by the sovereign individual human beings created in the image of God. Because of the negation of these dynamic powers of individuals to change the universe as a whole, Afghani comes to justify a fallacious separation between Religion and Philosophy. Afghani stated :

« {Religions, whatever names they are called, all resemble one another. No agreement and no reconciliation are possible between these religions and philosophy. Religion imposes on man its faith and its belief, whereas, philosophy frees him of it totally, or in part. How could one therefore hope that they would agree with each other ? ... Whenever religion will have the upper hand, it will eliminate philosophy ; and the contrary happens when it is philosophy that reigns as sovereign mistress. As long as humanity exists, the struggle will not cease between dogma and free investigation, between religion and philosophy : a desperate struggle in which, I fear, the triumph will not be for free thought, because the masses dislike reason, and its teachings are only understood by some intelligences of the elite, and because, also, science, however beautiful it is, does not completely satisfy humanity, which thirsts for the ideal and which likes to exist in dark and distant regions which the philosophers and scholars can neither perceive nor explore. } » (Keddie, Op. Cit., p. 193 .)

This false opposition between religion and philosophy is a paradoxical fallacy of composition that we have encountered before, but which requires some special attention, here, because the problem of distinction between belief and knowledge that Afghani is raising, under the guise of an opposition between religion and philosophy, is crucial, even though it is formulated in the worst possible form of sophistry. There are two false underlying assumptions here. First, the difference Afghani makes between Christians and Muslims is based on the false underlying assumption that the Islamic society is more retarded than Christian societies, and that, as a result of this unfortunate historical occurrence, the West and the East must, therefore, compete for knowledge and scientific progress. The other false underlying assumption is that the masses of people are capable of being moved only through religion, while only the individual can be appealed to by truth of scientific reason. Here, Afghani rejected the very idea of scientific discovery itself, that is, the discovery of universal physical principles which goes beyond the apparent boundaries of ethnic and religious differences, and represents the true heritage of all of mankind.

Moreover, there is another reason why Afghani would also reject a universal humanist heritage. The argument is provided by a second generation of the Islamic movement, the spiritual father of the Pakistan Islamic movement, Abul Ala Maududi, who established the so-called legal ground for maintaining an irreconcilable difference between belief and knowledge. Maududi wrote :

« { *The difference between Islamic democracy and Western democracy is, of course, the following : while the latter is based on the conception of the sovereignty of the people, the former is based on the principle of the caliphate [leadership] by the people. In Western democracy, the people are sovereign ; in Islam, sovereignty rests with God, and the people are his caliphs or subjects. In the West the people themselves make the law ; in Islam, the people must follow and obey the laws that God communicated through his prophets. In one system, the government carries out the will of the people ; in the other, the government and the people together must translate God's intentions into deeds. In short, Western democracy is a kind of absolute authority that exerts its power freely and in an uncontrolled manner, whereas Islamic democracy is subject of the divine law and exerts its authority in harmony with the commands of God and within the framework established by God.* » (Quoted by William Dietl, {*Holy War*}, 1983, p. 43.)

The point to be made here is that this statement represents the legal fallacy underpinning of the great majority of the Muslim movements, and also represents the justification for the brutalisation of the Muslim populations, through the belief of an outside vengeful authority. Thus, it must therefore be said in conclusion, that if truth by faith is different than truth by reason, then, there is something false in both the conception and usage of faith and reason. And that falseness is based on pitting the sovereignty of God against the sovereignty of man. That is the fallacy of composition which derived the Divine Right of Kings of the European oligarchy in opposition to the obedience of the subjects. This is more or less the transposition from Europe to Asia of the divine right of Kings onto the divine right of the Islamic Priesthood. In a sense, Afghani was attempting to succeed where Charles Maurras had failed.

This is the reason why the ideologues of British and French Intelligence believe that they have never been more successful than after they had created an enemy who had adopted the same fallacy of composition as their own, but with interests that were diametrically opposed to them.

Finally, it would be presumptuous to consider Afghani as a religious man or even a Muslim philosopher, and to attempt arriving at some kind of rational explanation of his “ideas” and his “actions” from that standpoint. As I said at the beginning of this report, Afghani was a sophist and was a conscious fraud committed upon the Muslim world. Keddie translated an extensive statement by a Syrian writer, Salim al-‘Anhuri, who was acquainted with Afghani in Egypt, during the 1870’s, and who described at length the irreligious ideal of Afghani. The statement of Anhuri is very revealing as to how an intelligent Muslim might have been shocked, or even traumatized, by the influence of British empiricism of Hume, Bentham, Hobbes, and Locke. Once “reason” has been accepted as a replacement for “belief”, as opposed to its companion, the positivist’s road to hell is already paved with Satan’s footprints. Anhuri has detected the same problem in Afghani with surgical accuracy:

“{He (Afghani) excelled in the study of religion, until this led him to irreligion [or atheism – {ilhad}] and belief in the eternity of the world. He claimed that vital atoms, found in the atmosphere, formed, by a natural evolution, the stars which we see and which revolve around one another through gravity, and that the belief of an omniscient Prime Mover was a

natural delusion that arose when man was in a primitive state of evolution and corresponded with the stage that his intellectual progress had reached. This meant that when man was a pure savage and primitive, he used to worship the lowest things in existence, like wood and stone, and when he had progressed on the ladder of civilization, and knowledge, his objects of worship rose correspondingly, and he began to venerate fire, then clouds, then the heavens and their celestial bodies. Man went on progressing on the scale of knowledge and deriving light from the lamp of science; taking the natural course he elevated the object of his worship and raised it in degree of loftiness until he said: 'It is free from quality and quantity, free of beginning and end, boundless and incomprehensible, filling everything and in everything, seeing all while none see it.' Man's intellectual capacities progressed after that, however, until they reached the knowledge that all these [beliefs] are kinds of delusions and confused dreams, originating from man's fear of death and his desire of immortality. This made him built from air castles of faith and towers of hope, such as had taken root in his imagination to the point that they almost became a fixed belief.

*“Man began by saying that he would pass on after his death to an eternal life, and that the wood or the stone were what would lead him to this higher place if he showed reverence to it and showered devotion upon it, and there arose from the worship liberation from the bitterness of thought about a death with no life after it. Then it occurred to him that fire was more powerful and greater in benefit and harm, so he turned to it. Then he saw that the clouds were better than fire and stronger, so he adhered to and depended on them. The links of this chain, wrought by the two tools of delusion and desire together with the instinct and nature of man, continued to increase until man culminated at the highest state. The result of natural laws was a reaction leading to the conviction that all the above is idle talk which originates in desires, and that it has no truth and no definition.” (Anhuri, {*Biography of Afghani*}, quoted and translated by Nikki Keddie, Op. Cit., pp. 30-31.)*

This surgical insight of Anhuri is as amazing as it is devastatingly truthful because it strikes at the heart of the false opposition that Afghani had created between belief and knowledge. This axiom busting intervention was so powerful that it actually forced a « disturbed » Abduh into writing an apologetic biography of Afghani for the single purpose of getting damage control against Anhuri. The truth of the matter is that there is not a word that Anhuri has written above that Afghani would have rejected on the basis of

disagreement. The surgical quality of Anhuri's insight shows that the error of Afghani is centered precisely on his misconception of « reason » evolving out of the ignorance state of primitive man. This is a typical British fallacy about the so-called « primitive man .»

The claim made by British anthropologists which says that human beings required 100,000 years to develop a capacity to use reason is as stupid as saying that the original mammal required 100,000 years to discover it's mother's milk. Similarly, Afghani's underlying assumption was that reason could not exist in early mankind. Therefore, reason must evolve from the backwardness of belief just like philosophy and science must grow out of the backwardness of religion. For Afghani, religion is the backward man's philosophy. However, the real truth of the matter, is that the fear of death, that Anhuri has identified here with respect to Afghani, is not only the illusionary expenditure of a life on earth in exchange for an after-live during eternal eternity. Anhuri identified in Afghani a special kind of fear of immortality, which is precisely the fear of eternal damnation. Thus, Afghani formulated his own satanic paradox when he stated: “***There is no deliverance except in killing, there is no safety except in killing.***”

When Afghani returned to London in 1891-92, the British discovered that his Positivist affinity with Ernest Renan had been more than superficial. Afghani had actually embraced the Positivist religion of August Comte, the « religion of humanity. » This is confirmed by Professor Keddie with respect to the influence that Afghani had on the Iranian leader, Malkum Khan. The following positivist statement is reported in the British {*Illustrated London News*} of December 19, 1891, under the title {*The Persian Crisis*} :

« Thirty years ago, with the growing contact with Europe, our learned people (i.e. Afghani) in the East conceived a great desire to know why Eastern races were not able to assimilate the European civilization (Positivism). They believe they have found the reason and the remedy. As the reason had its source in a certain form of exclusive religion, so the remedy would have to be found in a modification of that religion. After much study and reflection and a frank exchange of ideas, they have succeeded in formulating a new doctrine, which, however, agrees perfectly with the essence of Islamic religion, while it is in perfect harmony with European civilization. With this doctrine they have begun a new propaganda everywhere, a work which has been hitherto ignored by Europe, though it begins to show some surprising fruits.

« No progress, no undertaking, either commercial or political, can be realized in the East without the help of religion. Religion dominates us entirely... Knowing this to be the {*sine qua non*} of the Eastern question, our learned people sought to discover in religion the principle which had been the source of European progress. » (Keddie, Op. Cit., p. 358.)

Keddie then comments that this newly founded « religion of humanity », which is nothing else but the Islamic version of « Positivism, » was entirely « based on liberal, humanistic, and progressive principles, » which implied the creation of a « new Koran ». According to a report by Joseph Bruda on the Young Turks, [92-28-6/JB_001], this Positivist outlook was also very much part of the Young Turk revolution of 1908. Keddie reported that Afghani may have had some influence on the Young Egypt movement in the early 1880's, because a number of his followers, notably, Abdallah Nadim, Salim an-Naqqash, and Adib Ishaq, were members of Young Egypt. However, though I have not found any direct connection between Afghani and the Young Turk movements, their masonic, mystical, and positivist connections are very much the same.

7. BLUNT AND THE NEW IMPERIAL SET OF CLOTHES

In 1898, two years after the death of Afghani, the breakdown of the Ottoman Empire was mired with a conflict of interests between the French Empire and the British Empire. The incident was played out between the two, in an agreement to quarrel over Fashoda, in the Sudanese region of North Africa. At the time, Blunt reported the following note in his {*Diaries*} :

« *All this week has been one of excitement over the quarrel with France about Fashoda. A Blue Book has been published giving the English case, and , imperial plunder being in question, all parties, Tories, Whig, Radical, Churchmen, and Nonconformists have joined in publically extolling English virtue and denouncing the French. For myself, I see nothing in it more respectable than the wrangle of two highwaymen over a captured purse ; morally both sides are on a level.* »

What Blunt does not say in his perverted irony, however, is that this « *wrangle of two highwaymen* » is the result of his having organized, for a period of ten years, his anti-Ottoman Empire strategy with Afghani. The

Fashoda theatricals of Captain Marchand and of British Commander, Kitchener, were merely another episode in the saga of the usurious free-trade policy of the British Colonial Empire, which was now being projected from Egypt to the South Africa. A few years earlier, on January 9th, 1896, Blunt had stated : « *{I should be delighted to see England stripped of her whole foreign possessions. We are better off and more respected in Queen Elisabeth's time, the 'spacious days', when we had not a stick of territory outside of the British Islands, than now, and infinitely more respectable. The gangrene of colonial rowdyism is infecting us, and the habit of repressing liberty in weak nations is endangering our own. I should be glad to see the end... }* » This is the sort of anti-imperialist rhetoric that Blunt made his career on, paid for by the the Queen's own Privy Council. A paradox ? No. A mere change of invisible clothes !

Just a few years before the turn of the century, the British Empire was put into a paradigm shift. The upkeep of colonies was getting to be too expensive, the British Isles did not have enough man power to manage all of these foreign lands, and the Empire was coming under attack from all quarters. A new expanded means of global world imperial control had to be devised urgently. Thus, a change of clothes and a transfer of power had to be prepared, but with France as the junior partner. Blunt conceded that it was all about « permanent interests. » On October 17, 1898, Blunt wrote in his diary :

«*{Arrived at Saughton, I had it out with George [Wyndham, parliamentary under-secretary in the War Office] about Fashoda. He states the English case with brutal frankness. « The day of talking », he said, « about legality in Africa is over, all the international law there is there consists of interest and understanding. It is generally agreed by all powers that the end of African operations is to 'civilize' it in the interest of Europe, and that to gain that end all means are good. The only difference between England and France is which of them is to do it in which particular district. England intends to do it on the Nile, and it makes no difference what the precise legal position is. We may put forward the Khedive's rights if it is convenient or we may put forward a right of conquest, or a right of simply declaring our intentions. One is as good as another to get our end, which is the railway from Cairo to Cape. We don't care whether the Nile is called English or Egyptian or what it is called, but we mean to have it and we don't mean the French to have it. The Khedive may be kept on for some years as a sort of Indian maharajah, but*

it will end in a partition of the Ottoman Empire between England, Germany, and Russia. France will be allowed Northwestern Africa. It is not worth while drawing distinctions of right and wrong in the matter, it is a matter entirely of interest. » ({*Modern History Sourcebook : Wilfred Scawen Blunt : Britain's Imperial Destiny, 1896-1899.*})

This is, in a nut shell, Blunt's initial considerations of what later was to become the Sykes Picot Treaty (1916), that is, the total partitioning of the Southwest Asia region between France and Great Britain. The interesting aspect of his strategic outlook is the proposal of a British North-South railroad line from Cairo to Capetown, which was never built and was never intended to be built, but which was considered merely as a bargaining chip in counterposition to the French Trans-Africa railroad proposal of Gabriel Hanotaux, which was to pass through Fashoda, on an East-West corridor coming from Dakar to Djibuti. That French rail-line was never built either for synarchist reasons that I have developped in previous reports.

The total disregard for African people is also a clear indication of how much Blunt was a true anti-imperialist. Let us not forget that Blunt was an official agent of the British Empire, who was paid to denounce the old Empire and usher in the new Fabian form into existence. As Blunt says goodby to the nineteenth century, he can gleefully expect that his work in collaboration with Afghani in Egypt, will go a long way to break up the Ottoman Empire. The seeds of its destruction have been sowed by the so-called « Islamic reforms », and will bear all of their fruits after the First World War is over, and the Sykes Picot Treaty is signed.

What the partitioning of the Sykes Picot Treaty had done in 1916 was not merely to establish artificial limits for a new « Arab State, or Confederation of States », by carving out chunks of Turkey, Palestine, Lebanon, Syria, and Iraq, thus, destroying the nations of the Ottoman Empire, but it was also virtually guaranteeing a Fundamentalist Islamic uprising in the whole region, a resulting series of warlord conflicts between the Shiites and the Sunies, during the period to come, and this with the full blessings of an « Entente Cordiale » between France and Great Britain. We are only beginning to harvest the fruits of this Satanic strategy in Iraq today.

FIN