

# **The Psychology of Prejudice**

Sam Fryman

*First published August 2006*

**Also by the same author**

*A Mens Liberation Guide to Women 4th edition*

*A Womens Liberation Guide to Men 2nd edition*

*How to Meditate*

*Kundalini - Preventing the Apocalypse*

*A Mens and Womens Liberation Update*

*The Myth of the Teenage Rebellion*

*What Is Intelligence?*

*Kundalini - A Personal Experience*

*Feminal Farm - a short satirical novel*

*The Innocent Persons Guide to Law*

*Understanding Female Sexuality and Porn*

*Freedom of Speech & Maitreya*

*An Innocent Persons Guide to the Da Vinci Code*

*How the Feminists Stole Psychology*

*Hearing Voices and Psychic Phenomena*

*The Psychology of Soaps*

*Is Competition Necessary?*

*On Drugs and Alcohol*

*The Importance of Thinkers*

*The Demonisation of the Innocents*

# The Psychology of Prejudice

Sam Fryman

Speaking as a writer of sorts, critics can be very useful at times, because otherwise, lacking adequate feedback, we are in danger of simply always ‘preaching to the converted.’

For what really is the point of writing at all, if our views are only read and accepted by those who already thought that way and agreed with us anyway?

Of course, it *is* valuable in that it consolidates and hopefully expands on the scope and breadth of thought that those who are too busy with other things – as our workaholic and shopaholic Western society tries its very best to make happen – to give many matters much thought.

By the unreasonable demands on the lives of Western people in general, stressed and punch drunk – that is for example, forcing them to work two or three times many hours as would be really necessary to keep our world ticking over, to meet our *needs* – it is very hard for most people to understand either themselves or world events in a deep, thoughtful fashion, and thus all most people can realistically be expected to do is to absorb the ‘black and white’ view of reality that comes from our dumbed-down sound-byte driven news media.

But *in their own spheres* – perhaps they are computer experts, or doctors, or Wall Street brokers with university degrees and Ph Ds – they may be the sort of guys and girls who are used to being *in charge*, of getting others to jump when they bark the orders, of having this feeling that they know what is going on, that they are *right*.

As we see with many celebrities, who in reality may be only skilled at acting or singing, their mere *success* alone makes these people believe that they have the ability to pontificate about all kinds of matters about which they may in reality be very poorly informed.

But because they are *successful* in our luxurious, glorious Western world, they like to feel *righteous*. For after all, a society that has made *them* successful, is therefore obviously a *right* one, and its *status quo* should be defended to the utmost degree.

While they are busy receiving plaudits, counting the money in their bank accounts and enjoying the unprecedented wealth of the privileged Western world – we are not saying there is not prejudice outside the West, but it is *Western* prejudice, which we wish to focus on here – they do not want to even *hear* that there is anything wrong with this society which has been so good to them, and made them feel so important and special.

So thus if anybody threatens their *security*, i.e. their *dominant* position in society, their status, their wealth, of course they are ready to attack that person with all their might like an animal in the jungle protecting its territory, as the Darwinist competitive model of ‘survival of the fittest’ which our society accepts as its basis – as opposed to religious views – explains.

The same can of course apply to *nations* just as it can to individuals.

That is, many millions of Americans have a pride in their nation, that they are *the best* in the World, they have gung-ho movie heroes like Bruce Willis and Arnold Schwarzenegger who solve all their problems by showing their *superiority* to ‘the enemy’, by giving this ‘enemy of America’ a good beating, or shooting or blowing them up, as we saw for example in the Arnold Schwarzenegger movie *True Lies*, in which Arnie saves America from the evil Muslim terrorist who steals some nuclear warheads and tries to blow some American cities up.

So in the 60s and 70s movies ‘the enemy’ used to be the Russians, but now Russia has deteriorated into a capitalist, gangster-ridden, corrupt hell, with civil wars going on in it (again, you see involving the Muslims) – the new *Satan* has become the Muslim world, and thus we see Hollywood portraying ‘all American heroes’, sometimes in military uniform, like Arnie, who give it to these bad guys and religious nuts in no uncertain terms.

The Muslim terrorist in the *True Lies* movie for example ends up being sent off ‘to hell’ on the end of a rocket that Arnie fires in an amazingly spectacular scene involving a vertical take off and landing ‘jump jet’ which flies into the city centre and hovers beside a glass skyscraper office building where the ‘bad guys’ (you know, the *Muslim terrorists*) are holed up.

Consider that this movie *True Lies* was made in 1994, *long, long* before 11 September 2001 and our current *major problems* with Muslim terrorists.

This is how long this *world view* has been presented to us.

This is not *conspiracy theory*, this is *undeniable fact*.

Please, will all ‘black-equals-white’ reality denying people just calm down from their psychopathic states of vengeance and hate for one moment please, and just register the *fact*, that in 1994, we saw one major movie with likely the very biggest Hollywood action star of the time, Arnold Schwarzenegger, *depicting Muslims* as unreasonable, fanatical, genocidal bad guys who were willing to steal nuclear weapons and blow up millions of innocents for whatever crazy cause they happened to think up on that particular day.

Because for those of us who can *think objectively*, rather than just paranoically reaching for the latest sound byte of media propaganda which tells us America is wonderful, is the ‘good guy’, and these dark skinned Muslims are *all*, down to the very last one of them *terrorists, murderers*, and totally unreasonable religious maniacs, let us note that the movie *True Lies* – just as in real life news reporting – talked little about the *cause* that this Muslim terrorist in the movie was *fighting for*, and instead focussed one hundred percent upon *his wickedness, his evil*, in wanting to hurt all us *innocent people*.

For now we have a new breed of ‘patriots’ who will not hear one word against America, and want to wrap themselves in the flag as if it was one of their mother’s old dresses and they were suffering from some kind of bizarre Oedipus complex.

That is not to say, we are against *patriotism* as such.

It may shock or even stagger some of those who regard us as deluded ‘conspiracy theorists’ to learn that in our opinion *all nations* should be proud of their country, should have a sense of national community and identity, and that they should be *patriotic*, yet without it being an ugly patriotism that says like Muhammad Ali once mockingly did that ‘we are the greatest’, and our opponents – the enemy, the other nations of our world – are just a bunch of dumb, stupid and ugly guys.

If we are a *noble* people, if we are a *just* people, if we *truly* defend the weak, and dare to stand up courageously against the strong and wicked, if we are a *truly* Christian people, then what harm could there be in feeling a sense of national pride?

But what on the other hand if we just *think* we are a noble people, that we only fight just wars, that we are going round the world not bombing, invading and dominating others, but *teaching them democracy, showing them our superior and better way of life* – when in fact *the very opposite is true*?

Then patriotism – in support of such acts becomes not a good thing, but a monstrous spirit of Darwinist domination. We may *pose* as the good guy, but in reality we are just a King Kong beast in the global jungle, beating its chest and demanding everyone else bows down and pays homage to us and does everything we tell them to do *or else*.

But if we *put forward such a view* the person who *wants* to believe that America is all sweetness and Momma’s apple pie, cry out in fury – how dare you mock our kind, benevolent Father Christmas-like *Uncle Sam!* You are a *conspiracy theorist*.

[and we are not being *anti-American here*, we are against only *the current policies of the American leadership* – being against *the American people* and against *the leadership* are really *not* the same thing at all, as we do not believe the US leadership are really representing *the American people* any more than Tony Blair is truly representing *the British people* ]

And sadly, not all of these accusers are dumb and illiterate and uneducated, as some stereotypes suggest.

No – many of them are very clever and cunning.

They are experts in rhetorical argument, i.e. that which is designed to *persuade, to confuse (the issue), to hypnotise, to rumourmonger, to scaremonger, to create compliance by fear*, as opposed to that which is designed to *reveal the truth*.

That is, following the recent posting of an admittedly short, and less detailed than we would have wished article, *The Demonisation of the Innocents*, which suggested that the West negotiates with the Muslims instead of just trying to kill and bomb them senseless – just as gangsters would do to wipe a rival gang out – one critic accused us of being a ‘conspiracy theorist.’

He then backed this *accusation* up with ‘facts’ such as ‘we didn’t start the war’, ‘it was the Muslim terrorists’ and so on – you know, childish accusations like an argument between children in the playground about who threw the first stone.

The point being, that though it may well be possible to find out who really *did* throw the first stone in the playground, in terms of the Middle East crisis, and the Arab-Israeli conflict it is virtually impossible for all parties concerned to agree on this issue of *fault*, of *who is to blame*.

Many say *Israel* was an illegal state, founded by *Jewish terrorists* in 1947/48, whereas the Jews say “we are only reclaiming ‘the promised land’ given to us by Moses x thousand years ago.” And then maybe some other race we have never heard of will claim – ‘hey, buddy, just hang on one minute, I am the last surviving member of the Cozmosite tribe of 10,000 BC, and Kalidus the Great declared that this land would belong to us for ever, so this land is *mine*, and belongs to *me*.

And so it goes on.

This *childish squabble* that looks into history for blame, and who put up their stake first, is as ridiculous as if just because the Americans put their flag on the Moon *first* that they are going to claim that *the Moon belongs to them*.

And of course, we don’t doubt that if space travel were much easier, if it was possible to colonise and sell properties on the Moon, many Americans indeed *would* claim that sections of the Moon did indeed belong to *them*, if not even *the whole Moon*.

Congress would pass an *act* declaring America's right to ownership of all lands and properties on the Moon, and America's *consequent* right therefore to *wage military campaigns against those who would oppose them*.

For just how far is this Darwinist territory grabbing and dominating mentality going to go?

Will next America claim that it has got right of ownership of Mars (e.g. due to the Viking mission), and maybe of the sun?

Will we have to pay America a 'sun tax' or else keep our blinds drawn and stay indoors or be fined for feeling the rays of the sun?

This is all simply the philosophy of *domination and greed*.

And there are *millions* of citizens of America, who claim that America, which consumes *with Western Europe* more of the resources of our world than the rest of the nations put together (around 60%), despite only having around 5% of the world's population (12% including Western Europe), is not trying to dominate the world – of course not always *militarily*, but *economically*, which economic domination may not kill the foreign *people* individually themselves, but kills *their way of life, their culture, their ability to live independently, to have their own sense of identity and self-respect*.

[another statistic worthy of note is that during the 90s the average American consumed 30 times the amount of resources per capita than the average Asian Indian]

How utterly laughable and ridiculous to imagine that a country whose citizens take such an enormous share of 'the global pie' are not the *dominant* nation, who clearly are not 'sharing fairly' with everybody else. And this critic has got the utter nerve and cheek to call us "silly" and a "conspiracy theorist" nut and so on!

America and the West eats two or three times as much as what good health would require, while a quarter of the world starves or lives below the breadline, and does virtually *nothing* to stop this inequality and starvation, that *easily* could be prevented, and this person thinks that does not amount to domination, and is a "conspiracy theory"?

So that person is certainly right about one thing.



America is not *trying* to dominate the world, it is *doing it*.

For why for instance if America just wants the Muslim oil, which again our critic claims, does it not merely say – *let us negotiate and agree a price for the oil?* Why does it have to keep dropping bombs and firing missiles, just like a dominant global virtually gangster power would?

So anyone who is *reasonable* or *impartial* would see that the mightiest most powerful nation that has ever existed on this planet – i.e. America – could easily do things in a peaceful way if it wanted to.

But these people like our critic who are good at arguing, at *persuading*, they spread rumours, they scaremonger, they say “these Muslims all want to kill us! Wake up you fools, they want to kill us!”

They have a thousand deceptive, tricky and misleading arguments which all have *some* truth in them, but they will not accept this *broader truth*, this *reasonable, impartial objective* point of view.

We all likely know somebody who will argue with us about *anything*, about *every petty thing under the sun*.

Because their goal is not to expose or explore or find the truth, it is only to *win the argument, to prove that they are right* (even when they are *wrong* and very much aware of that fact).

Many men will have had this experience when arguing with a woman. It is obvious to anyone with a brain in their head that she is wrong, she probably knows it even herself, but *boy, no way will she admit it*.

So we are going to have to accept that we *cannot win* arguments with these people based on the facts, because *they will not accept the facts*.

They will say ‘your facts are wrong.’ They will trawl into history and quote other ‘sources’ and portray flimsy rumours as if they were major cast iron truths and incontestable facts, they use *suggestion*, they use *hypnosis*, rather than logic.

They make a lot of flimsy assumptions, present them as hard facts, and *only then* use logic to make a *false conclusion* from a bunch of wrong or inaccurate information, as if they had been logical and consistent all along.

They select all the data that *supports their case*, and *ignore the rest*, even if that rest is *one hundred times* more than what supports their case.

It is called *prejudice*.

i.e. they as Krishnamurti explained *start with a conclusion they want to believe* e.g. Muslims are evil and Americans are all heroes and saints.

Then they find all the (likely) cranks who say things that in their eyes *prove* their case, and dismiss and discredit the rest as lies, as ‘conspiracy theories.’

*They* are the mischief makers, they are the supporters of injustice and war, because they will not *listen*, they adamantly *refuse* to see things from the other guy’s point of view, especially if he has a different coloured skin, and a language and religion they can’t understand.

They are fond of *labelling* others.

They want to put us all in little boxes, that their immature, narrow and unforgiving minds can deal with, so they label us ‘Muslim terrorist’, ‘religious fanatic’, ‘conspiracy theorist’ and so on.

But none of even this detailed explanation will most of them accept, because all they can do is *defend their territory* like an animal, like a barking dog, just firing back more and more fresh and increasingly desperate and bizarre claims and counter claims.

So we are not going to try to argue *the facts* of international events with them, because they will argue black is white if necessary, if that’s what it takes to support their case.

So we are going to try *something else*.

We are going to look at *why* these *millions* – this is not just personal against our critic, we want to bring him and his kind back onto the raft of true humanity, or there will be no peaceful world – think this way, what has made them take such a different and typically diametrically opposing view to ourselves, i.e. those of us who do not like our critic merely believe in ‘freedom of thought’, but actually believe in *the rights of other nations to live in freedom* without other nations like the powerful Western ones and America trying to change their form of government and invade them and kill thousands of their people in the process.

No, we are going to have a look at what is happening in the minds of these people, and we are sorry to say, that should they *dare* to read on, it is quite likely to hurt.

We are going to look not just at why there is prejudice against the Muslims – or the Jews, the Negroes, or anyone else – but why there is prejudice *per se*.

How does a mind develop that sees only what it wants to see and ignores the rest?

Like all our other psychological flaws and inconsistencies it starts out in childhood.

It is very simple, just as the tribal wars of domination that explain *all* the trouble in our world are very simple, but those who are intent on domination, on *not playing fair* will not accept its simplicity.

For just consider what most of us are like.

Which of us men if we had the chance would not like to have sex with a dozen different women we know who are married to someone else, maybe even a thousand?

So what if you are a ruthless gangster, and are therefore in a position to tell your boys to go and threaten to kill the wife and family of any man who will not let you have sex with his wife.

We don't think even a very big gangster would live long with a policy like that, as many men would even die in the process of killing him for such a crime.

But what if the power is a mighty nation, armed to the teeth with military equipment, and even nuclear weapons, and your repressed enemy can be savagely slaughtered with precision missiles and bombs fired by your troops in safety from many miles away?

No single man can fight such a force.

But let us stay with this ruthless gangster, who has decided he wants to sleep with all the women in his neighbourhood, regardless of who they are married to.

How will he justify this inhumanity, this *mass rape* in his mind?

His sexual desire will justify it for him. But if he has any kind of conscience at all, or merely wants to assure his underlings that he is not going to rape their women also, *in order to stay in power*, he will find *words* to justify it.

He will say ‘these weak little guys don’t deserve these dames. Any real man would come and fight me and kill me for what I have done to their women. The strong will survive. That Darwin guy said it right. The strong like me will get to screw the dames, and the weak can go screw their right hands, it’s all the weak deserve. And of course you guys, my soldiers, you are the strong too, and that’s why you are working for me, so your dames are your own. I respect you guys, so I don’t touch *your* women.’

But the real truth is, that if it were down to single unarmed or even armed combat, these ‘little guys’ might even be well capable of killing the gangster boss with their bare hands or superior fighting skills, but of course, he is protected by his *army of gangster bullies*, just as the greedy globalising capitalists in America are protected by their army of soldiers and nuclear weapons.

But the fact is, that even us little ordinary citizens, could easily justify adultery in our minds, that is, having sex with another man’s wife if we got the opportunity to seduce her, and she was willing.

We would say – she doesn’t love him, she wasn’t happy with him. Or even – this guy was obviously just no good in bed, and she needed *a real man like me*.

It is animal greed, and we have to have laws and customs to protect us *from each other*, because otherwise we would all be killing one another every day.

But when there is only one *superpower* in the world, i.e. USA, then who can make that indomitable power behave itself?

Nobody can. They don’t stand a chance. Its *own people* will have to demand that its leaders act with *justice* and not according to the principle of Darwinist domination and conquest.

That is, George Bush considers himself a man of God. Do we think Jesus Christ would approve of what he is doing?

Do we think Jesus Christ who so the story goes replaced the ear of a Roman soldier – an *oppressor* – which Simon Peter cut off with a sword, would approve of all this bombing and all these missiles fired at virtually defenceless enemies?

Do we think that he would *ever* advocate a *military solution*, when he preached the gospel of love and *turning the other cheek*?

Not that your author is a *pacifist*. He does believe in military action in the case of a *truly just cause*, such as to remove a *genuinely evil dictator*, but he is not convinced that such military action – e.g. allegedly in the case of Saddam Hussein – *ever* happens for such honest and comic book hero reasons. There are always it appears *hidden agendas*, such as the Iraqi oil.

So the fact is that in life we only have conflict with other people or nations for either of *two reasons*.

This is not ‘rhetoric’ we are giving, this is *cool, rational objective logical analysis*.

We find most times that if we have an ‘enemy’, it is because *we did something wrong to them*, or else *we have something they want* and therefore *they attack us*.

For example, bullies in the school often attack those who are more clever or more attractive than them, just as the boy genius Peter Parker was the object of the bully Flash Thompson in the Spiderman comics and movie.

We just accept bullying, but we don’t ask *why*.

What is *wrong* with Flash Thompson that he has to keep pushing around Peter Parker, keep mocking him and belittling him?

The fact is that the teachers say Parker is a great prospect, and they say Flash Thompson is an idiot.

It is *envy*. It is seeing that someone else has something – even a light of intelligence – and you don’t have it.

You feel *humiliated* by comparison, and thus you want to get even, to *humiliate* that clever or better looking person back, to ‘cut them down to size.’

Unfortunately, this even extends to enmity between nations.

What is *the truth* of life in the Muslim world – the real everyday Muslim world, that has even encouraged the likes of rock star Cat Stevens to become a Muslim?

Do any of us know?

Do we really know how *the vast majority of women are treated* – you know, as opposed to just the soundbytes of cruelty; how the *old people* are treated; whether there is *order and justice in the schools and in the workplaces*; the level of *interpersonal hostility and crime*, and so on, many of which issues the late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> century West seems to have such a thoroughly dreadful record upon?

Your author has not lived in a Muslim country, but has seen plenty of Muslims in his own.

And what he has seen is that they are largely a peaceful, hard working group of people, who *are never violent unless attacked first*.

They seek to make a quiet, peaceful living by hard work. They believe in a God, they pray often.

But let us return to our point, the basis of *all conflict of all war*.

And it can be only one of two things:

- a) we did something to upset the party that is attacking us
- b) they are attacking us because we have something that they want (or on the other hand, *we are attacking them* because they have something *we* want, e.g. oil)

So our critic says – the Muslims want to murder us for not believing as they do – i.e. they *want our submission to their faith and belief*.

Well, firstly, what studies your author has made have indicated to him that the Muslim religion accepts all of Moses and Christ and Buddha i.e. it is an 'inclusive religion' rather than an *exclusive* one like appears to be true of the Jewish religion, which seems to accept neither Mohammed nor Christ.

In a well written book by a rebellious ex-Catholic nun named Karen Armstrong, now a college lecturer in Christianity, *Islam – A Short History*, is explained that the Koran expressly decrees:

“there shall be no coercion in matters of faith”

This is what *Mohammed* says.

But we do accept that not every *modern* so-called *Muslim* is necessarily following this formula to the letter.

That is, Karen Armstrong also discusses the concept of *jihad*, apparently meaning *struggle*.

But this does not necessarily mean an armed struggle against religious enemies (not that there should be *any* 'religious enemies' according to Mohammed's actual *inclusive* views of other religions) or dissenters.

But it appears that the current Muslims who think that way, are using the situation around in Mohammed's own time to see things that way, when the existing wealthy people *in Mohammed's own country* were violently opposed to his new ideas, and thus ostracized this new Muslim sect, and nearly caused his death, forcing him to flee to foreign parts .

i.e. consider this quote from Karen Armstrong's book pages 10-11:

'Mohammed acquired a small following and eventually some seventy families converted to Islam. At first, the most powerful men in Mecca ignored the Muslims, but by 616 they had become extremely angry with Mohammed who they claimed had reviled the faith of their fathers, and was obviously a charlatan, who only pretended to be a prophet...

But they were particularly concerned that this Judaeo-Christian belief (of an afterlife, as *opposed to the previously anti-afterlife view of the Arabs*) struck at the heart of their cut-throat capitalism. On the Last Day, Arabs were warned that the wealth and power of their tribe would not help them; each individual would be tried on his or her own merits: why had they not taken care of the poor? Why had they accumulated fortunes instead of sharing their money? Those Quraysh (pre Mohammedan Arabs) who were doing very well in the new Mecca were not likely to look kindly on this kind of talk and the opposition grew...'

So we see that Mohammed was in fact, though not against *trade*, against exploitation and greed. Karen Armstrong explains that his main goal was the creation of what was called an *ummah*, a caring sharing community that helped one another out, and neither exploited nor abused any of its members.

*This* is the original spirit of the Muslim religion, no doubt much of which still exists today, with for example the refusal of Muslims to charge interest on loans.

*This* is what our critic friend and his kind want attacked and destroyed and replaced with our corrupting out-of-control commercialism, that first seduces millions into buying what they don't need, persuades them to get into debt to buy it that they can't service even the typically high or extortionate *interest payments* upon – consider how the average Western couple spends *years* just paying off *the interest* on their mortgage – and then when they can't meet these repayments kicks them out of their homes or forces them into prostitution or leaves them on the streets.

To further celebrate the glory of our Western capitalist system, we cannot resist reporting a case which appeared in the newspapers in England this week.

It was of a 51 year old *family* man, an electrician running his own small business, who *hung* himself due to getting into debts of £50,000. The bank hounded him on account of his debts, ringing him non-stop most of the day, threatening him in various unscrupulous ways – his brother described them as like sharks circling him, and we can rest assured that at least some of these hounders who drove this man to his death must have been *women* as Western banks are full of women staff – yet it turned out at the inquest, that this honest working man was actually owed a great deal of money by big wealthy blue chip companies who had refused or excessively delayed paying him for his work, with this result.

We do not believe such an inhumane persecution and tragedy could *ever* happen in a Muslim society, certainly not of the kind Mohammed himself envisaged.



[and please do not imagine here that your author is a ‘closet Muslim’ wishing to convert Westerners to Islam – he is a *Christian* who believes that Muslims should stay Muslims and seek to be *true Muslims* as per Mohammed’s original, uncorrupted ideals (so for example, if there are any Muslim extremists or zealots who believe they should forcibly impose Islam on the West, their people and leaders should remind one another that Mohammed said as we have quoted above “there shall be no coercion in matters of faith”) ; and that likewise Christians should stay Christians, and seek to be true to *Christ’s* original ideals, such as *treat thy neighbour as thyself* (you know, even if he is a Samaritan, a Muslim or a Jew); and that *the Jews* should stay Jews, but seek to stay true to *the commandments of Moses*, likewise without varying or corrupting them]

And then secondly, the other great accusation constantly levelled at the Muslims, and constantly used to whip up hate against and therefore justify attacks upon the Muslim world, is their alleged *treatment of women*.

Well, firstly, we will point out the case of British female journalist *Yvonne Ridley*, who was captured by the Taliban during the Afghan war.

Was she stripped naked and sexually abused (like Iraqi men have been by US soldiers), or taken out to the public square and flogged, or beheaded or whatever for her Western anti-Muslim beliefs?

No, she said *she was treated with respect*, and in fact – though as we said, we are in no way *recommending* such a path – decided on her return to England to convert to being a Muslim, and now even wears Muslim dress (and please don’t try to tell us she was *brainwashed*, anyone who thinks your average British female career woman and journalist can be brainwashed does not realise that they would be confronted with one of the most stubborn and intransigent creatures on the planet, especially as regards *submitting herself to men*).

But this *true, real life* anecdote aside, just look at some more of Karen Armstrong’s meticulously researched book (she apparently spends *several years* researching each of her books) pages 13-14 on the subject of Mohammed’s wives, many of whom he married for political reasons and who bore him no children:

“But it is still true that Mohammed was one of those rare men who truly enjoy the company of women. Some of his male companions were astonished by his leniency towards his wives, and the way they stood up to him and answered him back. Mohammed scrupulously helped with the chores, mended his own clothes, and sought out the companionship of his wives. He often like to take them on expeditions, and would consult them and take their advice seriously. On one occasion his most intelligent wife, Umm Salamah, helped to prevent a mutiny.

The emancipation of women was a project dear to the Prophet's heart. The Koran gave women rights of inheritance and divorce centuries before Western women were accorded such status. The Koran prescribes some degree of segregation and veiling for the Prophet's wives, but there is nothing that requires the veiling of *all* women or their seclusion in a separate part of the house. These customs were adopted some three or four generations after the Prophet's death....

The women of the first ummah in Medina took full part in its public life, and some, according to Arab custom, fought alongside the men in battle.”

So we see that instead of Mohammed being the great demonic oppressor of women that the Western media continually suggests to us, that at the heart of the Muslim religion was a desire to liberate women and give them rights far in advance of anything that the Jewish or Christian world would offer women for well over a thousand years.

Which of our modern women knows that Mohammed was the first great liberator of women known to history, so much so, that even though a tribal chief, he even sewed his own clothes and washed the dishes?

Of course it is clear that there are many things which are part of *modern* Muslim culture, which seem oppressive to us – e.g. the excessive veiling of women, and *forcing women into marriages with men whom they do not love or wish to marry* – and by all accounts would have seemed equally oppressive to Mohammed himself, and of which your author certainly does not approve.

But firstly, it appears clear that almost all the world's major religions have corrupted somewhat since the time of their founders as an inevitable phenomenon of history, and moreover this in itself, does not of course justify us going to war with the Muslim world, but perhaps rather gradually exerting some friendly persuasion.

The only issue we would take with the Muslim view of religion, is that it seems to believe that Mohammed was *the final prophet*, which once again, we would question if *Mohammed himself* ever said, and suggests an intransigence to any modifications to its views, and perhaps therein lies the problem.

That is, we are now living in a *scientific age*, in which as we have explained numerous times in our writings elsewhere, has had the effect that an enormous quantity of Westerners will not accept being dictated to by any views that cannot be at least scientifically plausible.

As we have expressed in our works on *kundalini*, we cannot expect a scientifically aware post-Darwin society to blindly believe any more, but must have some scientific evidence of the biological basis of spirituality, which we have done our best to explain and *document as to our personal experience* (see *Kundalini – A Personal Experience*), as has Gopi Krishna in full detail, and we believe in time will be scientifically verified.

But as to our critic's paranoiac gripe against the Muslims wishing to kill him and all other 'free thinkers' who do not believe in the Muslim religion, your author has seen *no evidence whatsoever* of this in his own country, in which there are now well between one and two *millions* of Muslims.

England was *never* attacked by Muslim terrorists until 7 July 2005, and it was *British citizens, British Muslims* who did this, not those uneducated fanatical zealots of media fiction.

Al Qaeda *first, prior to any attack*, warned England to take its army out of Iraq, just as they warned Spain, and when England – i.e. when *Tony Blair* – refused it was *only then* that the attack came.

They *did not* unlike our critic claims say – you must all become Muslims or we will terrorise you. They merely said *leave our land, let our people be*, just as the Jewish people and the Westerners generally may recall that Moses effectively *terrorised* the Egyptians, the Pharaoh's people, with plagues and curses, with this similar demand of *set my people free*.

Likewise, Spain had the Madrid bombings, but *withdrew its troops* and has not been attacked since, whereas England is currently on *critical alert*, and it is *alleged* has frustrated some terrorist plan to blow up planes in the last week or two, though nobody knows if this is just more media 'spin' to keep justifying this 'war on terror.'

So our critic depicts the likes of Al Qaeda and the Muslims in general, as unreasonable monsters and murderers, who *cannot be negotiated with*, but this does not seem to tally with the *logic* which their actions demonstrated, just as with the IRA, whom *eventually* the British government *negotiated with* after for decades saying like George Bush *we do not negotiate with terrorists*, and guess what, hey presto, the IRA has *never* bombed mainland UK since.

There is *nobody* – except perhaps for certain categories of severely mentally ill people – who is not *logical*, who is *not capable of rationality*.

We just have to find out *what they want* and start talking to them about how we can reach a *compromise about it*.

*All* disagreements of every nature and size can be solved by this process.

This process only fails when one side or the other *refuses to negotiate*.

For example, a happy-go-lucky but henpecked salesman once joked to your author: “You know the difference between my wife and the Baader Meinhoff (German terrorist) gang? You can *negotiate* with the Baader Meinhoff gang...”

If one side or the other, or admittedly *both*, refuse to negotiate, refuse to compromise, then of course we cannot reach this compromise solution.

But those who *truly* do not wish to compromise – when the other side *would* under certain circumstances – can be very cunning about their intransigence.

They will state terms, such as:

“Here is a fair agreement for sharing up this land. We will have that unimportant little piece over there (you know, the small bit that has *all* the oil wells, gold and diamond mines, and the uranium ore deposits on it) and you can have that great big bit here (you know, the totally barren desert where no minerals or oil is believed to be). Look – you have got 10 million hectares (of *sand*) and we have only 1 million hectares (of riches beyond your wildest dreams). Are we not being *fair* to you?”

So there is no way that anyone would agree to a deal like that, and then the bullies who want everything for themselves spread the word that the other side is unreasonable and refuses to negotiate, and put out the ‘sound byte’ that the other side is unreasonable, and will not accept this 90% share of the land we are *generously* offering them.

But bullies everywhere do not care for *the truth*. They just present like our critic, these *plausible* kinds of lies, in which you see, there is always at least *some truth*, but not *the whole truth*, and thus they cause *doubt* in the minds of the innocent spectators who are easily deceived by such propaganda.

So when we look at the *psychology of prejudice* we see that in fact it is *one and the same* as the *psychology of the bully*.

The bully, the prejudiced person is he or she who cannot accept others’ right to exist as they are.

As we said, it is in essence not ultimately, their own fault, it is a ‘skill’ they learned from their parents.

That is, little Tommy or whomever is aged five, and plays innocently with his train set, and his father, who is you see *jealous of his mother’s affection for the child, for Tommy*, as is typical, says – that stupid boy will come to nothing, he is a softie, he is no good.

This bullying father’s *hate* of the little boy he shows him at every turn. If he can, he will even strike or beat him for no good reason, just to take his frustrations out on the boy, because as we have said *he is jealous of the love the mother has for the boy*, which has displaced whatever love she might have once had for him.

It is a fact of life that if they have to make a choice, most women will choose their children over their husband any day.

And that is *biologically* inevitable, it is Richard Dawkins’ *selfish gene* at work, as the fact is that the mother is maybe 50% genetically related to her child, and absolutely *zero* % (maybe a very little, especially in the same race) related to *her husband*.

So men have to understand and live with that, and *therefore* only pick a woman as wife and mother whom they are really great friends with *prior to pregnancy* and would never want to be without them.

But we have our bullied little boy who cannot get a kind word out of his father, and this little boy does not see *why* he is hated.

He still wants to *please* and be *accepted* and *loved* by his father, and a time may come when – e.g. if he turns out to be good at sport or whatever – the boy suddenly becomes *an asset of pride* to the father.

Other men see the boy has talent, and so the boy decides to do his best to please his dad, and gradually forgets the bullying trauma that his father once imposed upon him.

But vestiges remain. The resentment is still there in the background, and the bullying father decides that he will bully and cajole the child into being *a success* of which he can be proud, and so he handles the boy roughly, and tells him *not to be soft*.

Many fathers especially hate the weakness of the boy who is under his mother's control, call him a 'mummy's boy' and so on, and tell him if he cries, he is weak and pathetic and that *self-pity is a terrible thing*.

(there is an entertaining movie with Robert Duvall, called *The Great Santini* which shows one of these kinds of fathers in action, with Duvall playing a bullying military man who cannot relate to his son).

Whereas, what he has failed to realise, is that little boys only *take refuge* in their mother, and fail to properly develop their masculine side, when *their father does not love and accept them* at an early age.

So such boys who grow up bullied by their fathers, are actually carrying an emotional case of explosives inside them, which they live in denial of.

They have become the father they hated, who carried the same, and was maybe once (though he will *never* tell, will deny it with his dying breath) an insecure 'bed wetter' or whatever also.

Those who have been bullied suddenly find to their amazement that they can get satisfaction and relief from finding *someone smaller* to pick on. Some people even buy a dog or other pet and *bully that*.

The key point is – their father had *no sympathy, no pity* for them, and this *hardens* them. They feel an outrageous anger and intolerance about *others* who ask for pity, they *despise the weak*.

They think – *I never got pity, so nobody else* will get it either.

In the UK, for example, for decades there has been a tradition of junior doctors in hospitals working (i.e. being on call for) the most outrageous hours – typically over 100 per week – so that they are many times called from sleep half-dazed and having to make life and death decisions, which clearly is dangerous to patients.

But the senior doctors and consultants say *nothing* to object to this, because they *hate* the young whippersnappers who are coming up to replace them, and they think “we went through that trial, that *injustice*, so *why should they have it easy?* – they can have it hard too – *just like we did.*”

And more generally, for instance, the racist bully who is a victim of his own father’s cruelty torments and bullies e.g. the negro, in order to feel better *about himself*.

This desire to dominate others to feel *relief*, to avoid looking in the mirror of one’s own insecurity, because one could not take the *pain* of one’s inner self, is the thing that we have to understand, it is the basis of *prejudice*.

Prejudice means we have judged someone without listening, without understanding. We have not been *fair* to them, given them a fair hearing, a fair trial to explain themselves.

We have spread ugly rumours, lies and half-truths about them to *demonise them*, to make sure *nobody else believes in them*.

So these people who have been bullied, who are insecure and conflicted and troubled personalities, they are very happy indeed to be told by the media that they are *good Americans*, they are *wonderful*, and that there is an *enemy* to be bullied, to be looked down on, to be sexually humiliated even as with the prisoners in Iraq, and in those latter actions *alone* we can see the truth of our words.

When one has had great injustice imposed on one, as we have said, initially usually by *parents* – society's *number one abusers*, second only to *governments* – we have inevitably lived through long and numerous sessions of tears, and rage, and all that emotional damage inflicted upon us makes us *insensitive*, it creates a *hate monster* inside us, which seeks to get even with the world around us which has been so unjust to us, and then when presented with a suitable opportunity, we are delighted to unleash this hate monster on our victims, for example when our media and governments hold up the Muslim people as monsters and evil terrorists for us to *blame*, for us to *judge*, and point our angry fingers at.

Because the angry, conflicted, insecure and intolerant persons always have to blame *someone else*, because in their minds resides the *truth* that in fact someone else certainly *was* to blame, and it was generally speaking a bullying or cruel or thoughtless parent.

But they do not want to accept that there is anything wrong with *them* – it is always *those people out there* who are the villains, the trouble causers – and no longer able to blame their parents who may even now be dead, or so feeble they are no longer worthy of hate or rebellion against, they decide to blame and judge *whoever is handy*.

Just as we all tend to like to laugh at the stupid dunce or pathetic momma's boy in class, because *it makes us all feel better about ourselves*.

*We* were never given a chance *by our parent* so neither are we going to give *them* a chance, a fair hearing either.

*What was done to us*, the cruelty, the dehumanisation and so on, we will *do to them* in turn.

In carrying out such actions, we are hypnotised by our emotions of anger and hate, and that is why we can carry out these inhumane acts, just as the rapist who forces himself on a woman, typically hates women – including likely many women who have rejected and humiliated him – and thus, he feels his act of rape is only an act of 'evening the score', of getting revenge and 'justice' for himself.



So thus to stop rape and all similar crimes of inhumanity between men and men or women and men, we have to stop people getting into these awful conflicted states, we have to *from an early age* treat them with care and respect, so they never lose their sensitivity, they never lose their *humanity*.

Of course, there are those who believe man is fundamentally selfish, which is *true* of course in a biological sense, but that is not to say he is fundamentally *wicked*, unable to respond to fair treatment, and if we were to look at the evolution of every major criminal of our society one by one, we would in most or all cases find that they have been *made criminals*, and not *born* that way.

If anyone believes some are just *born evil*, let him prove it, because to date there is as far as we are aware *no scientific proof whatsoever that such is the case*.

There is no *evil gene*, as we have said, there is only a *selfish gene*, which means that of course we are *all* looking out for *number one*, but that does not mean we will be unable to *share*, so that we need not fight each other unduly for mates, territory and food and shelter, because there is *plenty to go around*.

Of course, if food was very scarce, even good people might start to squabble over it, but *that is not the position we are in*.

We are only fighting all these battles of the world – even within countries – because of *greed* and not because of *need*.

For you will notice, that those who like our critic, insist on calling the Muslims – who no doubt consider themselves as ‘freedom fighters’ – *terrorists*, and do not believe that fair and just negotiation is the way to solve our international problems, have *no solution*.

All they do is mock and try to discredit those whose ideas if accepted would lead to *peace*.

For if such were to happen, if we were to treat the weak with respect, instead of dominating, they would then have no hate object to belittle and bully.

We can indeed see this process in the rise of Hitler. That is, the German people were in chaos and shame and economic depression after their defeat in the first world war.

Hitler offered them their pride back, and to do this he scapegoated the Jews, he created *a hate object*, just as did the fictional government in Orwell's *1984* manufacture a hate object, an 'enemy of the people' – Emmanuel Goldstein – whom the people daily vented their anger upon, though of course, the real villain was the government itself, with its elite party, who all had special privileges which were assured to them by their continuance to serve the totalitarian regime.

And we see how this hate object *unites the people*, becomes a central focus to restore their dignity, their lost feelings of *adequacy*, of self-respect.

And just as once the blame was all cast on *the Jews*, now it is the turn of *the Muslims*.

And of course, in modern times we also see *the demonisation of men* by the feminists, again due to a hateful mindset, whose origin is in a deprived childhood, as we more or less *proved* by examining the lives of leading feminist psychologists, in our earlier work *How the Feminists Stole Psychology*.

But it is a serious problem that if we get into an argument with one of these discontent insecure people, especially of a public kind, they may successfully manage to con the audience into believing they are right and we are wrong, even though quite the contrary is true.

Because they appeal to *popular sentiment*, they *play to the crowd*.

There is a now seldom or never shown movie, of which our critic friend may or may not be aware, with a wonderful performance by Glenn Ford, depicting how a secret society is pulling the social strings called *The Brotherhood of the Bell*.

Glenn Ford's character imagines at first that all he has in life, he has got on his own merit, but one day comes, and *the Bell* wants him to do something he regards unscrupulous as *service to the Bell*, so he refuses.

Then *the Brotherhood of the Bell* turns on him, ruins his life, and he tries to expose it.

But of course, as per the tactics of our critic friend here, he is mocked, those behind the scenes, whom he never knows whether they are members of this conspiracy or not, pull the strings to have him publicly discredited, laughed at.

In a particularly wonderful scene, the ex 70s *Cannon* detective series star, William Conrad, who is in this movie presenter of a somewhat riotous TV audience participation and interview show, mocks him mercilessly, and Glenn Ford is so outraged and feels so thwarted that he actually attacks him.

But the clever Machiavellian aspect is that Conrad's devious interviewer actually deflects this idea of 'the Brotherhood of the Bell' which he regards as nonsense, and says *it is the Catholics, the cardinals of Rome* who are stirring up all the trouble, and the audience bawls and screams *no! It can't be!*

And so on.

In other words, as in the present, he has an audience that is willing to believe almost anything, almost any lies, as long as there is a *common enemy*, a *hate object*, to demonise, and comfort them in their righteousness and insecurity by hate of and feeling superior relative to.

Of course, if the hate object is weak and defenceless, it is very easy to slander or libel it and nothing bad ever happens to us. It is powerless and cannot resist or hurt us, just like the bullied victim in the schoolyard.

For that is what bullies do – they always pick on the weak, the easy targets whom they believe cannot fight back.

But sometimes *they are wrong*.

They do not see that inside some people – e.g. many of the Muslims – they may not have a great deal of military power, but what they have is *power of spirit*.

And the power of the human spirit can grow very strong indeed in the face of *great injustice*.

Even people who are not necessarily religious in generally accepted terms, can decide that their life as they know it is so humiliating and unacceptable that they would rather die than carry on in such ignoble circumstances, and may decide to take many of their 'enemies' with them, as in the case of the suicide bombers for example.

But of course one of the biggest prejudices of all is against religion in general, not only the Muslim kind.

And why is this?

Let us deal with facts rather than *conspiracy theories*.

The *fact* is that numerous politicians want religion of all kinds *kept out of politics*.

That is, because they want religion kept out of *the circles of power*, which is of course what politics is all about.

In England, some Bishop now and then speaks out on some controversial issue, and many politicians hiss and boo and say that he (it's usually a *he*) should stay out of politics, it's not the business of the church to interfere in political matters.

[you know, the thinking goes – “listen Mr Preacher, just stick to Christenings, funerals and marriages will you, *that* is what we need you for – do not interfere in politics, because we do not want your *morality* interfering with *government*, i.e. with the rule of *the rich and powerful*”]

But let us ask a rarely asked question in this regard, which is *exactly what is politics?*

So we are not going to go all academic and abstract about this, we are going to ask *what exactly is politics today, right now, in this 21<sup>st</sup> Century Western society?*

And what it is, is the process of argument and decision making amongst government officials by which *they tell the rest of us what to do*.

As we said, it is about *control*, it is about *power*.

So either we are controlled by *secular* authorities, or we are controlled by *moral or religious ones*.

So our society has been gradually hypnotised into denying the religious and moral in favour of the secular.

Some, like probably our critic friend would say ‘nonsense – religion is just rubbish, and now we are free of centuries of domination.’

And our answer would be – yes, free you certainly are. Free to be dominated by the greedy people in our society who just want personal aggrandizement and the unbridled ability to exercise power, even to the extent of killing thousands of their own and other nations’ citizens in needless wars.

Do you think that George Bush and Tony Blair do not get a thrill from sending off their troops into battle, ordering the bombing by jet planes and firing of missiles, in this exercise of power, just as once the Roman Emperors revelled in the judgement seat over gladiatorial contests, and granted either life or death to the slave combatants, to the cheers or boos and hisses of the drunken bloodthirsty crowd?

Few of us can imagine what to wield such awesome *power* must be like, to stride on the world stage, to walk on the pages of history while millions live and die in obscurity – they exist for a while and then *die* just in order that they may be infinitesimally small and worthless pawns on the board of our international chess game.

Do we really imagine that George Bush or Tony Blair really give a damn about *the lives of the soldiers* whom they send away to die, and even less about those they kill?

(we mean, do we think that were they sending *their own sons (or even now daughters)* into war to likely die, they would make these decisions so easily? – just as when ‘the Iron Lady’ Mrs Thatcher easily sent the British troops into the Falklands war to be maimed and die and kill ‘the enemy’, but when *her own son* was once lost in the desert exploring, she was suddenly a distraught, traumatised, anxiety ridden and fragile figure)

No. Everybody can be a sacrificial lamb to them, and such deluded fools as our critic see only the one dimensional version of the drama presented to them, not because they are *unable* to see the truth, but as we have said, due to their own insecurities and desire to judge and blame *others* rather than *looking within* and resolving their own inner conflicts, because *they don’t want to*.

It is just so *easy* to play the blame game, to insist that we are always right, and they, 'the enemy' is always to blame, is always wrong.

But can we ever get enough people to lay aside their prejudice and their hate?

Likely not.

Most people will not give up their hatred of others until some awful catastrophe arises, until as the saying goes 'a gun is held to their head.'

And it is really that simple in terms of *cause and effect*.

That is – the reason we are all in peril is because *we are not acting rightly*.

We (in the West) impose an injustice of *inequality* on the rest of the world.

And it really should be so *easy* to deal with the Muslims in particular, because *they do not desire our wealth*.

They are not greedy people. They want only *enough*, they want only *peace and freedom*.

We don't deny that some of them have got a desire to maybe even try to impose by force the Muslim religion on the world, but this is surely a very small minority of extremists and zealots, who would not at all be able to gain support, were it not for this *extreme situation* we are in.

By imposing or allowing injustices on the Muslim and Third world and poorer countries we create hate against us.

We *empower* extremists, we *create* the jealousy, the envy, the hate and ultimately *terrorism* against us.

The powerful people who control the Western governments and media, or even *comprise them*, live in mansions and drive luxury cars.

The average 'terrorist' likely lives with his wife and ten children or whatever in a one or two roomed shack.

It is all very simple, but the powerful rulers and politicians say ‘oh you are wrong. The world is so complicated. There are all these zealots and extremists who want to make us all Muslims and murder those who will not become one.’

And then fools like our critic buy into it, when it is many times the most bare-faced and ridiculous lie.

Our critic is an intelligent person, but he is sabotaged from using his intelligence, by his emotionally traumatised inner self that is addicted to judgement and hate, that ‘cannot ever give the sucker an even break.’

[of course there may be another possibility – we must take care when arguing with such a critic to consider that he may simply be an ‘agent provocateur’, a ‘stirrer’, perhaps even working for some kind of agency, who does not debate honestly as we do, but simply makes outrageous or deliberately provocative and likely untrue statements to ‘get a rise out of us’, and maybe to attempt to provoke and trap us into saying something which damns *us*, e.g. to blame Israel for all the problems in the world, like Mel Gibson allegedly did, so that then they can discredit us and label us ‘anti-Semitic’ – well, sorry, but *we do not hate the Jews*, we love Tony Curtis, Kirk Douglas and Randy Newman – let us not forget, though apparently most Jews do, that *Christ* was a Jew – but we may disagree with *the Israeli leadership* which is of course a totally separate affair than *racism*, because after all we disagree with the *British* leadership also, which as far as we are aware is not Jewish].

So because there are millions of his kind in the West, who will refuse to look deeper at what is going on, and who actually do not fundamentally believe in peace as a realistic option, but want to believe in the official explanation of events, this misery will go on.

Thousands more will die, will suffer, will bleed. It will grow and get many times worse – how bad, god only knows – before the stress and horror of our lives becomes so uncomfortable that these unwise people will be deposed by enough of the population who will not take their unjust rule anymore.

So the power does not lie with me, with Sam Fryman, it lies with the reader, with you.

Do not fall for the idea that our world problems are too difficult, that they are *complicated*, that they are insoluble.

No.

That is just the lie put about by the greedy people who will not share.

We say – would you mind if we had half of that cake please?

And they have a thousand reasons why it can't be done. Some will even hire lawyers to think up complex arguments for them, to explain why *they* deserve and need a big share of the cake, whereas *we* do not.

This is the blindness of prejudice, that can see only the own needs of the egotistical selfish person at the expense of everybody else.

It is time for us to look more deeply at those who rule and lead us.

Are they just and wise men and women?

What do they do with their own lives? Are they all storing up money in their bank accounts, getting rich by bribes and favours from those in commercial power, who fund their election campaigns?

If so, how can we believe they are like us who are poor or only averagely wealthy people?

Of course, they are not, they are generally speaking *elitist*, and our lives mean little or nothing to them, they care only to walk upon the stage of history, whilst so many live and die in misery, poverty and obscurity.

If there is to ever be any peace in the world, it will be brought about *exclusively* by unselfish socially responsible women and men.

As each day shows the new disasters that our current unwise and generally acquisitive and self-aggrandizing leaders bring, in time even the most prejudiced will see that these leaders bring only disaster upon us all, and must be replaced by better and wise and less prejudiced women and men.