



# The Guardian newspaper and their shameful yellow journalism

18/06/1435 - Musa Cerantonio

Yesterday, on the 17th of Jumada ath-Thani (corresponding to 17 April 2014 in the calendar of the Christians), the Guardian newspaper published via its website a sensationalist article based around myself and my recently deceased Facebook page. The article somehow managed to misquote my words to them as well as containing inaccuracies about my biography, however they were rather small and insignificant and not really of any concern to me for the time being. What was of great concern to me however is where the article veered off into full-blown sensationalism, slander and waging of conspiracy theories against myself.

Now before quoting the article I would like to give the readers a chance to read the article, assuming it has not been edited at the time of reading, and so the full article may be read here - <http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2014/apr/17/facebook-removes-page-radical-preacher-jihadists>

The article claims rather audaciously that via my former Facebook page, that I urged my 12,000 subscribers to assassinate US politicians. This is suggested by the Guardian to have possibly been the reason why my Facebook page was terminated, however it would seem quite odd for this to be the case as my page was opened less than a month before that posting, and remained open for a further 5 months after its publication without any issues. The reality in this case is that I neither urged anyone to do such acts nor would anyone draw such an outrageous conclusion from the piece that I wrote.

The piece itself discussed the Islamic principle of preventing evil which is taken directly from the saying of the Prophet Muhammad:

مَنْ رَأَى مُنْكَرًا فَلْيُنْكِرْهُ بِيَدِهِ وَمَنْ لَمْ يَسْتَطِعْ فَبِلِسَانِهِ وَمَنْ لَمْ يَسْتَطِعْ فَبِقَلْبِهِ وَذَلِكَ أَضْعَفُ الْإِيمَانِ

"Whosoever among you sees an evil then let him stop it with his hand. Whoever is not able to do so, then with his tongue, and whomever is not able to do so, then with his heart, and that is the weakest of faith"

This principle forms the basis of what can be considered self-defence in Islam, that a person who is faced with evil against him must stop it as best he can, according to his capabilities. Islam is not alone in considering self-defence against evil and tyranny to be an essential right, rather humanity as a whole acknowledges this and embraces the concept, as such I do not need to dwell upon why self-defence against a direct evil is necessary as I believe that any logical human being already accepts and adheres to this principle.

So here are the words that I was quoted by the Guardian as having written on my Facebook page -

"If we see that Muslims are being killed by the tyrant leaders of the USA then we must first stop them with our hands [ie by force]."

As can be seen, this sentence is clearly inspired by the above saying of the Prophet Muhammad which instructs the believers to stop any evil first and foremost physically, with our hands. Now not only did I mention that we must have the right to defend ourselves, but I also qualified it with specific circumstances that would necessitate this self-defence, I wrote, "If we see that Muslims are being killed by the tyrant leaders of the USA..." This clearly and without doubt is advocating self-defence and is not saying "Kill people for no reason" or "Kill those who are not trying to kill you", rather it states that **if** the USA is trying to kill you, then stop them from doing so rather than lying down and being slaughtered like a sheep.

Is this controversial? Is this what the Guardian finds to equate to 'urging my followers to kill'? Or is it simply a reminder that if you are going to be killed, stand up and defend yourself against any tyranny!

I find it rather unsettling that the Guardian decided attempt to demonise the one asking Muslims to defend themselves, but completely ignored the other side of the coin - the ones doing the killing against whom we must defend ourselves. Is it such a controversy to mention that yes, US soldiers do kill Muslims and do commit horrible crimes around the world? Take for example the [2006 incident in Mahmudiyyah, Iraq](#), where 5 US soldiers raped a 14 year old girl and killed her and her family. According to what I had taught about preventing evil, it would be the right and the duty of the young girl to defend herself by force, even if it meant killing those 5 soldiers. I should hope that no person would disagree with me on this point, however it seems that the Guardian is suggesting that there is something wrong with this! Just as I mentioned, if you are faced with tyranny and evil then you must stop it, and I added further that this can (and should) be by direct force, whether it included "fighting them, by assassinating their oppressive leaders, by weakening their offensive capabilities". Let us apply the principles

that I outlined to the Mahmudiyyah incident:

Victims - Abeer Qasim Al-Janabi and her family

Perpetrators - 5 US soldiers

Method of stopping evil - Fighting against the soldiers, killing the leader of the group (Steven Dale Green), or by weakening their offence, eg. taking their weapons from them.

Can anyone, especially the writers of the Guardian article, point out to me exactly where the problem is here? Had Abeer and her family been able to do this we'd have a 22 year old girl alive today along with all of her family. Instead however we have a horrific crime carried out by the US Army against Muslims.

It seems however that the right to self-defence that I promoted has been somehow twisted by the Guardian. For example the term 'leader' was turned into 'politician', as if I was calling for the deaths of every small town mayor in the USA who had nothing to do with the killing of Muslims! Please, spare me from this nonsense! Trying to get this from what I wrote is desperate and shameful. Similarly, I did not say that just because 5 soldiers killed the young girl that my non-Muslim uncle living in the North-West of the USA must be killed (or anyone else for that matter), rather I specified that those committing the evil and the leaders commanding it must be stopped, even if it means by killing them in self-defence.

What amazes me is how the call for Muslims to defend ourselves is seen as being something worthy of writing an article about, whereas the tyranny that we are defending ourselves from is never questioned. If Muslims were not being killed, we would have no need to call for self-defence. So the solution is rather simple - stop tyranny, stop killing us. If however the USA continues to do so then we have every right to defend ourselves from their attacks. The next time a US soldier tries to rape a young girl we retain every right to stop the animal from doing so. The next time that the USA attempts bombs a wedding celebration in Yemen we retain the right to self-defence rather than simply being blown to pieces without any attempt at preserving our own lives from such tyranny.

If this is what the Guardian considers to be 'terrorism' then it is shameful and hypocritical. Rather it seems that in the war against Islam being waged by our enemies, that these cowards writing such things try to establish that self-defence is not even a right of the Muslim and that any Muslim who dares even suggest that we should not be slaughtered like sheep without a fight is an 'extremist' and a 'terrorist'.

Again, there is a simple solution to all of this - Don't want to be killed by us when we self-defend? Then stay out of our lands and don't try and kill us, because we, like any human being, will defend ourselves, as much as a surprise as it may be to some...