

## Hatred for the ideology not the follower

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 22 November 2017 09:34

---

I was very surprised by an otherwise astute close relative a few days ago, when she said Donald Trump was a “Very, very evil man”.

She was on the way out the door so we didn't have time to chat about such a media-driven leftist-reaction.

About ten years ago I went to interview Rick Stein the chef and had a tour of his various eateries and chef school in Padstow, Cornwall.

Then, tonight, I was watching a Rick Stein cookery programme, which I always enjoy. This time he was in Mexico.

What my relative said came to mind as I watched Rick chatting with ordinary Mexicans, and I wondered if my readers understand who I stand against at times. For example, when I praise Trump for wanting to build a wall to stop Mexicans getting to the USA, do readers understand that I am against the illegals, not against the whole Mexican nation?? I have said so a number of times... but has it registered?

Back in the mid-90s, I stood against charismaticism extremely strongly and was generally condemned for it by my peers... except for the many thousands of Christians who were terrified and dismayed by the new movement. Though charismaticism is unbiblical, I was not speaking against genuine believers who happened to join charismatic churches, because I saw them as deceived.

However, I DID speak against die-hard charismatics who adopted the full unbiblical teachings of the movement, because what they said, thought and did was fully orbbed satanic wickedness.

But, how many readers understood this distinction? Those who happen to have fallen into a charismatic church may be untaught, and certainly are misled, but I can at least speak with them gently. But, die-hard charismatics are not even saved. They are not Christians, but

## Hatred for the ideology not the follower

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 22 November 2017 09:34

---

deceivers. Do readers understand the distinctions I made?

Then we have the latest condemnation of Islam. As I have said many times, the Muslims who entered Britain in the fifties-eighties were genuinely looking for work and integrated. They did not push their false religion down our throats. So little was said. But, after that time along came Islamic agitators, and their numbers are increasing rapidly. Now, I am forced to speak against them, and MUST caution everyone against Islam AND against Muslims, even if they are presently quiet.

My personal approach is very simple – if they do nothing to me I will respond to individual Muslims as I would anyone else. As I have said, the difference in their attitudes towards me (and others) has changed remarkably in just a few years. Whereas they would smile and return my greeting, now they look away, or to the floor, and do not reply, looking sullen. Given the attacks made by Muslims at random moments, their change in attitude puts me on edge, so I cannot any longer trust them to be okay. Even though I KNOW most Muslims in the country are okay.

Do readers understand that my complaint and warnings are against Islam and those Muslims who are obviously anti-West (and therefore anti-me), and not against all Muslims? Whilst I cannot trust ANY Muslim today, I quickly assess them when they come near me or when I speak with them. I would do this in the rougher parts of my own city where my own locals live! It is caution and self-preservation! But, do my readers understand the differences I portray?

There is, however, a rising problem with the latter people. That is, with agitation by 'true Islamists' on the rise, and growing Islamic terror and social power-plays (e.g. praying in the street, blocking off all traffic and entry by westerners, and no-go areas), we must now be very realistic and clamp-down on Islam and Muslims. In my mind I link this with the second book of Kings and how God condemned the pagans of the day (from which arose Islam and Allah). In the West we have allowed our own downfall by letting into our countries pagan followers who God absolutely hates. Yes, He hates Muslims, no matter how quiet or vicious they may be. Hence my warnings and condemnation of allowing Muslims to enter the west and occupy it, changing the ethos into Islamic totalitarianism that hates the Lord.

Friends, do you understand all these distinctions? I am certainly not a racist, nor a hater of false religionists. Rather, I loathe their false religions (there are thousands of false religions, but I believe Islam is the only one that teaches hatred for God and Christians, and calls for our

## Hatred for the ideology not the follower

Written by K B Napier

Wednesday, 22 November 2017 09:34

---

murder – hence my warnings). I do not hate anyone. But I do hate what they believe or teach or enact.

If these distinctions are not understood, is it because of the readers' own hates and prejudices added to what I write? Or, is it caused by my writing being badly explained? I honestly believe I have explained what I write about plainly. So, please read carefully and understand any differences I might speak of, which can sometimes be subtle, and often glaringly obvious. Otherwise the things I speak of will have no power or application. As a basic pointer, I do not love those who hate God and who worship false gods. That is, as a whole.

But, I am often led by the Spirit to speak kindly to individuals within those movements, sometimes with no reason given by the Lord.