

EASY MEAT – INSIDE BRITAIN’S GROOMING GANG SCANDAL

A book review by Anne Marie Waters

Also published on: <http://www.annemariewaters.org/easy-meat-inside-britains-grooming-gang-scandal-a-book-review/>

Part one: Islamic Culture

I can’t usually afford the time to write book reviews, but for this one, I had to make an exception. Three in fact; one won’t cover it so this is in three parts.

Easy Meat, by Peter McLoughlin, is about as comprehensive a report in to the horrible phenomenon of so-called “Asian grooming gangs” as has been produced. Published earlier this year, it is an in-depth examination in to this dreadful crime where thousands of girls, some as young as 10 years old, were brutally raped, tortured and pimped by gangs throughout England. These gangs were comprised almost exclusively of Muslim men. Most of the victims were white English girls, but Sikh girls were also often targeted.

The grooming gang scandal burst in to public consciousness with the publication of the Jay report in 2014. It described how at least 1,400 girls had fallen victim to these gangs in the South Yorkshire town of Rotherham alone. As McLoughlin explains in some detail, Rotherham was a drop in the ocean. All over England (and Holland) thousands upon thousands of young girls have been raped and pimped for decades, and with absolute impunity. Furthermore, it is still going on.

Such impunity was the result of the inaction of a public sector terrified of being labeled racist if it mentioned the ethnicity of the men involved. The media furore that followed the Jay report did refer to ethnicity however, and shouldn’t have. Ethnicity is not the issue (except in reference to the victims, who are often selected because they are white), religion is the issue – and Peter McLoughlin is not afraid to say so.

He writes: “Despite the experts knowing that not all the Muslims in Britain who do this are Asian, despite knowing that an almost identical pattern of criminality has been going on in Holland (and that the Muslims in Holland who are doing it are from Turkey and Morocco), the experts refuse to look at Islam as a causal factor, even when there is no other cause that can be seen”. McLoughlin points out that even while denying Islam could have been influential in these crimes, politicians and other authorities simultaneously liaised with Muslim “leaders” in attempts to confront them. As McLoughlin asks “Why did the Home Affairs Committee have input from a Sheikh, but not from a Bishop?”

It is the religious identity of these men that the powerful have not addressed. Instead, the issue is deemed to be one of culture, whilst ignoring the impact of Islam in shaping it.

As is argued in Easy Meat “over hundreds of years the stories, morality and principles from the Koran, the Hadiths, and the Sira (The Life of Mohammed) must have passed in to Islam culture. These principles, values and narratives have affected what Muslims view as right and wrong. These things shape their view of the world”. The statement is powerful, owing to its staggering common sense. Of course Islam and its teachings influence the morality of Muslims, that is a given. It doesn’t mean that all Muslims think or act alike, but Islamic morality is bound to inform the norms of Muslim societies – that indeed is its role.

When they migrate, people do not leave their beliefs behind, and so England finds itself with 100,000s of young men whose morals, and view of women and sex, are informed, to at least some extent, by Islamic teachings and principles. This is precisely why Islam needs to be looked at in the context of the grooming gang crimes, but all relevant authorities simply ruled this out as a possibility.

Peter McLoughlin writes: “Groups like Boko Haram and Islamic State would not be taking young non-Muslim girls as sex-slaves if such behaviour was not found in core Islamic texts as being the behaviour of Mohammed, the founder of Islam”. He points out that those who argue the grooming gang scandal has no relation to Islam never seem able to produce scriptural evidence in support of this. McLoughlin however, has plenty.

Permission for Muslim men to rape female non-Muslims is littered throughout Islamic scripture. A significant verse from the Koran, which refers to female slaves, is this one: We have made lawful to you your wives whom you have given their dowries, and those whom your right hand possesses out of those whom Allah has given to you as prisoners of war’. McLoughlin claims “not only are Muslim men permitted legally and morally to rape their slaves, they are also forgiven if they turn a slave girl in to a prostitute. It is clear, that these kind of Islamic views easily lend themselves to Muslim men seeing women as objects, to be controlled and dominated by men. It would lead them to believe that if some non-Muslim woman within their control could be prostituted, there would be no moral or legal consequences for them within an Islamic world-view.”

Needless to say, he is absolutely right. There is simply no getting away from it, the cultural influence of Islam, and Islamic doctrine itself, must have had an enormous impact on the attitudes of the men involved in rape gangs across England. I know that as I type thousands of young girls are undergoing exactly this very same torment.

Islamic culture, that is culture shaped by Islam to whatever extent, has brought misery to Europe over the last few decades. Sharia, honour violence, jihadism, misogyny, anti-Semitism, and rape. In *Easy Meat*, Peter McLoughlin portrays this methodically. This is not an uplifting or entertaining book, but it is absolutely essential reading. If you want to know just how widespread this crime has been, and the reasons it occurred, then *Easy Meat* is where to begin. It reveals with harrowing clarity just how much Islam has begun to hurt us, and that our leaders and our elite are aiding and abetting in this without shame.

Part Two: Political Correctness

Have you ever read something and felt a kind of relief, an overwhelming sense of ‘at last, someone else gets it’? I felt that way a hundred times when reading Peter McLoughlin’s *Easy Meat*, but nowhere moreso than when I read this: “Could political correctness really be so powerful that it could allow this child-care scandal to persist and flourish for decades? We should not underestimate the power of this mental straight-jacket. People often refer to political correctness in humorous terms, but in reality it is no laughing matter. Political correctness is a sinister device constructed by the Left to ensure that negative outcomes of Left-wing ideology are never subject to criticism”.

The first part of my *Easy Meat* review can be read here [<http://www.pegidauk.org/v1/news/44-easy-meat-part-one>]. It’s an unmissable book. It takes all aspects of the grooming gang scandal and dismantles them for ease of consumption, but the chapter ‘Abuse of the narrative of racism’ is a particular highlight. The gang-rapes in Rotherham and elsewhere occurred for a variety of reasons, it was I’ve written before, a perfect storm. One of the primary causes however was the insidious creep of political correctness and once again, McLoughlin is not afraid to say so.

Very few things are wholly and entirely dangerous, including political correctness. I don't particularly want to return to a society where black people put up with denigration, or women are patted on the backside at work. But as usual, there was no need for this distortion to have taken place. Basic decency and respect for each other would also have rid of us of racism, sexism, or homophobia, so there was no need for us to reach a point where even the truth becomes subject to offence, subject to what someone else deems acceptable. That is exactly what political correctness has done, that is why it is poison. The truth has become subject to political convenience and political positioning, so that when it is inconvenient to the governing Left, the truth is concealed and to hell with the consequences. Thousands of girls were raped and tortured because the truth was suppressed, and the truth was suppressed because it was politically dangerous for the Left. This is entirely unforgivable, and it ought to finally bury political correctness in the dark crevices of history where it belongs.

Political correctness isn't about being nice to each other, much as its proponents like to assert while standing on their self-constructed moral high ground, it is a tool of compliance that has, as McLoughlin explains, been utilised by the far Left wherever and whenever it has power. It is a tool of oppression and subjugation, nothing less. The phrase emerged from the far Leninist Left and denotes those who steadfastly adhere to the party line. It presents us with a list of the acceptable and the unacceptable. Whatever doesn't favour and advance Left-wing thinking is placed firmly in the camp of the unacceptable. In practice, this has been applied nowhere more disgustingly than with regard to Islam and Muslim immigration. The Left wanted Britain's borders open to a religion and culture that is entirely incompatible with ours. When the terrible consequences of this folly were felt, those consequences had to be hidden or damage to Labour's vote share would have been the result.

As described in Easy Meat "having encouraged Muslim immigration to the UK without any national debate concerning the nature of Islam and how Islamic values conflict with those of the indigenous population, the socialist government determined that Islam should not be criticised". Peter McLoughlin provides shocking examples of repeated attempts by Labour to outlaw, to criminalise, anything that was deemed insulting to Muslims. This is not only because Labour so desperately needs the Muslim vote, but it is also to ensure that the misery that Islam causes is kept out of public discussion. This would undermine multiculturalism, it would highlight the sheer stupidity of the global borderless delusion, and most importantly of all, it would prove some of Labour's opponents were right.

According to McLoughlin, the rape of the girls in Rotherham and elsewhere was ignored at least partly because the British National Party (BNP) had raised the issue, and rather than prove them right, Labour (overwhelmingly) thought rape was preferable. The girls involved, or their families, simply did not matter one iota. Labour could not allow the BNP to have a valid point. That the truth remains true regardless of who tells it, does not inform this kind of thinking. The truth is irrelevant, appearances matter more. That is the poison at the heart of political correctness. It is all-pervasive and it is serious, so much so that police intervened to prevent a media broadcast in 2004.

Edge of the City, a Channel 4 documentary about child sex grooming, was withdrawn from broadcast because "a variety of pressure groups, along with West Yorkshire Police, attempted to block" the film from being shown. To quote the Guardian: "Groups such as Unite Against Fascism, the 1990 Trust, and the National Assembly Against Racism began to flood Channel 4 with requests to delay transmission. The Chief constable of West Yorkshire, Colin Cramphorn, joined the call, and Channel 4 complied.". Peter McLoughlin describes how Channel 4 denied their decision to pull the documentary was to prevent the BNP making political gains. Whether one believes this or not might be considered a matter of opinion, but regardless of reasons, the implications are shocking.

It is clear that information is being held from public view for political reasons, and the police are ensuring that nothing troublesome can be seen. It matters not that the broadcast of such a documentary might actually help stop this crime from happening, it matters not that the public have a right to know (particularly girls) about a predator in their midst, it matters not how many will suffer – What matters is politics, what matters is political correctness.

Easy Meat is clear and informative book. It lays before the reader the pernicious and poisonous underbelly of the grooming gang scandal – the misogynistic culture of Islam, the political correctness that hid the truth, and in part three of this review, I will look at perhaps the most toxic of them, what these girls had truly fallen victim to... they were, as Peter McLoughlin argues, the victims of multiculturalism.

Part Three: Multiculturalism

When I and others correctly point out that world cultures are often vastly different, and in hugely important respects entirely incompatible, I and others will inevitably be called bigots, Islamophobes, racists, the usual.

What could be more different or incompatible than democracy and theocracy? What could be more different or incompatible than freedom of speech and death for blasphemy? What could be more different or incompatible than women and men having the same civil rights and women being the legal property of men who decide how their lives should be lived? What could be more different or incompatible than freedom for homosexuals and death for homosexuals?

I'll point out the obvious again: these things will not live side by side – it is either one or the other. There is no middle ground. In Muslim majority countries, blasphemy is usually illegal and often carries the death penalty, same for homosexuality, and to say that women are treated badly is the understatement of the millennium. Leaders and lefty journalists may continue to deny the incompatibility of Islam and democracy, but they very much speak with forked tongue. The people who are the most vocal advocates for multiculturalism know and acknowledge the existence of incompatible cultures, that's why they came up with multiculturalism in the first place. The difference between the pro and anti-multiculturalism sides is that the pro side sees nothing wrong in other people's cultures, regardless of oppressive or cruel they might be. All are equal. In effect, they do not distinguish between right and wrong, while questioning the morals of people who do.

This is the third part of my review of the brilliant book Easy Meat, by Peter McLoughlin. In the first two parts, I described how McLoughlin detailed some of the main causes of the mass rape of young girls in Rotherham and all over England: misogynistic Islamic doctrine, political correctness, and the one I believe to be near-top of the sinister list, the deceptive and immoral notion of multiculturalism.

Peter McLoughlin described the victims of mass rape by Muslim gangs across the country as being victims of multiculturalism. He wrote:

Modern multiculturalism has been a short-sighted and cowardly doctrine, designed to suppress the conflicts between value systems of different cultures. It has meant that for 20 to 50 years, there has been mounting pressure (driven by a metropolitan elite who mostly live in middle-class, monocultural, Anglophone enclaves) to suppress any signs of the cultural conflict between the host culture and some antagonistic minority cultures. In the context of the suppression of information on the grooming gangs, thousands of innocent schoolgirls have had their lives ruined, ruined in ways that most British people thought ended in the distant past. These schoolgirls were sacrificed so that the middle-class, monocultural elite did not have to entertain the disturbing idea that some cultures

think slavery is legitimate, or that a 50 year old man having sex with a 9 year old girl is an act of piety.

To describe the young girls in Rotherham and elsewhere as having been sacrificed is entirely accurate. These rapes, as well as countless other crimes, were allowed to carry on largely to protect the notion that while cultures are different (hence multiculturalism), all the bad parts of other cultures have to be ignored and the message that multiculturalism is a positive experience of shared lives must be the only one in the mainstream public square. Critics of multiculturalism would, as usual, be smeared as racist.

Multiculturalism advocates are obsessed with protecting the ‘we are all the same’ delusion (while simultaneously celebrating “diversity”) and it is one of great con-tricks of the age. Not only do multis refuse to recognize cultural practices as deeply immoral, they insist that all immorality is equally immoral.

Take for example the leftists already arguing that homophobia in general is responsible for the gay-club slaughter in Orlando. This position doesn’t recognize that homophobia is worse in Muslim-majority societies than in any other: ‘gays face the same problems everywhere’ is the rather bizarre thinking. Just like post-Cologne when leftist multiculturalists jostled to be the first to put it down to misogyny as a whole, the same borderless fantasies are the prompt.

There are no borders, no countries, no national common cultures, no distinct historical developments that inevitably result in varied belief systems, none of this – we are all equal (but lets celebrate diversity).

Like political correctness, multiculturalism is simply a tool utilized by the left-dominated mainstream to disguise truths while causing confusion by simultaneously, and by definition, acknowledging those same truths. The truth is that some cultures simply will not mix, and this is acknowledged by virtue of the existence of multiculturalism itself. A further truth is that some cultures are brutal and violent while others are not, this truth is the one being disguised in service to a political ideal of “equality”; if people suffer, multiculturalism simply does not care.

Easy Meat is a must-read. It’s the most detailed examination of this tragic set of circumstances I have seen. It lays down the harsh reality – this violent conflict was always going to happen with mass global migration, and the efforts of our leaders have gone in to distorting the truth about it than they have in to preventing the conflict.