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ABSTRACT

In 2006, sixty-one percent of the young adults of America felt that Islam was a peaceful religion. Fifty-six percent had a favorable opinion of Islam and fifty-one percent feel Islam teaches respect of others. Only ten percent felt prejudice against Arabs and Muslims.¹

Some, perhaps, are encouraged by these numbers, for it appears that our young adults are growing up to be a very tolerant people. Most of our youth, after all, have repeatedly

been told by our national leaders, "Islam is a peaceful religion." If this is true, why should we not reciprocate? In some ways, this is very commendable. All should strongly agree that one should not be prejudiced against anyone because of their nationality. But what if Islam is not a peaceful religion? What if it is not tolerant or respectful of others? What if, in fact, the religion teaches prejudice against anyone who is not Islamic and requires true Muslims to struggle against the infidel until the infidel is subdued? Then, perhaps, the older generation is not intolerant, as they may initially appear. But rather, they may simply not be naive having experienced more history and watched more news. As most of the elderly will tell you, youth has many wonderful advantages, but life experience is not one of them. Six out of ten of the older generation believes Islam is not peaceful. Seven out of ten look unfavorably upon Islam, believing it does not respect others. Put more directly, many of the older generation surveyed think that Islam is a violent and intolerant religion. If Islam is a violent, intolerant, expansionist religion, then this younger generation and the subsequent generations will make themselves increasingly vulnerable to the onslaught of Islam if they do not think clearly and respond accordingly. Who is analyzing the situation more correctly? What are the consequences for embracing each view? How can an objective person determine which view to hold? This study seeks to answer such questions. The best way to determine whether or not Islam is a peaceful religion is to look at Islam's leaders, its literature, its theology and its history. The body of this study will do just that, beginning with the pre-Islamic world, the life of Muhammad, the four caliphs, the Umayyads, the Abbasids, the period of fragmentation of Islamic lands, the Ottomans, Islam in the 20th century, and finally an examination of the present. Beginning with a Judeo-Christian perspective, this study demonstrates that
Islam is bad theology and a profoundly bad actor in history. This study is a reasonable polemic against authentic historic Islam with an awareness that Jesus came to redeem every person on this earth, including Muslims. Many Muslims are profoundly devout, but devoted to a heretical, ineffective, and oppressive theology. Christians can no longer ignore Islam, for it is reemerging on the world scene and the consequences of apathy or ambivalence will be profound.

Discussion Questions:

1. What age group is most positive towards Islam?
2. What age group is least positive towards Islam?
3. Why the difference? (Include in your discussion the concepts of prejudice and naiveté.)
4. What sources of information would help determine whose analysis is correct?
5. What is the politically correct position and what do the P.C. think of those who disagree with them?
6. What are the potential consequences of the P.C. position to individuals and Western Civilization if Islam is not a peaceful tolerant religion at its core?
7. Is apathy a defensible or responsible position?
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PREFACE

If you are reading this curriculum, you are probably of secondary high school age in a Christian school or church. This material is written specifically with you in mind. If the topic of comparative religion is not completely ignored, then students your age generally are just introduced to a variety of "isms" and ideologies. It is the role and responsibility of the parent, the church, and the school to give you some historical and theological information about Islam. By sharing some of the brutal facts about the history and theology of Islam, some will say this is prejudicing you with "an unfavorable opinion or feeling formed beforehand or without knowledge, thought, or reason."\(^2\) If done correctly, this is actually giving you an accurate perspective, "the faculty of seeing all the relevant data in a meaningful relationship."\(^3\) Understanding the relationship that has existed between Islam and biblical Christianity since Islam's inception, prepares you for genuine and honest interaction. This is not being done without "knowledge, thought or reason." This is actually being done on purpose to prepare and protect you for the challenges that you and your generation will have to address. Rewriting history or playing down theology is dishonest and potentially dangerous for decision making. This work is from a Bible honoring perspective. From that perspective, it is clear that while we often use


similar vocabulary, the theology of Muhammad and Islam, at its central core, is completely different than the Bible. The application of this theology has been oppressive to all Islam has encountered and conquered. In many cases, the consequences of being a practitioner of Islam is profoundly sad, both in the here-and-the-hereafter. It puts humans on a religious treadmill, forcing them into unnatural attitudes, beliefs and behaviors. The case against Muhammad and Islam as "a departure from established [Biblical] beliefs or standards" \(^4\) and violent is fairly easy to establish and has much documentation to support this throughout its fourteen hundred year history. Between the two sins of anger and apathy there is much more of the latter than the former. The questions many need to ask themselves are the following: "Do I care if Islam is a false and violent religion that is currently being embraced by many in America?" "So what difference does it make to me if I do not care?" "Apathy cannot kill you, can it?" As followers of Jesus, you should care; it does make a difference, and apathy can kill. This study will make a case as to why you should care.

Hopefully, you have neighbors, friends or classmates that are Muslim. If you do, they are probably much more like you in many more ways than they are different from you. Everyone likes to be liked and treated with respect. Imagine how you would feel if you were the only Christian in a Muslim school. It would be difficult at best; as a Christian, it is good to be sensitive and supportive to all students, but especially to those you know are coming from a different culture. The last chapter of the book deals with suggestions on how to have a positive ministry with your Muslim friends. But the real intended audience

---

is you, the Christian high school student. The information you learn in this study is intended to do several things. First, to protect you from the idea that Islam is a religion you might possibly consider following. Amazing as it may seem, nominal or notional Christians have been known to convert to Islam. This is especially true for those who fall in love with a Muslim and wanting to win or please their spouse are willing to convert to Islam thinking Islam is like Christianity. Katrina, a former Miss Alabama, and author of Married to Muhammad, spoke at the high school where I taught. She shared how a handsome Muslim man showered her with love and attention. The transcript below comes from her interview with Scott Ross of the 700 Club.

SCOTT ROSS. At any time during your dating process did the spiritual roots of your life–i.e. Jesus Christ–come into the equation anywhere?

KATRINA. Absolutely

He . . . [Muhammad] kept telling me . . it was the same God, just a different language, that Allah was the same God as the God I served. I was in love with the guy. I say that love is not blind, it’s deaf and dumb also.

SCOTT ROSS. Did your family attend?

KATRINA. No, I didn’t tell my family. He’d say, 'Are you an adult or a child? Are you going to do what your Mom says the rest of your life, or are you going to go with the man of dreams?' I thought the Middle East was somewhere in the middle of the country. I thought that Muslims were Ali Baba and the 40 thieves and the magic carpet ride. I was clueless!

The whole wedding was done in Arabic.

SCOTT ROSS. So you didn’t understand what you were doing?

KATRINA. I didn’t understand anything. It was intriguing, the mystique of the whole thing.

SCOTT ROSS. Anything there give you pause? Anything that you committed to?

**KATRINA.** When I came out of the wedding ceremony, I saw that not only had my name been changed, but my religion had been changed also. I’d become a Muslim. . .

14 years later . . .

[Financially Katrina was cared for, Muhammad owned 20 furniture stores and she was showered with money but it did not satisfy. When Muhammad would get mad at her he would follow the Qur'anic practice of beating her: " . . . the good women are therefore obedient, . . . and (as to) those on whose part you fear desertion, admonish them, and leave them alone in the sleeping-places and beat them. . . " (Surah 4.34). Katrina had four children with Muhammad, which he expected to be raised Islamic. In time Katrina asked him if he hated Christianity and America so much then why did he and each of his brothers marry Christian women. The response is shocking.]

**KATRINA.** He told me point blank that if we can’t take this country by force, we’ll take our time and take it through marriage. Islam doesn’t want the U.S., or even Israel. They want the world.

**SCOTT ROSS.** What do you tell women who are considering converting to marry a man who is a Muslim?

**KATRINA.** Don’t do it. There’s no evangelistic dating. You’re not going get him saved, I’m telling you. God doesn’t put unequally yoked people together. If you think this is the man for you, he doesn’t even know love, because Jesus is love. 6

After reading this, the decision to date and marry a Muslim should be much more
difficult for you to make. Second, I hope this study prepares you to empathetically pray
for and effectively love and witness to Muslims whenever you get the opportunity.

Third, this study should aid you in understanding your world better, especially, Islam,
Islamic history and vocabulary, Western Civilization, geography and American history
and politics. Remember, this curriculum is written from a Biblical perspective. Much of
the curriculum and content one commonly reads or hears is from a multiculturalist
perspective. Multiculturalists believe all religions are the same and that Bible believing

Christians are as dangerous or extreme as fundamentalist Muslims.

What this curriculum is NOT intended to do is to give you embarrassing facts about Muhammad and Islam so you may in turn use the facts as clubs in an attempt to discredit or embarrass sincere believing Muslims. May the Lord rebuke you if you do such a thing! Such conduct will put a wedge between you, representing Christianity, and them. This may encourage them in developing bitterness towards all Christians making them harder to reach with the Gospel of Jesus. It may also result in your physical harm.

Blasphemy of Muhammad is punishable by life imprisonment or death in some Islamic countries.7 Remember when you took driver's education? The instructor taught you how to drive safely because he wanted to protect and prepare you to drive safely through real life situations and to avoid crashes. Nevertheless, it was up to you to do what you were taught or consequences do follow. A car is a great joy but it can also be a tool of your destruction or others. Drive safely! Use this information wisely!

Without being explicit or morbid for gratuitous sake (that is “without apparent reason, cause, or justification”8) several stark cruel facts about Islam are presented for several reasons. Many of you may have no real opinion about Islam. The gross or explicit facts are included to remove all doubt from your soul (i.e. your mind, will or emotion) as to the false nature of Islam. It is up to you, with the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to learn how to share the truth of the gospel, in a forthright and loving manner with those who are

7 Christian Solidarity Worldwide, February, 1999, "Blasphemy Laws In Pakistan,” “Commonly known as the blasphemy law, section 295C of the Pakistan Penal Code 1860 stipulates that any person who ‘by words, either spoken or written, or by visible representations, or by any imputation, innuendo, or insinuation, directly or indirectly’ defiles the name of the Islamic Prophet, Mohammad, is liable for blasphemy. In additional to a fine, he shall be punished with the death sentence or imprisonment for life.” http://www.cswusa.com/Countries/Pakistan-blasphemylaws.htm. (accessed July 7, 2009).
sincerely, but unwisely, committed to a historically heretical and violent faith.

Christianity is spread by the appeal of the truth, not by bullying, embarrassing or the sword. If you start to share your faith with a Muslim and you discover they do not want to hear it, stop! Be content planting a seed or watering a seed. Only God brings the growth. The harvest may come years later. Be salt and light not a sledgehammer. You probably have no idea what price becoming a Christian may cost your Muslim friend or acquaintance, or what their becoming a Christian may do to the relationship they have with their family or community. This is serious business. Leave room for the Holy Spirit. Hopefully through this study you will come to appreciate what a great cost many Moslems pay when they accept Jesus as their Savior.

Potentially, this study could produce anger in you. If so, " in your anger do not sin. . . search your hearts and be silent" (Psalm 4.1-4, Ephesians 4.26). Also, this study may cause you to become fearful of Islam. Remember "perfect love casts out fear" and Jesus said, "Surely I am with you always, to the very end of the age." (Matt. 28:20 ).

Succumbing to anger and fear could eventually destroy you and any potential ministry you might have with Muslim classmates or acquaintances. James, the brother of Jesus writes,

"My dear brothers, take note of this. Everyone should be quick to listen, slow to speak and slow to become angry, "for man's anger does not bring about the righteous life that God desires. "Therefore, get rid of all moral filth and the evil that is so prevalent and humbly accept the word planted in you, which can save you. (1.19-21)

What this study wants to accomplish is to encourage courage; to inspire you to boldly, lovingly and with empathy to be ambassadors and perhaps genuine friends for

Jesus to Muslims. The Apostle Paul, no stranger to the challenges of witnessing to emotional detractors asked his fellow Christians to.

"Pray also for me, that whenever I open my mouth, words may be given me so that I will fearlessly make known the mystery of the gospel, for which I am an ambassador in chains. Pray that I may declare it fearlessly, as I should (Ephesians 6.19-20).

How I Researched the Curriculum.

My research and inspiration for this curriculum has come from five sources. First, it started quite naturally by attending history classes in junior and high school, and by watching the news. Second, by traveling to the Middle East, Europe, and Israel, I had my interest piqued as I saw the different faiths interacting. Jerusalem is not really a city of peace but a city of pieces divided between Jewish, Christian and Muslim. Third, by having students in my classes like David and Fariba, both of whom became devout Christians. Fourth, by reading the Qur'an, the Hadith, and dozens of books about Islam from a variety of perspectives. In fact, this research is being done to complete work on a Doctor of Ministry Degree at Liberty University. Finally, by having the opportunity to take classes from a knowledgeable Christian scholar like Ergun Mehmet Caner. Caner was raised a devout Muslim, but accepted Christ as his Savior and Lord because of a student like you, who persistently invited Ergun to youth activity after youth activity, never giving up. This student was used by the Holy Spirit to change Ergun's world; now Ergun is blessing the Christian world by sharing insights into Islam from a biblical perspective. Without this opportunity this thesis would surely be on a different subject.

My first introduction to Islam was in junior high, when Mr. Gregory began to talk about Islam. I wish he had drawn my attention to the events that had occurred five years before my birth on May 14, 1948 when Israel had become a nation. Many Christians
today believe that Israel becoming a nation again, after almost 2,000 years, was a fulfillment of Ezekiel's prophecy in chapter 37. The new nation of Israel was born, but was nearly strangled in her crib by Islam. The very next day, May 15, 1948, Israel was attack by five Arab nations (Jordon, Lebanon, Iraq, Egypt, and Syria). Many would say Israel miraculously survived. What I do remember Mr. Gregory telling us was that when he was younger, he had actually traveled to Saudi Arabia, posing as a Muslim, and participated in the Hajj as if he were a true Muslim. We asked him what would have happened if he would have been discovered. He said that he would have been killed. That story is over forty years old, but I still remember the wonder and excitement his clandestine trip evoked in me. At age thirteen, no one drew my attention to the Six Day War of June 5-10, 1967, but it is an inspiring story that merits further study. Again, Israel is outnumbered and yet survives against incredible odds.

In October of 1973, one year out of high school, I remember I had to wait in line to get gasoline for my car on an odd or even day. My turn was based on my license plate ending in an odd or even number because of a gasoline shortage in the United States. The Islamic countries of Egypt and Syria had attacked Israel, in what is called the Yom Kippur War (i.e. Day of Atonement), on Oct. 16-26, 1973, hoping to exterminate, expel or place Israel in a dhimmi (i.e. subjugated taxable) status. Much planning had gone

---


into this battle but again, some would say miraculously, Israel defeats these two Islamic armies. The Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), decided to stop shipping oil to the United States between October 17, 1973-March 18, 1974, to punish the U.S. for its support of Israel's right to exist. Gasoline prices in the United States jumped from 30 cents a gallon to $1.20 cents a gallon.\textsuperscript{12} Israel defeated this Islamic coalition and took control of the Golan Heights of Northern Syria, which had been used to shell Israel, and the Sinai Peninsula of Egypt. Israel gave back the Sinai in 1982 in a good faith effort to exchange land for peace. Egypt got the land but Israel did not get the peace. The year 1979 marks a year of many Islamic conflicts. I remember the Russian Invasion of Afghanistan and the United States' support for the Mujahideen (i.e. Muslims involved in a jihad or struggle with infidels) against the Russians giving them three billion dollars worth of aid. Russia's defeat was largely due to the weapons the United States gave these fundamentalist Muslims to fight the atheistic Marxists. That same year the Americans watched for 444 consecutive days as Iranian student revolutionaries held U.S. embassy workers captive. Amadinejad (who was an Iranian revolutionary student at the time) is the current president of Iran who ordered the cruel suppression of mostly peaceful demonstrators who opposed his apparent stealing of the Iranian election in June 2009. In 1979 and 1980, President Carter initially seemed unwilling and later unable to secure our hostages release. The Iranian religious leader and revolutionary, Khomeini, called Carter the "Great Satan" and treated him with contempt. The hostages were eventually released the day Carter left office and President Reagan took office. Khomeini

knew Reagan had a different philosophy about dealing with terrorism. In March 26, 1979, there was great fanfare when Menachem Begin of Israel, Jimmy Carter of the United States, and Anwar Sadat of Egypt signed the Camp David Accords.\textsuperscript{13} However, on October 6, 1981, Anwar Sadat was assassinated during a military parade\textsuperscript{14} by Islamic fundamentalists for signing this treaty with Israel.

In the early 70s, Muslims hijacked a number of planes (1970, 1973, 1974) and made certain demands. On June 24, 1985, I distinctly remember the hijacking of a TWA Pilot John Testrake\textsuperscript{15} and Flight 847\textsuperscript{16} from Athens, Greece to Rome, Italy. Testrake’s head was stuck out the window and a pistol pointed at it. After a death of one of the hostages and before the rest of the hostages were killed, Israel volunteered to release 700 Shiite terrorists they were holding in exchange for the pilot, crew and passengers. There are many more points of conflict but for the sake of brevity, let us jump ahead to 9/11/2001. Like the previous generation remembers Pearl Harbor, this generation will remember the sneak attack on 9/11. By this time most of us in the West had grown up recognizing that ongoing conflict with fundamentalist Islam was common and it was generally

\textsuperscript{15} Youtube, June 14, 1985, "Today In History For Saturday, June 14th," http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1jrInYjuO0/ (accessed August 27, 2009).
\textsuperscript{16} www.daylife.com/photo/01rv5YddFdlw/ (accessed July 1, 2009).
waged against soft non-military targets. Consequently, I was and am still supportive of President George W. Bush's strong approach in dealing with yet another attack on non-combatants in the 9/11 terrorist attack. Osama Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri gave Bush little choice. Osama Bin Laden wrote an open theological polemic to the Saudi peoples entitled, *Moderate Islam Is a Prostration to the West*. Bin Laden wrote this in response to a post 9/11 publication of the Saudis, *How We Can Coexist*. Bin Laden declares,

I take issue against this declaration on many counts. . . I do not claim to pause at every error, for these far exceed what I focus on. Nonetheless, I do take issue with a number of them. Whatever I do rightly is from Allah' whatever I err in is from myself and Satan. . . The declaration came at a most inopportune time. Indeed, we had expected from ones such as these a speech to incite the zeal of the men of the Islamic umma [i.e. Islamic community] to defend their religion, way of life, and blood. . . but instead of us finding messages empowering the world's helpless through all legitimate (Islamic) means, we find that they have lost their way and issued a state that, in short, consists of entreaties and supplications to the West. 

Raymond Ibrahim, the translator of this writing analyzes it as follows,

al-Qaeda's condemnation of the Saudi position is perhaps best viewed as "Radical Islam's" condemnation of "Moderate Islam." Indeed al-Qaeda's main gripe throughout the entire essay has to do with the principles of moderate Islam, which the Saudis claim to uphold in their letter (thereby "prostrating" themselves to appease the West). So while this essay is ostensibly little more than an irate letter from one group of Muslims to another, on a more transcendent level it is a doctrinal denunciation of the very concept of moderate Islam. (This is a critical matter, since moderate Islam is often seen as essential for peace between Islam and the rest of the world.) Al-Qaeda's argument is that "radical" Islam is Islam- without exception.

Bin Laden wrote to the Saudis and challenged them to tell us in the West the truth about Islam. Bin Laden wrote,

There are only three choices in Islam, either willing submission; or payment of the jizya, thereby physical, though not spiritual, submission to the authority of Islam; or the sword-for it is not right to let him [an infidel] live. The matter is summed up for every person alive; either submit, or live under the suzerainty of Islam, or die. Thus it behooves the [Saudi] signatories to clarify this matter to the West- otherwise they

---

18 Ibid., 19
will be like those who believe in part of the Book while rejecting the rest.\textsuperscript{19}

President Bush initially recognized appeasement was not working. Islam seemed to respect or at least respond more appropriately to strength than it does to perceived weakness. Dore Gold, Ph.D. in Middle East Studies from Columbia, former ambassador to the United Nations for Israel and as an adviser for Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel, had this to say about various approaches to the Middle East crises.

The difference in approaches is reminiscent of the distinction

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., 42
columnist Charles Krauthammer once drew between the Carter administration's overall foreign policy goal (producing international agreements) and that of the Reagan administration (defending U.S. national interests). The point here is not to take sides in U.S. partisan politics, but rather to demonstrate that fundamentally different approaches exist to solving vexing diplomatic issues, some of which are more successful than others.  

Traveling to the Middle East was interesting and insightful. I was able to observe Islamic people in a number of Islamic, Israeli and European cities as I made trips to Europe and the Middle East in 2000, 2007 and 2008. In 2000, travels took me to Athens, Greece, Crete, Patmos, Turkey, Egypt, the Sinai Peninsula and inside the Al-Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock Mosque in Israel. I remember being in Cairo and very politely requesting (by motioning to my camera) permission to take the picture of an Egyptian woman. The woman's response was an angry hissing and waving of her arms. No translation necessary. I went back to Israel in 2007 and a third time back to Greece in 2008. These trips have all enriched my understanding and interest in the Mediterranean area and in the study of Islam. However, even as I look forward to making another trip to Israel, I must confess I agree with Muhammad in the Hadith when "The Prophet... said, 'Travelling is a kind of torture as it prevents one from eating, drinking and sleeping (properly). So, when one's needs are fulfilled, one should return quickly to one's family."  

My few personal encounters with Muslims and former Moslems came through my classroom. It was a joy and an education to have several Muslim and former Moslem students in my classes. They were all fine young men and women. David from Pakistan

22 Muhammad Muhsin Khan (Translator), *The Translation of the Meanings of Sahih Al-
and Fariba from Iran both accepted Jesus Christ as their Lord and Savior. David and his mother and brother did so while living in Pakistan. David was electrically shocked and his older brother shot (but not fatally) by their father for becoming Christians. Later, David's father died fighting against the United States in Afghanistan. David shared that many in Pakistan were addicted to the heroin of the poppies grown there but did not have needles, so they would cut themselves and pour the powder directly into the open wound. David was a young man of tremendous faith and courage. At the time I knew him he wanted to grow up and become a translator for the U.S.A. The Hadith clearly and repeatedly states that those who leave Islam should be put to death. "Allah's Apostle, 'Whoever changed his Islamic religion, then kill him.'" 23 Allah's Apostle said, "The blood of a Muslim who confesses that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and that I am His Apostle, cannot be shed except in three cases. . . [third case] the one who reverts from Islam (apostate) and leaves the Muslims." 24 Unfortunately there are many examples of this honor killing. This threat upon converted Muslims' lives is still understood by all those who have left Islam, and is one reason you do not see congregations full of former Muslims which would unfortunately make them easy targets for Islamic terrorists.

Fariba shared that short sleeved shirts were not allowed in Iran and that one man would train a 50 caliber gun on you from the back of a jeep where they had been patrolling looking for infractions in the code, while another would take out a can of spray

---


24 Ibid.
paint and spray the offending uncovered arms. I heard of the same thing being done in
Saudi Arabia from an exchange teacher there. Fariba shared that during the Iraq-Iran war
even children of Iran were being encouraged to join in the war effort and parents were
given a refrigerator if they had their children sign up for war. Apparently some workers
in the refrigerator factory took offense at this. The newspapers carried stories of the
parents who when opened the door of the new refrigerators, some of them had been
rigged to pull a pin from a grenade and the parent was then killed. Fariba also said that if
a girl wanted to go to the university, investigators would come around and ask the
neighbors if the girl had been wearing eye make-up or listening to Western music. Those
were two offenses that would prohibit one from being permitted to attend the university.
As a fifteen year old, Fariba took her money and crossed the Turkish border, narrowly
escaping rape by a drunken Turkish border guard. She caught a flight to LAX airport
looking for her older brother who had immigrated to the U.S. She arrived in Los Angeles
not speaking a word of English. She was eventually given legal status as a refugee and
made her way to Portland, Oregon where she was adopted by the history teacher at
Portland Christian Schools. She was a remarkably courageous young lady.

My academic study of Islam began in earnest three years ago when I began reading
and writing papers on Islam for a variety of elective apologetic and theology classes. By
now the number of these books on Islam fill several shelves of my library. The books are
written from a variety of perspectives on Islam. These shelves include, of course, the
Qur'an and the nine volumes of the Hadith (i.e. memories of what Muhammad said and
did by those who loved and followed him). These Hadith were originally collected by
Sahih Al-Bukhari and have be carefully translated by Dr. Muhammad Muhsin Khan and
published in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. I have books written by Muslims who profess Islam as the true path and the West as the problem provoking Islam. There are books written by "moderate" Muslims who believe Islam is a great religion but needs to be tinkered with. They blame fundamentalists for the rise in conflict. There are books written by theologically liberal Christian or atheistic authors who promote multiculturalism and moral equivalency. These books/authors deny any contribution to this nation from biblical Christianity and deny any consequences from opening the door to Islam. Some advocate the reducing of religious tensions by suggesting to Islam and Christianity that they both allegorize their theologies. There are books written by Christians and Jews who were raised under or suffered under Islamic jihads. There are books written by Christians and secularists who are very alarmed at the growth of Islam in Europe and the West. These authors are genuinely concerned about what the future holds if the West does not awaken and reaffirm her Judeo-Christian heritage. Finally, there are books written by Christian scholars who were raised in the Muslim world. These are the books I cherish the most because they understand Islam from the inside and the outside.

I write all this to say there are many voices out there talking about Islam. Without false modesty, I recognize I am just a novice in the study of Islam who knows that many of the best of these books are written by people who have been tested and purified by fire. If this study contributes anything to the dialogue or debate over Islam, it seeks to provide curriculum to Christian educators that is meaningful and accurate, thus enhancing the dissemination of information gleaned from some of these great people with great ideas. Hopefully, this study will awaken a desire to read more, learn more, prepare for, and genuinely love and appreciate the plight of the individual Muslim more than you ever
thought possible as you study Islam.

Discussion Questions:

1. Who is this curriculum intended for?

2. How would this curriculum need to be modified if used in a public high school?

3. Does sharing the "brutal facts" about Islam unfairly prejudice you against Islam?

4. Is rewriting or revisionist history and theology superior to being accurate and truthful?

5. What was Katrina's experience and advice? Why did Muhammad marry her?

6. How did the driver's education analogy relate to your Christian witness to Muslims?

7. What are two emotions this study should not generate in you and why?

8. What are the sources of this research?

9. Describe the author's experience with Islam and the sources he drew from?
CHAPTER 1

APOLOGETICS AND POLEMICS. MORE NOT LESS NEEDED!

Have you ever played a sport? I was a defensive nose-guard in football and a catcher in baseball. Football and baseball are made up of offense and defense. Defense in football is when the other team has the ball and you try to stop them from scoring a touchdown or in baseball from making a run. In theology it is the same way. Apologetics is defense. The opposing ideology or religion asks you questions hoping to expose a weakness in your thinking and you are to give an answer from (ἀπό) logic (λογικός), which is called apologetics (ἀπολογία). This word is used in several places in the New Testament. Acts 22.1, "Brothers and fathers, listen now to my defense (ἀπολογίας)." Philippians 1.7, 16, "It is right for me to feel this way about all of you, since I have you in my heart; for whether I am in chains or defending (ἀπολογία) and confirming the gospel, all of you share in God’s grace with me. . . . The latter do so in love, knowing that I am put here for the defense (ἀπολογίαν) of the gospel." The classic passage is 1 Peter 3.15-16, "But in your hearts set apart Christ as Lord. Always be prepared to give an answer (ἀπολογίαν) to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have. But do this with gentleness and respect, keeping a clear conscience, so that those who speak maliciously against your good behavior in Christ

may be ashamed of their slander." Apologetics is, "The branch of theology that is concerned with defending or proving the truth of Christian doctrines." 26

The other side is offense. That is when you try to score points on the opposition. You get to ask them questions and expose their weaknesses. This branch of theology is called Polemics (πόλεμος). 27 This word is also used several times in the New Testament. It can be used to mean actual war.

And what more shall I say? I do not have time to tell about Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah, David, Samuel and the prophets, who through faith conquered kingdoms, administered justice, and gained what was promised; . . . and escaped the edge of the sword; whose weakness was turned to strength; and who became powerful in battle (πόλεμος) and routed foreign armies (Hebrews 11.32-34).

When speaking of the end of time, Jesus himself gave this warning,

Jesus answered. "Watch out that no one deceives you. For many will come in my name, claiming, 'I am the Christ,’ and will deceive many. You will hear of wars (πόλεμων) and rumors of wars (πόλεμων), but see to it that you are not alarmed. Such things must happen, but the end is still to come. Nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom. There will be famines and earthquakes in various places. All these are the beginning of birth pains." (Matthew 24:5-8)

Polemics can also mean a spiritual war; a war of ideas. This is how the word is being used in this context. This word is not unlike the Arabic word jihad which has a double meaning. Jihad in the Qur'an usually means an actual war but Sufi Muslims also maintain that it can refer to a spiritual struggle as well. 28 Similarly this can be deduced from James 4.1 "What causes fights (πόλεμοι) and quarrels among you? Don't they come from your desires that battle within you?"

27 A Greek-English Lexicon "πόλεμος" (polemos) p. 691
28 Thomas Patrick Hughes, Dictionary of Islam (Chicago: KAZI Publications, Inc, 1886), 243. "Sufi writers say that there are two Jihads: ...'the greater warfare,' which is against one's own lusts; and . . .
Jude, the brother of Jesus, challenged the body of Christ with these words, "Dear friends, although I was very eager to write to you about the salvation we share, I felt I had to write and urge you to contend (ἐπιốγωνίζομαι)²⁹ [strenuously] for the faith that was once for all entrusted to the saints." (Jude 1:3)

Paul sees the Corinthian church is also failing to contend for the faith. He was not pleased with their apathetic tolerance for the pseudo-theology being taught in his day about Jesus, the Holy Spirit or the Gospel of Salvation. He wrote, "For if someone comes to you and preaches a Jesus other than the Jesus we preached, or if you receive a different spirit from the one you received, or a different gospel from the one you accepted, you put up with it easily enough" (2 Corinthians 11:4). Clearly, Jude and Paul were troubled that the church was not "contending [strenuously] for the faith". They were disappointed that the church was "putting up with it." Not challenging preaching and the teaching that contains false doctrine is cowardly and ultimately results in lost souls. Orthodox Biblical Christians need to be challenged and equipped to be more polemical not less. A theological polemic is "A controversial argument, especially one refuting or attacking a specific opinion or doctrine."³⁰

In our age of relativity, polemics has fallen on hard times, but there were a number of polemicists in the early church who exposed heresy. Paul asks an important question to the church today, "...if the trumpet does not sound a clear call, who will get ready for

battle (πόλεμον)?” (1 Corinthians 14:8) Exposing heresy and liberating persons from spiritual enslavement is a noble task. In the last fifty years Christianity in the United States has suffered a series of legal decisions restricting its influence in the public square. The U.S. has moved to a multiculturalist position. Many youthful orthodox Christians and their parents have naturally picked up and adopted this attitude that is repeatedly being presented. Today, everyone is being encouraged to be tolerant of every religious idea. Even President Bush took this view.

September 20, 2001, "The terrorists are traitors to their own faith, trying, in effect, to hijack Islam itself. The enemy of America is not our many Muslim friends; it is not our many Arab friends. Our enemy is a radical network of terrorists, and every government that supports them."

September 17, 2001, "The face of terror is not the true faith of Islam. That's not what Islam is all about. Islam is peace. These terrorists don't represent peace. They represent evil and war."

September 10, 2002 "All Americans must recognize that the face of terror is not the true faith -- face of Islam. Islam is a faith that brings comfort to a billion people around the world. It's a faith that has made brothers and sisters of every race. It's a faith based upon love, not hate."

October 11, 2002, "Islam is a vibrant faith. Millions of our fellow citizens are Muslim. We respect the faith. We honor its traditions. Our enemy does not. Our enemy doesn't follow the great traditions of Islam. They've hijacked a great religion."

December 5, 2002, "America treasures the relationship we have with our many Muslim friends, and we respect the vibrant faith of Islam which inspires countless individuals to lead lives of honesty, integrity, and morality. This year, may Eid [i.e. a three day feast at the end of Ramadan] also be a time in which we recognize the values of progress, pluralism, and acceptance that bind us together as a Nation and a global community. By working together to advance mutual understanding, we point the way to a brighter future for all."

April 30, 2002, "America rejects bigotry. We reject every act of hatred against people of Arab background or Muslim faith America values and welcomes peaceful people of all faiths -- Christian, Jewish, Muslim, Sikh, Hindu and many others. Every faith is practiced and protected here, because we are one country. Every
immigrant can be fully and equally American because we're one country. Race and color should not divide us, because America is one country."

Tolerance is truly a wonderful quality. Every Christian is required not only to be tolerant but also to love even his enemies. Jesus himself said, "I tell you: Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, that you may be sons of your Father in heaven. (Matthew 5:44-45) But one can be tolerant of the person and love a person without accepting their theology. President Bush had many pressures upon him, but, as a genuine follower of Jesus, he should have sought words which would have communicated his love and tolerance of Muslims without distorting the truth about the historic Islamic faith and practice. He and President Obama should have emphasized that this was, or at least should continue to be, a Christian nation rather than to suggest America has abandoned her Christian foundation for a utopian pluralistic foundation that exists nowhere in the world. To expose heresy does not make one a bigot. A bigot is "one who is strongly partial to one's own group, religion, race, or politics and is intolerant of those who differ." As a Christian, one should be strongly partial to Christianity, but that does not mean we need to be intolerant of others. Jesus said, “I am the way and the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me.” (John 14:6) Peter said, "Salvation is found in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given to men by which we must be saved.” (Acts 4:12) Jesus was not being a bigot. Jesus was sharing the true message that salvation does not come from Islam or any other pseudo-religion. Consequently, Jesus gave his disciples the great commission,

"Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you." (Matthew 28:9, 10)

Mark 8:34-38 warns,

And when he had called the people unto him with his disciples also, he said unto them, Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's, the same shall save it. For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels.

Early Christians were not persecuted for worshipping Jesus; they were persecuted for worshipping Jesus only. If they would have been willing to worship other deities as well, they would have avoided persecution, but would have compromised the message of Jesus. The true disciples of Jesus were fully convinced Jesus was the only way not just a way. Early American founders were also fully convinced Jesus was the only way to salvation. Today, however, pluralists are legally seeking to prevent schools from even using the Bible as a textbook or reference book in American schools. This is a complete reversal in culture from pro-Christian to anti-Christian. American schools should also be permitted to use the Qur'an as a reference book, for reading it clearly informs the Western students of Islam's intolerance of all non-Muslims, except those who have purchased protection through the jizya tax. Teachers and students should be permitted an honest reading of it, in its entirety, if desired. Reading of the Qur'an and instruction about the Qur'an should be permitted without forcing a favorable or unfavorable biased interpretation of Islam. Let the Qur'an speak for itself.

________________________
August 19, 2009).
Teachers in public schools should not push too hard promoting a religious view, nor should they seek to incite riot against a particular religion. Instead, they should be fair arbitrators, encourage truth and understanding, and let discussions go to logical conclusions. An honest reading and discussion of the Qur'an should not be accompanied by a threat of legal action against a teacher or school if the discussion does not turn out favorable for Islam. Justice, honesty, accuracy and freedom should be the goal, not politically correct speech - which fails to prepare our students for the challenges that lie ahead.

President Bush is a Christian; I believe history will show that he was a very good president, but a poor theologian and historian. There certainly are bad religions. Exposing a bad religion is an important ministry of the body of Christ and can be done with the purest motives. Certainly those individuals and their families who have been imprisoned by oppressive authoritarian religions and then set free by the true gospel through the ministry of the church can testify to the goodness of such a deed. Ultimately, the goal of this author is to encourage the development of the attitude and the skill of high school students to witness effectively to their Muslim friends. This may require Christian youth to see the ugly truth about the religion of Islam. Paul defends his polemic ministry and explains that his weapons of spiritual war are not mean spirited or waged through violent warfare.

By the meekness and gentleness of Christ, I appeal to you—I, Paul, who am "timid" when face to face with you, but "bold" when away! I beg you that when I come I may not have to be as bold as I expect to be toward some people who think that we live by the standards of this world. For though we live in the world, we do not wage war as the world does. The weapons we fight with are not the weapons of the world. On the contrary, they have divine power to demolish strongholds. We demolish arguments and every pretension that sets itself up against the knowledge of God, and we take captive every thought to make it
obedient to Christ. (2 Corinthians 10:1-5)

The Islamic scholar, Vartan Gregorian, opposes the use of polemics in the dialogue between Jews, Christians and Muslims. Gregorian quotes a variety of secular anti-Islamic polemicists, but saves his worse condemnation for the Christian theologians who he thinks owes Islam something.

Worse still are the inflammatory and widely broadcast statements of some American religious leaders. In a speech broadcast by NBC Nightly News in November 2001, Franklin Graham, the Christian evangelist’s son, declared that Muslims pray to a "different God" and that Islam "is a very evil and wicked religion." 33

Two points need to be made. First, what if Graham is correct that Muslims pray to a different god (which they surely do)? Should these comments not be permitted to be made? What are the consequences, short term, for his comments? Are the long term consequences greater if comments like these are not made repeatedly in all kinds of venues? In the short term, if Franklin does not make this comment there is a superficial appearance of harmony and unity which his comments disrupt. But if the second part of his statement is true (which it is), then the United States is unnecessarily opening itself up for an "evil and wicked religion." The United States should carefully study the problems occurring in Europe and ask themselves if they desire the same in the United States. The consequences of this decision, if not changed, will be felt for generations if the United States stays on the course Europe has embraced. Islam does not do well with diversity. Historically, it never has despite the Andalusian myth. Out of the fifty-six Islamic nations in the world today, there is not one that is a model for genuine tolerance, while


Saudi Arabia heads the *Open Doors World Watch List* as the world's worst persecutor of Christians and for its abuse of religious liberty. Saudi Arabia makes no secret of such policies. On 10 March 2003 Associated Press Network reported: "Saudi Arabia, as the birthplace of Islam, will not allow churches to be built on its land, according to Defense Minister Prince Sultan. Islam is the only accepted religion in Saudi Arabia, home to the faith's holiest shrines in Mecca and Medina. "This country was the launch pad for the prophecy and the message, and nothing can contradict this, even if we lose our necks."  

The United States has chosen the better path. The United States can maintain those ideals as long as there is a relatively small Islamic population in the United States controlled by immigration quotas. But is the United States truly prepared to live in fear of offending a large Islamic population? When offended this group demonstrates with protests and violence. Small population generally equals small problem, large population means a large problem. The long term consequences of a large Islamic community should be discussed and debated openly while we still can. Gregorian then quotes Pat Robertson's comments from CNN on February 2002.

"I think people ought to be aware of what we're dealing with." Muslims "want to coexist until they can control, dominate and then, if need be destroy," "The prophet Muhammad, . . Preached hate and violence;" he [Robertson] added, "I think Osama bin Laden is probably a very dedicated follower of Muhammad. He's done exactly what Muhammad said to do, and we disagree with him obviously, and I'm sure many moderate Muslims do as well, but you can't say the religion is a religion of peace. It's not."

Robertson, is correct on each of his points. First, Muhammad initially modeled coexistence while he was in the minority in Mecca between 610-622. In fact, he said,  

---

"Let there be no compulsion in religion. Truth stands out clear from error. Whoever rejects evil and believes in Allah hath grasped the most trustworthy hand-hold, that never breaks. And Allah heareth and knoweth all things" (Surah 2:256). Then he and his followers immigrated to Yathrib, a Jewish city with three Jewish tribes in it. Ayman Al-Zawahiri in his essay on "Loyalty and Enmity"

acknowledges another little-known doctrine- that of *taqiyya*. According to this doctrine Muslims under certain circumstances openly deceive infidels by feigning friendship or goodwill--even apostasy--provided that their heart remains true to Islam.\(^{35}\)

Osama bin Laden brags that, "our prophet... did not wait more than three months in [Yathrib] Medina without raiding or sending a raiding party into the lands of the infidels to beat down their strongholds and seize their possession, their lives and their women."\(^{36}\)

This was not seen as a crime, for infidels are to be subdued or submitted to Islam whenever possible by any means possible. Within two years, Muhammad was desiring to exterminate and expel one of these Jewish tribes. Eventually he drove off two of the tribes but the third tribe suffered the most. He permitted the decapitation of approximately 800 of their boys and men while the mothers and daughters were sold into slavery. All of this was done within the first five years of Muhammad's arrival in the Jewish village of Yathrib. Today we know this village is a city called Medina, "City of the Prophet." This is a historic fact.

Secondly, Muhammad did preach hate and violence, as Robertson stated. Muhammad said, "Believers [i.e. Muslims], take neither Jews nor Christians for your friends" (Surah 5:51). "Make war on them [Jews, Christians, polytheist Arabs] until idolatry shall cease

\(^{35}\) Ibrahim, p.64.

\(^{36}\) Ibid. p. xxxi
and God's religion shall reign supreme. . . "(Surah 8:40)\textsuperscript{37} "I will cast terror into the hearts of those who disbelieve [Islam]. Therefore strike off their heads and strike off every fingertip of them." (Surah 8:12) Third, Osama was a Muslim who would have been appreciated by Muhammad as he is by millions of Muslims around the world today. Finally, while moderate Muslims do not believe in a literal interpretation of the Quran the intent of these passages is clearly understood by fundamentalist Muslims and Christians. Multiculturalists also do not recognize the binding nature of the violent teachings of the Qur'an. Multiculturalists need to realize that historically, Islam has a 1,400 year pattern of violence, and it is a mistake to think Islam can be tamed by multiculturalists or "moderate" Islamic theologians.

Gregorian, of course, is writing from the perspective of a Muslim who would very much like to see Islam grow and flourish in Europe and the United States. If I were a Muslim, I too would be pleased with the direction the United States is going. President Obama, in Angora, Turkey, April 6, 2009 said,

> I know there have been difficulties these last few years. I know that the trust that binds us has been strained, and I know that strain is shared in many places where the Muslim faith is practiced. Let me say this as clearly as I can. the United States is not at war with Islam. In fact, our partnership with the Muslim world is critical in rolling back a fringe ideology that people of all faiths reject.... The United States has been enriched by Muslim Americans. Many other Americans have Muslims in their family, or have lived in a Muslim-majority country – I know, because I am one of them. \textsuperscript{38}

This kind of speech and behavior prompted Frank J. Gaffney Jr., long time foreign affairs expert and President of the Center for Security Policy, to write an article in the \textit{Washington Times} on Tuesday June 9, 2009, entitled \textit{America's First Muslim President?}

\textsuperscript{37} Dawood, N.J., \textit{The Koran} (Baltimore, Maryland, Penguin Classics, 1968) p. 309
\textsuperscript{38} http://enduringamerica.com/2009/04/06/video-obama-speech-in-turkey/ (accessed Aug. 18,
What little we know about Mr. Obama's youth certainly suggests that he not only had a Kenyan father who was Muslim, but spent his early, formative years as one in Indonesia. As the president likes to say, "much has been made" -- in this case by him and his campaign handlers -- of the fact that he became a Christian as an adult in Chicago, under the now-notorious Pastor Jeremiah A. Wright.

With Mr. Obama's unbelievably ballyhooed address in Cairo Thursday to what he calls "the Muslim world" (hereafter known as "the Speech"), there is mounting evidence that the president not only identifies with Muslims, but actually may still be one himself. Consider the following indicators.

• Mr. Obama referred four times in his speech to "the Holy Koran." Non-Muslims -- even pandering ones -- generally do not use that Islamic formulation.

• Mr. Obama established his firsthand knowledge of Islam (albeit without mentioning his reported upbringing in the faith) with the statement, "I have known Islam on three continents before coming to the region where it was first revealed." Again, "revealed" is a depiction Muslims use to reflect their conviction that the Koran is the word of God, as dictated to Muhammad.

• Then the president made a statement no believing Christian -- certainly not one versed, as he professes to be, in the ways of Islam -- would ever make. In the context of what he euphemistically called the "situation between Israelis, Palestinians and Arabs," Mr. Obama said he looked forward to the day "... when Jerusalem is a secure and lasting home for Jews and Christians and Muslims, and a place for all of the children of Abraham to mingle peacefully together as in the story of Isra, when Moses, Jesus and Muhammad (peace be upon them) joined in prayer."

Now, the term "peace be upon them" is invoked by Muslims as a way of blessing deceased holy men. According to Islam, that is what all three were - dead prophets. Of course, for Christians, Jesus is the living and immortal Son of God.

... Whether Mr. Obama actually is a Muslim or simply plays one in the presidency may, in the end, be irrelevant. What is alarming is that in aligning himself and his policies with those of Shariah-adherents such as the Muslim Brotherhood, the president will greatly intensify the already enormous pressure on peaceful, tolerant American Muslims to submit to such forces - and heighten expectations, here and abroad, that the rest of us will do so as well.  

This book opposes revisionist history and theology or appeasing Islam under a false
lure of national security. Christians should affirm and embrace the biblical views about
God, Jesus, Scriptures and Salvation as truth. Jesus is not just as a way but the way.
Christian doctrine is in direct conflict with Islamic doctrine in each of these areas.
Consequently, biblical Christians would not and should not like to see Islam grow and
flourish in the United States or anywhere else in the world. This attitude stems from a
couple of motivations. First, there is the desire to shore up and conserve America's
Christian foundation that has been so good to us. Secondly, it is for the sake of the
Muslim as well. This attitude is a reflection of a genuine concern for people caught up in
a religious system which promises salvation for its adherents, but only provides an
oppressive, abusive system in its place. Consequently, this genuine heartfelt difference
of opinion sets up the necessity of a legitimate dialogue or debate. This kind of dialogue
or debate can be had in Western Civilizations, provided legislation and media does not
erroneously outlaw such debate as hate speech. True hate speech is, in fact, also
forbidden by Peter, one of the Apostles. He wrote in his first letter, "But in your hearts
set apart Christ as Lord. Always be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you
to give the reason for the hope that you have. But do this with gentleness and respect. . . "
(2 Peter 3:15) A true dialogue or debate cannot be had in an Islamic country over concern
of being killed by those with whom one is dialoging. In fact, criticizing Muhammad, the
Qur'an or Islam can result in being beaten, tortured, imprisoned, or executed in many
parts of the Islamic world. Even a polite discussion can digress quickly.

After centuries of neglected ministry to the Muslims, Henry Martyn, (1781-1812)
became an Anglican missionary to India at the turn of the eighteenth century. "Before his

August 19, 2009).
arrival he had already studied Sanskrit, Persian and Anatolia." He relates his experience in having a theological dialogue or debate with a number of Muslims at the assistant to the Sultan's house, not a suggested activity for the faint in heart or faith. The interesting thing is that this debate could have happened yesterday. He was an amazingly courageous man. He journals,

June 12th I attended the Vizier's levee, when there was a most intemperate and clamorous controversy kept up for an hour or two, eight or ten on one side and I on the other. The Vizier, who set us going first, joined in it latterly, and said, 'you had better say God is God, and Mohammed is the prophet of God.' I said, 'God is God,' but added, instead of 'Mohammad is the prophet of God,' [Martyn finished the common creedal statement differently by saying] 'and Jesus is the Son of God.' They had no sooner heard this, which I had avoided bringing forward until then, than they all exclaimed in contempt and anger, 'He is neither born nor begets,' and rose up as if they would have torn me in pieces. One of them said, 'what will you say when your tongue is burned out for this blasphemy?' One of them felt for me a little, and tried to soften the severity of this speech...Thus I walked away alone, to pass the rest of the day in heat and dirt. What have I done, thought I, to merit all this scorn? Nothing, thought I, but bearing testimony to Jesus. I thought over these things in prayer, and found that peace which Christ hath promised to His disciples." [Zwemer writes,] Only the Last Day will reveal the extent of the influence of this man, who, with no Christian to tend or comfort him in his last illness, laid down his life at Tocat [India] on the 16th of October, 1812.

In many Islamic nations today, converting to Christianity earns a death penalty for the convert and the Christian who led them to the Lord.

Allah's Apostle said, "The blood of a Muslim who confesses that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and that I am His Apostle, cannot be shed except in three cases. In cases for murder, a married person who commits illegal sexual intercourse and the one who reverts from Islam (apostate) and leaves the Muslims."
Yaser Said\(^4^4\) shot his two daughters, 17 year old daughter Sarah\(^4^5\) and his eighteen year old daughter Amina, in honor killings because he felt they were assimilating and embracing the Western Civilization lifestyle. This tragedy is becoming more common.

On August 11, 2009, seventeen year old Rifqa Bary\(^4^6\) was interviewed because she fled from her father. He threatened to kill her for becoming a Christian. The American courts will decide whether or not Rifqa Bary will be returned to her parents.

**Rifqa Bary.** Well, I’m a Christian, and my parents are Muslim. They’re extremely devout. And they can’t know about my faith – well, they do now. But they’ve threatened to kill me. I don’t know if you know about honor killing….You guys don’t understand. Islam is very different than you guys think. They have to kill me. My blood is now halal, which means that because I am now a Christian, I’m from a Muslim background, it’s an honor. If they love God more than me, they have to do this. And I’m fighting for my life, you guys don’t understand. You don’t understand. What did your father say to you? He said he would kill me. Or he’d have me sent back to Sri Lanka where they’d put me in the asylum…

**Reporter.** Do you really think that this is true or do you think that this is just a threat?

**Rifqa Bary.** There’s actually hundreds of cases that are backed like me. Amina and Sarah, they were forced to go back home. They were killed by their dad! This is not just some threat! This is reality! This is truth! This is reality! How many more cases do you want? There’s case after case. There’s hundreds of them. I am one. I am one of hundreds. They have to. You guys don’t understand. They have to. I don’t know what else to say, but they have to. If you want proof, there’s hundreds of cases that can validate my story. Even my friends and people from back home, they knew what would happen to me. My own brother knew about my faith and he didn’t tell my dad. What does that say? He knew the consequences! He knew!

\(^4^4\) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=favzluXtznM (accessed Aug. 19, 2009)
\(^4^5\) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=favzluXtznM (accessed Aug. 19, 2009)
\(^4^6\) youtube.com 17 year Rifqa Bary, threaten with death by father for her becoming a Christian.
**Reporter.** So what do you want at this point now?

I want to be with them. I want to be free from my parents. I want to be free. I want to worship Jesus. I want to go to church on Sundays and read my Bible and see Jesus alive, whenever I want to. You talk about religious freedom? No! I don’t have that. I want to be here. I want to worship Jesus freely. I don’t want to die.  

For this reason it is important that Christians and lovers of freedom and democracy and lovers of Muslims refute the claims of Muhammad, the Qur'an and Islam if these freedoms are to be retained in the next generation. Both here and abroad Christians need to get involved in the dialogue and debate. The reading of the following chapters is intended to strengthen your confidence in biblical Christianity and to expose the heresy of Islam. If you go to a physician and you have a serious health problem, and it is treatable but not without a real cost, do you think the physician should tell you the truth in love or do you think he should tell you what you want to hear?

These chapters have several goals. First, to protect Christian youth from thinking that Islam is another legitimate option of faith. Second, to inspire and prepare students to be a winsome, confident, positive, empathetic, loving witness to Muslims. Third, to warn upcoming generations of the danger and consequence of Islamic expansion into Europe and the United States. Islamic expansion and conquest has been part of Islam since Muhammad modeled it. Today, the threat of Islamic conquest, or the hope of Islamic conquest, depending on your perspective, has reemerged or been reawakened in the hearts of many Muslims around the world. Unfortunately the threat of potential world conquest by Islam seems as real today, in this and upcoming generations, as it did for the

---

fifty-six nations of the past who were forcibly submitted to Islam.

Discussion Questions:

1. What is apologetics?

2. What is polemics?

3. What was Jude and Paul's position on apologetics and polemics?

4. How would you describe President George Bush's position on Islam and do you presently concur or disagree with it?

5. What did Jesus teach about salvation and what is the significance of his teaching to our discussion on Islam?

6. Christians have to be wise and responsible in discussions about Islam, but if they fairly criticize Islam what can they expect to happen?

7. Is Islam a tolerant religion in Islamic countries?

8. What does it sound like the multiculturalists would like to accomplish in Europe and the United States? Consequences?

9. What position does President Obama have regarding Islam and religion in general in the United States?

10. What is the expressed position of this book regarding Islam and why?

11. What is an honor killing and who are Sarah and Amina Said, and Rifqa Bary?

12. What has reemerged in the hearts of many Muslims worldwide?

13. Based on the above what would be a sensible policy for the United States regarding Islam?
CHAPTER 2 WHY THIS TYPE OF CURRICULUM IS NECESSARY FOR YOU!

You are more fortunate than perhaps you know to grow up in a culture where Christianity has been the predominate faith. What a great blessing to be able to have the opportunity to freely hear about the Jesus of the Bible. This became critically important in my personal life in my high school years. Foolishly, during those years, I participated in the lifestyle and culture of the 60's which naturally led to serious trouble. In the midst of that turmoil, it became apparent what needed to be done and I cried out to Jesus and experienced his forgiveness and healing in my life. Now looking back, some thirty-five years later, that salvation experience truly made, and continues to make, a wonderful and profoundly positive difference in my life. Since that experience, I have discovered some
of the wisdom available in the Bible. I have attended both colleges and universities, secular and Christian, married a beautiful Christian woman and raised three sons. As a Bible, history and theology teacher of Christian youth for nearly thirty years I think I have some idea as to what a biblically healthy life and culture should look like. My current appraisal is that many in our culture are, likewise, foolishly rejecting our Judeo-Christian heritage and seeking to promote a new secular and multiculturalist foundation. This course of action naturally leads to serious turmoil in multiple areas. The question is will the Judeo-Christian message still be prevalent enough in your culture for your generation to continue to receive God's blessing upon it? Will your generation know to cry out to Jesus for forgiveness and healing? Frankly, it should already be quite apparent that the "new" secular and multiculturalist foundation is profoundly cracked and creating serious problems. Yet this seems to have little or no effect on those boldly advocating this worldview change. Some members of all three branches of government are ardently advocating building more and more upon a faulty secular foundation, criticizing those who want to restore its original Judeo-Christian footing. This book was written to challenge you to become a part of preparing yourself and your peers to slow or completely reverse this secular and multiculturalist trend.

There are some in this nation who are following the example of the European Union and purposely moving our culture to embrace Islam as an equivalently authentic expression of faith. They also are encouraging the embracing of a multiculturalist view of Western Civilization. There are many aspects of our culture which need to be addressed, but this study will focus upon the increasing open armed acceptance of Islam into our

Western Civilization culture while at the same time diminishing the profound and critically important influence biblical Christianity has made to our culture and our people. This study will demonstrate that opening our arms to Islam and to multiculturalism is a profound mistake and steps need to be taken, in the not too distant future, or America may truly become the fragmented, divided, multiculturalist culture, for which many are calling. A culture like this will lack the ability to act together to be a positive good in the world except in perhaps the most dire situations; but maybe not even then for we will have ideological enemies within that will make this impractical. Our Puritan founding fathers wanted America to be, "a city on a hill" (Matthew 5:14-15). For hundreds of years, the United States has been imperfectly that "light," but it seems as if the United States is in danger of having that Christian light go out and losing her own way. Is it too late for America to return to her Judeo-Christian foundation? No! Certainly there are many who are willing to work with you to see that this does not happen.

Awakenings like this have occurred in America's past. The Pilgrims coming to America in 1620 was the beginning of America's Christian heritage. In the 1720-30s America experienced her First Great Awakening, in the early 1800s her Second Great Awakening. In the early 1900's the spirit of God moved and historians have called this time The Benevolent Empire. Student missionaries carried the Gospel all over the world. These were men like Samuel Zwemer and William M. Miller. Now at the turn of the 21st Century we need another Awakening. We read this promise in God's word, "if my people, who are called by my name, will humble themselves and pray and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from heaven and will forgive their sin and will heal their land." (2 Chronicles 7:14) This promise is as true for us today as it
was when first given to Israel. In Numbers 23:19 it states, "God is not a man, that he should lie, nor a son of man, that he should change his mind. Does he speak and then not act? Does he promise and not fulfill?"

Will you commit to seriously study Islam from a distinctively Christian and biblical perspective and to encourage your friends to do the same? A sincere attempt has been made to organize this material into a form that is factually accurate, readable, interesting, and positively encouraging and empowering to you. I want you to be intellectually, emotionally, spiritually prepared to address the growing challenge of Islam. I also want you to engage positively with your peers that are promoting the talking points of secularists and naive multiculturalists who do not apparently recognize the consequences of this theological and ideological shift away from our Judeo-Christian heritage. Your generation is presented with a growing threat posed by fundamentalist Islam and her supporters. It is truly my generation's responsibility to do what we can to help equip you to meet this challenge. Without orthodox biblical education how will you ever be alerted to the threat early enough to do anything about it or be equipped to effectively share the Gospel of Jesus with Muslims and multiculturalists? This study is an imperfect attempt to provide an introduction to the study of Islam, to motivate you to study Islam, to equip you and introduce you to scholarly resources.

As a former youth pastor and Christian high school teacher, I have come to understand that many Christian youth do not have a comprehensive knowledge of their own faith much less others' faith. Some are very interested to learn more about both while others need to be inspired to appreciate either. You might find yourself in one of these two groups. If you are a Christian, remember that one of the last things Jesus told
his disciples to do is found in Matthew 28:19-20. This is called *The Great Commission*.

Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you. And surely I am with you always, to the very end of the age.

When Jesus originally challenged his disciples with this world mission he was living in Jerusalem, Israel. The disciples numbered, at best, in the hundreds. Nevertheless, with the empowering of the Holy Spirit these disciples did take the Gospel of Jesus to the world and today the largest organization in the world is the Christian church. One out of three, or 33%, of the entire world's population call themselves Christians. Now, let's quietly inside jump up and down a little bit at the tremendous appeal and effect that Jesus’ words have had on the world. This is amazing and fantastic! But before we jump up and down too much, we need to remember two things. First, sadly, many of us who call ourselves Christians really do not know what this means. Consequently, this has brought the name of Christianity into disrepute in some quarters of our world. Secondly, nearly six centuries after the birth of Jesus, another religious figure was born in Mecca, Saudi Arabia in 570. Forty years later, in 610, he claimed to have received revelations from the angel Gabriel, an alleged messenger of Allah, and started the religion of Islam (i.e. submission or surrender). The followers of Islam are called Moslems or Muslims. Today Islam has grown to over a billion and number approximately one out of five, or 22% of the world's population.

Those of us who have coached or played sports understand the enjoyment of a good competition. However, the nature of this contest is not of that kind for several reasons. The stakes are eternally high. The Gospel of Jesus and the works salvation of Islam are not the same, not compatible, no matter who tells you otherwise. The differences of their evangelism methods are profound, free will vs. oppressive methods. Jesus and his
disciples spread their message in the Roman Empire to those who would willingly listen. Conversion to biblical Christianity is and was a free will commitment of the soul (i.e. mind, will and emotion) to the person and work and message of Jesus Christ. Islam (i.e. submission or surrender to Allah) was and is often forced upon people following their land being conquered. The conquest can come gradually by immigration or rapidly by invasion. Conversion to Islam, by those not killed outright, may be accomplished as unbelievers in Islam (kafirs, infidels) tire of being placed in second class status known as dhimmitude. Their children see more benefit to convert to Islam after generations of servitude. Many rewards for the compliant, much pain for the noncompliant. Against the free freewill of persons, Islam is forced upon a population from early childhood through adulthood. Indoctrinated converts are kept in check by being reminded five times a day of impending eternal fiery judgment for those who may leave Islam. Surely, fear and ignorance of the truth, not faith, keeps many Muslims going to mosque. Converts to Christianity and the Christian missionary are both threatened with execution. This is not a threat that is not carried out. The amazing thing is that any "infidels" in the face of such oppression, have such strong convictions that they continue to refuse to submit or surrender to Islam even when there is so much pressure to do otherwise. In that situation would you resist?

Ergun Caner Th.D. and Emir Caner Ph.D., brothers and scholars, raised in a Sunni Islamic home in Turkey, immigrated to the United States with their family to construct mosques. While in high school, both of these young men found the courage to freely accept Jesus Christ as their personal Savior and Lord. They maintained this faith even though it meant rejection by their father who they describe as their hero. They know
some of the personal price paid for rejecting Islam. Today they are both serving in positions of leadership at great Christian schools. Ergun is President and Dean of Liberty University Seminary, Lynchburg, Virginia and Emir is President of Truett-McConnell (Baptist) College in Cleveland, Georgia. Together they have written several very insightful books on Islam and Christianity. In their award winning book *Unveiling Islam* they write,

"The greatest difference between Jesus Christ as God and Savior and Muhammad as prophet of Allah, comes at this point. Jesus Christ shed His own blood on the cross so that people could come to God. Muhammad shed other people's blood so that his constituents could have political power throughout the Arabian Peninsula. Further since Muhammad is held to be the "excellent examplar for him who hopes in Allah and the Final Day" (Surah 33:21), we need to look no further for explanation of violent acts within Islam than to look at the character of its founder."

In contrast, Jesus emphasized a change in heart, "I tell you the truth, no one can see the kingdom of God unless he is born again... the Spirit gives birth to spirit " (John 3:3).

Historically, Islam has spread by a struggle (i.e. jihad), violent or gradual. In the second to last "revelation" Muhammad received, he called for the violent conquest of non-Muslims.

---

**PICKTHAL** *(This translator of the Qur'an was a convert from Christianity to Muslim)*

Surah 9:5 “Then, when the sacred months have passed, slay the idolaters wherever you find them, and take them (captive), and besiege them, and prepare for them each ambush..."  
Surah 9:14 Fight them! Allah will chastise them at your hands..."  
Surah 9:26 ...punish those who disbelieved.

**YUSUFALLI** *(A Muslim Translator)*

Surah 9:29 Fight those who believe not in Allah nor the Last Day, nor hold that forbidden which hath been forbidden by Allah and His Messenger, nor acknowledge the religion of Truth, (even if they are) of the People of the Book [i.e. Jews or Christians], until they pay the Jizya with willing submission, and feel themselves subdued.

---

Muhammad told his followers to spread Islam at the point of the sword, slay some, and subdue all, "until they pay the Jizya [i.e. protection money] with willing submission, and feel themselves subdued." Muhammad has not changed his word and neither have many of his followers changed this practice. Christians are naive to think otherwise but many are ready, willing and able to do just that.

Christians can and should seek to be genuine friends to Muslims, but Muslims, according to the Qur'an, are repeatedly warned not to have Jews, Christians or unbelievers as their friends. Pickthal, raised Christian but as a young man converted to Islam translated.

Surah 3:28,186 Let not the believers [i.e. Moslems] take disbelievers [i.e. Jews and Christians] for their friends…ye will hear much wrong from those who were given the Scripture before you, and from the idolaters. But if ye persevere and ward off (evil), then that is of the stedfast heart of things.”

4:139,144 “Those who choose disbelievers [i.e. Jews and Christians] for their friends instead of believers! [i.e. Muslims]... O ye who believe! Choose not disbelievers for (your) friends in place of believers.

5:51,55-57, “O ye who believe! Take not the Jews and Christians for friends. … He among you who taketh them for friends is (one) of them. Lo! Allah guideth not wrongdoing folk. ... Your friend can be only Allah; and His messenger…O ye who believe! Choose not for friends such of those who received the Scriptures before you [i.e. Jews & Christians]…”

9:23 “O ye who believe! Choose not your fathers nor your brethren, for friends if they take pleasure in disbelief rather than faith. Whoso of you taketh them for friends, such are wrong-doers.”

The two faiths are not theologically compatible. In fact, Islam teaches that Jews and Christians have corrupted Allah's religion and Muhammad was sent to correct its heresy. The last words of Muhammad describe his ending attitude toward the Jews and Christians. He said,

When the last moment of the life of Allah's Apostle came he started putting his
'Khamisa' on his face and when he felt hot and short of breath he took it off his face and said, "May Allah curse the Jews and Christians for they built the places of worship at the graves of their Prophets. The Prophet was warning (Muslims) of what those had done. [emphasis mine]  

Christians do not want Muslims to be cursed; we want them to meet the real Jesus not the Isa of the Qur'an. "Moderate" Muslims have learned to agree to disagree agreeably. History, both ancient and modern, demonstrate that fundamentalist Muslims are angry and when given the opportunity they can be very authoritarian, brutal and even sadistic in the cause of spreading Allah and Islam. What are Christians to do? Get even?  

The Apostle Paul gave profoundly important directions for Christians who have been brutalized.  

Do not repay anyone evil for evil. Be careful to do what is right in the eyes of everybody. If it is possible, as far as it depends on you, live at peace with everyone. Do not take revenge, my friends, but leave room for God's wrath, for it is written. "It is mine to avenge; I will repay," says the Lord. (Roman 12:17)  

However, this does not mean Christians should allow Islam to quite literally, cut off their heads. As God ordained sovereign nations, European nations and the United States should have policies that reflect reality. What has been done needs to be undone.  

Superficially, some write about the similarities of Judaism, Christianity and Islam. For example, they all believe in God, The Torah, the Psalms. Muslims and Jews both honor Abraham and Moses. Muslims honor Jesus. For the Muslims, Jesus is only Isa a prophet, but to Christians, Jesus is the son of God, Savior, someone to be worshipped and loved. Christians and Muslims also both tend to be conservative on social issues (e.g.  

pro-life and anti-abortion, pro-heterosexuality and anti-homosexuality). However, Judaism, biblical Christianity and Qur'anic Islam do not agree on the most critical theological and political issues of our day. Devout Muslims know that the religions of Abraham are not compatible. For example, Sheikh Adnan Ahmad Siami, spoke at a mosque in Mecca on May 11, 2001. In that sermon he clearly rejects the call for unity. He said, Several years ago, a sinful call arose, which unfortunately garnered support from some clerics, intellectuals, and preachers of this Islamic religion, [a call] for the unification of the monotheistic religions. They flaunted an empty and false slogan of 'religious harmony,' Christian-Islamic friendship, and uniting the three religions into a global religion. . . The call for the unification of the religions is a call for the abolition of religious differences among people. No more Believer and infidel. All will come under the unity of human harmony....This accursed call has ramifications that most certainly will shake Islam in the hearts of its people, leading them to the lowest of the levels of Hell. Among these ramifications. (1) to destroy ... belief (2) to present the infidels' schools of thought as correct. . . (3) to permitting conversion to Judaism with no shame whatsoever; (4) to the abolition of the vast difference between the Muslims and others . . . conflict between truth and falsehood; (5) to the transformation of the religion of Islam into a religion like the other, false religions, into a religion that has no advantage over the other religions. . . (8) to facilitate the infiltration of Christian missionary activity. . . The pope's recent visit to Syria. . . is without a doubt, another manifestation of that call. . . may Allah punish him as he deserves. . . to live in peaceful coexistence is nothing more than an audacious and impudent call for the unification of religions. . .

One of the most significant differences with Muslims is that most Islamic nations do not even recognize Israel's (i.e. God's chosen people) right to exist in the very land God gave them. In contrast, biblical

Christians reject *Replacement Theology* and have been, and should be, supporters of the nation of Israel. Israel is mentioned in scriptures to be a key part of Christian eschatology.

Christians should view May 14, 1948\(^{52}\) as a fulfilled prophecy. When Israel was officially disbanded in A.D. 135 by Emperor Hadrian's order, Jews remained in a worldwide diaspora for nineteen hundred years before they officially became a restored people to their national homeland again by a vote of the United Nations. Today the United Nations has changed enough that they would undo that vote if they could. Clearly, a reasonable person could and should conclude that Ezekiel 37 is about the Israeli people's return to the land of Israel's "The Valley of Dry Bones."

1. The hand of the LORD was upon me, and he brought me out by the Spirit of the LORD and set me in the middle of a valley; it was full of bones. 2. He led me back and forth among them, and I saw a great many bones on the floor of the valley, bones that were very dry. 3. He asked me, "Son of man, can these bones live?" I said, "O Sovereign LORD, you alone know."

4. Then he said to me, "Prophesy to these bones and say to them, 'Dry bones, hear the word of the LORD! 5. This is what the Sovereign LORD says to these bones. I will make breath enter you, and you will come to life, says the LORD.'"

. . . 6. Then he said to me, "Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel. They say, 'Our bones are dried up and our hope is gone; we are cut off.' 7. Therefore prophesy and say to them, 'This is what the Sovereign LORD says. O my people, I am going to open your graves and bring you up from them; I will bring you back to the land of Israel. 8. Then you, my people, will know that I am the LORD, when I open your graves and bring you up from them. 9. I will put my Spirit in you and you will live, and I will settle you in your own land. Then you will know that I the LORD have spoken, and I have done it, declares the LORD.'"

The reconstituting of the nation of Israel is historically unparalleled. It is an amazing confirmation of the reliability of God's word in Ezekiel 37 that the LORD has spoken

---

\(^{52}\) David Horovitz, *The Jerusalem Post* (Jerusalem, Israel: Jerusalem Post, 2009), 89.
accurately in the Jewish/Christian Bible.

Theologically, Muslims reject some of the most critical doctrines of Christianity. They reject the inerrancy of the Old and New Testaments, the inherited sinfulness of man, the fatherhood of God, the death and resurrection of Jesus and Jesus' atoning sacrifice for our sins (that is the Christian Gospel), just to name a few of the differences. If you remove these doctrines from Christianity, biblical Christianity and the Gospel collapses. Muhammad back-handedly acknowledges the teachings of the Old and New Testaments do NOT match his teachings when he recited the following, for if they did match there would have been no need for this warning:

And the Jews will not be pleased with thee, nor will the Christians, till thou follow their creed. Say. Lo! the guidance of Allah (Himself) is Guidance. And if thou shouldst follow their desires after the knowledge which hath come unto thee, then wouldst thou have from Allah no protecting guardian nor helper. (2:120).

It appears that either biblical Christianity or Islam will ultimately prevail as the world's predominate religion. Some seem to think this is a false choice. Multiculturalists, like President Obama, according to his speeches in Turkey and Cairo, believe the two religious can live harmoniously together. After fourteen hundred years of history, there should be many examples of this harmony, if in fact it were possible. Living under the dominating control of Islam (as a Christian) is NOT living in harmony. No examples of harmonious habitation can be truly found when Islam is represented by any appreciable numbers in any land; no matter how hard one searches, past or present. Recently, President Obama did suggest that Andalusia (Spain 711-1492) was such an example of

harmonious living. A accurate examination of this period demonstrates this

was not a correct description from a dhimmi’s point of view. However, the consistent patterns are the tensions that we see today between Islam and Western Civilization.

Harvard Science of Government and strategic studies professor, Samuel P. Huntington, created quite a stir when in the Summer of 1993 he noted that "Islam has bloody borders . . . [and] The next world war, if there is one, will be a war between civilizations."  


...by one count some thirty-two ethnic conflicts occurred during the Cold War, including fault line wars between Arabs and Israelis, Indians and Pakistanis, Sudanese Muslims and Christians, Sri Lankan Buddhist and Tamils, and Lebanese Shiites and Maronites [i.e. Christians]. . . The overwhelming majority of fault line conflicts however have taken place along the boundary looping across Eurasia and Africa that separates Muslims from non-Muslims. . . In all these places, the relations, between Muslims and peoples of other civilizations- Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox, Hindu, Chinese, Buddhist, Jewish-- have been generally antagonistic; most of these relations have been violent at some point in the past; many have been violent in the 1990s. Wherever one looks along the perimeter of Islam, Muslims have problems living peaceably with their neighbors. . .

Huntington continues,

Muslims make up about one-fifth of the world's population but in the 1990's they have been far more involved in intergroup violence than the people of any other civilization. The evidence is overwhelming... There were, in short, three times as many intercivilizational [i.e. Muslim vs. Muslim] conflicts involving Muslims as there were conflicts between all non-Muslim civilizations... Islam's borders are bloody, and so are its innards."

Huntington said in his footnote, "No single statement in my Foreign Affairs article attracted more critical comment than 'Islam has bloody borders.' I made that judgment on the basis of a casual survey of intercivilizational conflicts. Quantitative evidence from every disinterested source conclusively demonstrates its validity." To illustrate the above point Huntington quotes a study on military size by James Payne where Payne concludes that, "The average force ratios [i.e. size of army compared to total population] and military effort ratios of Muslim countries were roughly twice those of Christian countries..."

Quite clearly, the theology of Islam, generated from a plain sense reading of the Qur'an, is simply incompatible with biblical Christianity. While the Christian church has not ever perfectly lived up to God's word, the Bible, it has moved us in that direction and generated real freedom of conscience. Christians really would like to get along with Muslims. The desire is so strong that they will even deny the reality of the futility of the idea. The Qur'an clearly teaches Islam should force "submission or surrender" to Allah whenever or wherever possible under threat of judgment of Allah if one fails to jihad. Muslims cannot change this premise. Consequently, until one faith or the other becomes

58 Ibid. pp. 254-258.
59 Ibid. p. 258.
60 Ibid. p. 258.
completely dominate, they will be forever locked in struggle for they are truly incompatible. Biblical Christianity grows through the presentation of reliable theological ideas, while reemerging fundamentalist Islam tragically grows through forcing submission to their heretical ideas by the sword, bombs and bullets. Biblical Christians recognize the struggle often takes on a military component out of self defense or to prevent another international genocide, but the motivation behind the physical conflict is a spiritual one. The Apostle Paul wrote, “For our struggle is not against flesh and blood, but against the rulers, against the authorities, against the powers of this dark world and against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly realms” (Ephesians 6:12). Our generation of Christians must work to prepare and steel our student's will to persevere in this long ideological religious struggle which will only be concluded upon Jesus' return. Muslims have this long term view. Curriculum like this is necessary in order to equip your generation. You must be able to respond biblically to this growing challenge or my generation will have failed your generation of Christians.

The Saudi Arabian Wahhabi or Salafi curriculum (grades K-12) seeks to prepare their Saudi children for this religious contest by purposely teaching intolerance of non-Muslims in their school curriculum. Ali Al-Ahmed, a Shi’a from Saudi Arabia, honestly and courageously, describes the impact of Wahhabi Salafi curriculum upon the young minds of Saudi children. He knows that officially the Saudi government condemned the 9/11 attacks but knows that the Saudi government has not addressed the cause of the attacks.

... Yes, Prince Nayif condemned bin Laden, and other princes... Prince Turki condemned Bin Laden. They did not [however] condemn that message. They
condemned bin Laden. ... Bin Laden learned this in Saudi Arabia. He didn't learn it in the moon. That message that Bin Laden received, it still is taught in Saudi Arabia. And if Bin Laden dies, and this policy or [intolerant] curriculum stays, we will have other Bin Ladens.61

In the first centuries, early Christians did what we need to do today. Kenneth Scott Latourette quoted an Oxford historian who said, "Early Christians out-thought, out-lived, and out-died the adherents of other religions."62 So must we.

If the roles were reversed would you want Muslims to persevere in their witness to you? Hopefully, this book will create genuine love and empathy in your hearts for Muslims. Muslims are merely following a man, a book and a religion that is not inspired by the God of the Bible. They genuinely believe it to be true and all the threats made against hypocritical Muslims and to the unbelievers genuinely frighten them. You can be used by God to set them free.

Surah 3:4,11,16,19, “Lo, those who disbelieve the revelation of Allah, theirs will be a heavy doom...Allah is severe in punishment....guard us from the punishment of Fire...Whoso disbelieveth the revelations of Allah...Allah is swift at reckoning...Lo! Those who disbelieve the revelations of Allah...promise them a painful doom...

Surah 4:14, 137 And whoso disobeyeth Allah and His messenger...He will make him enter Fire, where such will dwell for ever...Lo! those who believe, then disbelieve and then (again) believe, then disbelieve, and then increase in disbelief, Allah will never pardon them”

Surah 5:86 “But those who disbelieve and deny our revelations, they are owners of hell-fire.”

Surah 10:5 “…as for those who disbelieve, theirs will be a boiling drink and painful doom because they disbelieved.’

Remember, Muslims faithfully meditate on these passages five times a day. The 9/11

bombers were not crazy, they were fearfully devout! They were, in their theology, guaranteeing their salvation. If you believe the Qur'an is true, it is a small matter to understand the emotions of the 9/11 bombers. As a father, you could understand how you could be proud to have your sons be willing to give up their lives in the cause of Allah if the Qur'an were true. The tragic problem is that the shahada, "There is no god but Allah and Muhammad is his prophet" is completely false. Muslims are promised paradise by such deeds but according to the Bible they are only guaranteeing their damnation. The best way to get rid of a terrorist is to help them become your Christian brother or sister.

The first critical step to having this occur is to get as many people as possible off the fence, out of the bleachers and onto the field with the Christian Gospel. To motivate us to witness we must be completely convinced that Islam is not the way or a way. The best way to persuade high school students of the profoundly erroneous nature of Islam is to take an objective politically incorrect look at the horrible fallen corrupt nature of the man Muhammad and his message. Both the man and the message have had bloody and brutal consequences on the world from his time until the present. The details of such a study are graphic and repulsive but it makes clear to any objective viewer that this man and this message and his followers are not from the God of the Bible. This man and his religion have wrought more harm on this world, with a potential for much more than any other man past or present. Any good the Islamic culture has performed pales in comparison to the amount of suffering that it has caused.

There is a price to be paid for apathy, and Western Civilization will pay it if it does not awaken to this threat. Just a word to the wise, no matter what position you take on the Judeo-Christian-Islam debate, there will always be some who will strongly
emotionally disagree with you. So think and speak clearly and thoughtfully so as to not
give your detractors an easy target. Remember, as the saying goes, your long term goal
is to "light a candle, not curse the darkness."

Discussion Questions:

1. Do you consider yourself fortunate to have grown up in a predominantly Christian
culture? If so why?

2. Do you desire the same for your children? Why or why not?

3. How was the author hurt by the culture of the 1960s and how was he helped by the
Judeo-Christian culture? Do you have a similar experience?

4. Does it appear to you that our culture is going in a positive or negative direction?
   What do you base your opinion on?

5. What was the expressed purpose of this curriculum?

6. What ideology have some gotten Europe to embrace?

7. What did the 1600s, 1700s, 1800s and 1900's experienced in the United States? Do
   you think it will experience this in the 2000s?

8. What did Jesus want his genuine followers to do in Matthew 28:19-20?

9. Who are Ergun and Emir Caner?

10. How does Christianity and Islam spread differently?

11. Are Muslims to have Christians as friends?

12. Is Christianity and Islam more similar or dissimilar on the most critical doctrines and
    practices?

13. What did Sheikh Adnan Ahmad Siami think of a call for unity among the three
    monotheistic religions of Abraham?

14. Do you believe that Israel has been replaced and God no longer has a future plan for
    them? Defend your answer.

15. What does Ezekiel 37 describe and why do some see May 14, 1948 as a fulfillment of
    this passage.
16. List four profoundly critical doctrines that Islam rejects about Christianity?

17. What appears will ultimately happen in the contest between Islam and Christianity and how does President Obama differ from this opinion?

18. Who is Samuel P. Huntington and what did he say in the Summer of 1992 that drew international attention? Upon further study what else did he discover?

19. Paul said our struggle ultimately was against whom in Ephesians 6:12?

20. What did Ali Al-Ahmed correctly observe about the K-12 Saudi Curriculum and what are the consequences?

21. What does the Qur'an promise for those who come to doubt the authenticity of the Qur'an?


23. What is the best way to get rid of a Islamic Terrorist?

24. What is our long term goal as Christian witnesses?
CHAPTER 3 THE PRE-ISLAMIC WORLD OF MUHAMMAD

Any student of history needs to ask the following questions Who? What? Where? When? and Why? The "Who" of the study of Islam is initially the question concerning the founder Muhammad and his successors. The "What" is what happened and what is the religion of Islam, its beliefs and practices. The "Where" is initially Mecca, then Yathrib/Medina, then Damascus, then Baghdad - all capitals of the ancient Islamic world. Today, Islam is in every capital of the world. The "When" has to do with dates of important events. Timelines are helpful in visually sorting out long periods of history. The "Why" deals with questions surrounding the mission of Islam and the tensions, generated from the implementing of that mission. Many of these types of questions will be answered and more generated as we survey Islamic history.

As you read the historic chapters, it is important not to get bogged down in the details and lose sight of the thesis. This entire history section will be modeled after the eight historic groupings supplied by George Braswell Jr. in his book, *Islam. Its Prophet, Peoples, Politics and Power*.\(^\text{63}\) Take notice, however, that this is not a complete or a sympathetic history of Islam. It is not focusing on possible cultural contributions made by Islam. This is a history focusing on the question of whether or not Islam has comported itself in a peaceful manner. If Islam is a religion of peace, it should be peaceful at some time in its history. In point of fact, Islam has repeatedly fought with

others and fought with itself throughout most of its history and continues to do so to this very day. This is quite possibly a fulfillment of Genesis 16:12, "He will be a wild donkey of a man; his hand will be against everyone and everyone's hand against him, and he will live in hostility toward all his brothers."

Any survey that condenses nearly 1,400 years of history (prior to A.D. 570 to present) will, out of necessity, be hitting only the high or low points. Nevertheless, this is very helpful, for it provides a schema or an organizational pattern or structure upon which information can be sorted out. The focus of the historical study will be to look at the man, the methodology of Islamic growth and its treatment of non-Muslims throughout its history. We are looking for patterns. The pattern most evident is the repeated use of jihad to conquer and subdue all infidels.

Broadman and Holman, 1996), 8.

The Pre-Islamic Arabian Peninsula

Muhammad (570-632) was born in Mecca, into a religiously diverse community.

Arabia was home not only to Arabian idolatry, but also to Sabeans, Zoroastrians, perhaps even some Buddhists and of course Jews and Christians. A number of Christian historians and theologians have made a strong case that Muhammad incorporated a lot of these other groups' doctrines and practices into his "new" religion of Islam. William J. Federer, author of What Every American Needs to Know About the Qur'an, writes about Muhammad's early travels with his uncle Abu Talib. Federer explores the different religions Muhammad came across which he would one day incorporate into his new

---

religion. "Muhammad could not read, so what he learned about Judaism, Christianity, Zoroastrianism, Manichaeism and Arabian pagan religions, such as Sabeans, came mostly from stories and oral traditions he heard on . . . travels" with his uncle. From Manicheanism, Muhammad learned it is advantageous to incorporate ideas of Christianity. He, like Mani, claimed "to be the Paraclete promised in the New Testament, [and] the Last Prophet, the Seal of the Prophets (Surah 33:40), completing a long line of prophets, which included Seth, Noah, Shem, Abraham. . . accusing their followers of corrupting their teachings." From Zoroastrian, he learned about, " seven heavens and seven hells. . . [and a] night journey [to heaven] (Surah 17:1). . . jihad. . . Jinn or Genie (Sura 72), . . . a tree in [a sensual] paradise . . . with wine and women called . . . Houris . . . Surah 44:54; 52:20; 56:22-23; 78:32-34]." R.J. Cootes and Snellgrove in their text, The Ancient World, writes of the borrowed idea of a journey after death across a bridge.

When a true Zoroastrian died he passed through the fire without being hurt and, for him, the bridge leading from earth to heaven was wide. A bad man, however, would find the bridge so narrow that he would fall off and never reach paradise. . . In later times the Romans copied some of Zoroaster's beliefs in their worship of the god, Mithras. The Muslims, on the other hand, conquered Persia in the seventh century A.D. and ruthlessly wiped out this gentle religion. Today a mere 125,000 Zoroastrians survive.

But as we have seen, Muhammad also borrowed many ideas from the Zoroastrians.

The crossing of a bridge at judgment makes one think of the Islamic Sirat bridge.

Each one's deeds will be weighed in God's balance, and the record of each will be placed in his hand, in the right hands of the blessed and in the left hands of the damned. . . the bridge Sirat must be crossed, which is very narrow and very long.

---
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True believers will be able to cross easily, but the wicked will fall into hell.\textsuperscript{70}

From growing up in Mecca Muhammad would have observed or, perhaps, participated in Arab paganism. Many of the pre-Islamic practices are incorporated right into Islam today.

Arab pagans walked in circles around the square edifice called the Ka'aba [i.e. cube] and . . . kiss the Black Stone, a 12-inch in diameter meteor rock . . . Arab pagans prayed five times a day towards the Ka'aba in Mecca and fasted part of a day for an entire month, as Muslims do at Ramadan. The symbol of the crescent moon, which pre-Islamic Turks also venerated, is atop every mosque and on many Islamic countries' flags. Islam adopted, the lunar calendar, starting their months with the sighting of the first crescent of a New Moon.\textsuperscript{71}

Robert Morey writes in his book, \textit{The Islam Invasion}, that,

Since the faith of Islam deems it blasphemous to even suggest that the teachings of Muhammad and the Quran find their source in pre-Islamic custom, culture, and religion, Muslims did not do any significant research on what pre-Islamic Arabia was like. It has been up to Western scholars [Morey lists a dozen of them] since the turn of the century to discover the cultural and literary sources Muhammad used in the construction of his religion and the Quran itself.\textsuperscript{72}

Morey writes of the Sabean's contribution to Islam.

The dominant religion that had grown very powerful just before Muhammad's time was that of the Sabeans. The Sabeans had an astral religion in which they worshiped the heavenly bodies. The moon was viewed as a male deity and the sun as the female deity. Together they produced other deities such as the stars. The Quran refers to this in Sura 41:37 and elsewhere. They used a lunar calendar to regulate their religious rites. For example, a month of fasting was regulated by the phases of the moon. The Sabean pagan rite of fasting began with the appearance of a crescent moon and did not cease until the crescent moon reappeared. This would later be adopted as one of five pillars of Islam.\textsuperscript{73}

Morey goes on to quote Arab scholar Nazar-Ali who observed, "Islam retained many
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aspects of pagan religion."  

Alfred Guillaume, Department Head of Near and Middle East Studies at the University of London and professor of Arabic at Princeton, wrote "The customs of heathenism have left an indelible mark on Islam, notably in the rites of the Pilgrimage."  

Professor Augustus H. Strong stated that Islam "is heathenism in monotheistic form."  

Early Christian missionary to the Muslims, Samuel Zwemer (1867-1952), wrote it was clear that Muhammad had used syncretism and fused a number of beliefs and practices of other non-orthodox and orthodox religions when he created his new religion. Zwemer wrote that Islam, is not an invention, but a concoction; there is nothing novel about it except the genius of Muhammad in mixing old ingredients into a new panacea for human ills and forcing it down by means of the sword. These heterogeneous elements of Islam were gathered in Arabia at a time when many religions had penetrated the Peninsula, and the Ka'aba was a Pantheon. Unless one has a knowledge of these elements of the “Time of Ignorance” [i.e. what Muslims call the time before Muhammad] Islam is a problem. Knowing, however these heathen, Christian and Jewish factors, Islam is seen to be a perfectly natural and comprehensible development. Its heathen, Christian and Jewish elements remain, to this day, perfectly recognizable, in spite of thirteen centuries of explanation by the Moslem authorities.

---
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ANALYSIS OF THE BORROWED ELEMENTS OF ISLAM.  

I. From HEATHENISM  
(As existing in Mecca or prevalent in other parts of Arabia.)  


b. Arabian Idolatry  

A. Ideas and Doctrines:  
1. Words that represent Jewish ideas and are not Arabic but Hebrew.  
Taboot (ark); Torah law; Eden; Gehinnom; Rabbi, Abhar=teacher; Sakina=Shekinah; Taghooth (used hundreds of times in Koran)=error; Furkan, etc., etc.  
Unity of God.  

2. Doctrinal views  
Seven hells and seven heavens Final judgment. Signs of last day. Gog and Magog. Prayer. Its time, posture, direction, etc.  

Laws regarding impurity of body. Washing with water or with sand. Laws regarding purification of women, etc. Use of "inshallah", age of discretion corresponds to Talmud.  

4. Views of life.  
Adam, Cain, Enoch; the fabulous things in the Koran are identical with Talmud. Noah—the flood—Eber (Hud)—Isaac,—Ishmael—Joseph. Cf. Koran with Talmud. Abraham—His idolatry—Nimrod’s oven—Pharaoh—the calf (taken from Talmud). Moses—The fables related of him and Aaron are old Jewish tales. Jethro (Shuab); Saul (Taloot); Goliath (Jiloot), and Solomon especially. Cf. Talmud.  

B. Stories and Legends:  
(According to Rabbi Geiger.)  
2. Respect for religious teachers; the Koran references to priests and monks.  
3. Jesus Christ—His names—Word of God, Spirit of God, etc.—Puerile miracles—Denial of crucifixion. (Basilidians, etc.)  
4. The Virgin—Her sinlessness—and the apostles—"hawari" an Abyssinian word meaning "pure ones."  
5. Wrong ideas of the Trinity. As held by Arabian heretical sects.  
6. Christian legends as of "Seven Sleepers," "Alexander of the horns," "Lokman" (=Esop.)  
8. Alms-giving as an essential part of true worship.  

The Koran could not have been composed by any except God. Will they say he forged it? Answer bring therefore a chapter like unto it.” The Koran. (Surah Yunas.)  

Zwemer has compiled a readily understandable chart comparing and contrasting the borrowed elements of Islam from the various groups of heathenism mentioned above as well as from Judaism, including their non-biblical stories, fables and legends. Again, a reminder that all Muhammad would have heard was from stories. He would not have been able to check which stories were in which sources or how reliable those sources were. From Christianity, Zwemer includes information from the apocryphal gospels and the heretical sects of Christianity.

Discussion Questions

1. What are the kinds of questions every good reporter must ask when learning about a story?

2. List and memorize the eight historic periods of Islam and the dates.

3. Any historic study that condenses 1,400 years must do what?

4. What theme is being studied in this historic survey?

5. What have numerous historians and theologians learned about the original sources of the doctrine and practices of Islam?

CHAPTER 4 THE LIFE OF MUHAMMAD (570-632)

Thomas Patrick Hughes (1838-1911) was an amazing and courageous Christian who loved God and Muslims.

He spent his entire missionary career (1864-1884) at Peshawar, capital of the Northwest Frontier Province, 18 miles from the Khyber pass. He blended with the populace through adopting Afghan dress and mastering Pushtu. He wrote the official government textbook for learning that language. His ultimate aim was to refute Islam.\(^\text{79}\)

Hughes wrote, "The Character of Mohammed is a historic problem, and many have been the conjectures as to his motives and designs. Was he an impostor, a fanatic, or an honest man- 'a very prophet of God'?\(^\text{80}\) Put another way, was Muhammad a deceiver, or deceived, delusional or demon possessed, or working for the divine as a true disciple or not? One is tempted to jump in and share one's conclusions, in no uncertain terms, but that would, perhaps, create a debate before a foundation was laid. In the long run, it may simply be a wiser course to allow some of the more salient details of Muhammad's character to be presented from the Qur'an and the hadiths, and let you, the reader, make your own evaluation as to whether or not he was a prophet of the God of the Bible. First, let us examine his background.

Muhammad's childhood cannot be described as anything but tragic. He was born (570) to Abd Allah (or Abdullah, Servant of Allah) and Aminah. Abdullah died (c. 569) just prior to the birth of Muhammad, leaving Aminah with the responsibility of raising


Muhammad until age six when she also died (576). The grandfather, Abd-al-Muttalib, took over the responsibilities for Muhammad for two more years until he died (578). Abdullah's brother, Uncle Abu Talib, finished raising Muhammad with his son, Ali. Muhammad grew up working with his uncle as a textile trader on a caravan route. In 595, an older woman, also in the trading business, age 40, twice widowed, named Khadijah, took notice of Muhammad by then age 25, and proposed marriage to him. Muhammad accepted. By all reports, they were very happily married for twenty-five years. Muhammad would eventually have six children born from this union, two sons and four daughters, but only the daughters lived past childhood.

Two of his daughters married men important to Islam. Ruqayya married Uthman, who would become the third Caliph (644-656) and Fatima, married Ali, Muhammad's cousin and the fourth Caliph of Islam (656-661). Muhammad was both Ali's cousin and his father-in-law. Eventually, Fatima and Ali had two sons, Hasan and Husayn ibn (i.e. son of) Ali. If the life of Muhammad ended here, Muhammad's story would be a story of triumph over tragedy, but it does not end here. In 610, Muhammad, possibly following the example of Christian hermits, retired to the small cave of Hira (13' deep, 6.9" wide) on the mountain Jabal an-Nur, near Mecca to meditate and pray.81 There is little, if any, dispute on any of the details up to this point.
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However, Muhammad's story takes a drastic turn here, for during one of these pilgrimages, in the year 610, Muhammad claims he was visited by the angel Gabriel. Over the next twenty-two years (610-632), Gabriel allegedly visited Muhammad at least 114 other times bringing revelations from Allah. These would eventually be recorded in the Qur'an. This has led to a cult following of Muhammad by more than a billion followers. Multiple times, each day, faithful Muslims repeat the shahada creed, "There is no god but Allah and Muhammad is his prophet." Each and every time Muslims say or write "Muhammad" they follow this with words in Arabic that translate into the phrase, "Peace be upon him." This can be verified in Islamic literature, for each and every time

Muhammad's name is in print you see his name followed by Arabic writing or the letters (p.b.u. h.). An example of this is easy to find. In the Hadith, *Volume 2, Book 15, Number 70*, we see the slavishness with which they follow this tradition as narrated by Aisha. We read:

Allah's Apostle *(p.b.u.h)* came to my house while two girls were singing beside me the songs of Buath (a story about the war between the two tribes of the Ansar, the Khazraj and the Aus, before Islam). The Prophet *(p.b.u.h)* lay down and turned his face to the other side. Then Abu Bakr came and spoke to me harshly saying, "Musical instruments of Satan near the Prophet *(p.b.u.h)*?" Allah's Apostle *(p.b.u.h)* turned his face towards him and said, "Leave them." When Abu Bakr became inattentive, I signaled to those girls to go out and they left. It was the day of 'Id, and the Black people were playing with shields and spears; so either I requested the Prophet *(p.b.u.h)* or he asked me whether I would like to see the display. I replied in the affirmative. Then the Prophet *(p.b.u.h)* made me stand behind him and my cheek was touching his cheek and he was saying, "Carry on! O Bani Arfida," till I got tired. The Prophet *(p.b.u.h)* asked me, "Are you satisfied (Is that sufficient for you)?" I replied in the affirmative and he told me to leave.  

The entire religion of Islam is based on the credibility of Muhammad's alleged encounter with Allah through Gabriel. Morey casts serious doubt on the reliability of this story by alleging there are actually four different accounts of this story recorded in the Quran. Muslims would, of course, reject this interpretation, but if Morey is correct, this raises the question, "Was Muhammad a deceiver?" Morey concludes, "The Quran gives us four conflicting accounts of this original call to be a prophet. Either one of these four accounts is true and the others false or they are all false. They cannot all be true."  

1. *Allah personally appeared* to Muhammad in the form of a man and Muhammad saw and heard him in Surahs 53:2-18 and 81:19-24

---
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Yusufali: He was taught by one Mighty in Power (53:5), . . . So did (Allah) convey the inspiration to His Servant—(conveyed) what He (meant) to convey. The (Prophet's) (mind and) heart in no way falsified that which he saw, (53:10-11).

Pickthall: That this is in truth the word of an honoured messenger, Mighty, established in the presence of the Lord of the Throne (One) to be obeyed, and trustworthy; and your comrade is not mad. Surely he beheld him on the clear horizon. (Pickthall's footnote reads, The reference is to the Prophet's vision at Mt. Hira.”)


Yusufali: Say, the Holy Spirit has brought the revelation from thy Lord in Truth, in order to strengthen those who believe, and as a Guide and Glad Tidings to Muslims (16:102).

3. Angels are the ones who came down to Muhammad and announce his call to be a prophet in Surah 15:8.

Yusufali: We send not the angels down except for just cause:

4. Gabriel is the only angel in Surah 2:97.

Yusufali: Say: Whoever is an enemy to Gabriel—for he brings down the (revelation) to thy heart by Allah's will, a confirmation of what went before, and guidance and glad tidings for those who believe.  

Who gave Muhammad this message: Allah, the Holy Spirit, angels, or Gabriel?

How can anyone test whether or not Muhammad actually had this spiritual encounter?

If he did have this encounter, was it with the true God himself or even a messenger of the true God through Gabriel? Nearly 600 years earlier the Apostle Paul described a tactic of deception used by Satan. Paul warns, that on occasion, Satan himself masquerades as an angel of light. Paul writes,

And I will keep on doing what I am doing in order to cut the ground from under those who want an opportunity to be considered equal with us in the things they boast about. For such men are false apostles, deceitful workmen, masquerading as apostles of Christ. And no wonder, for Satan himself masquerades as an angel of light. Paul writes,
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light. It is not surprising, then, if his servants masquerade as servants of righteousness. Their end will be what their actions deserve. (2 Corinthians 11:12-15)

Throughout history, false prophets have claimed encounters with the divine. Surely everyone would agree there are dishonest people who make up bogus claims about their religious encounters. So how can one test Muhammad's claims? God gave a test through Moses in Deuteronomy 18: 21-22 to help people determine whether or not an alleged prophet truly spoke for God. Moses asked the people, "How can we know when a message has not been spoken by the LORD? [Answer] If what a prophet proclaims in the name of the LORD does not take place or come true, that is a message the LORD has not spoken. That prophet has spoken presumptuously. Do not be afraid of him."

Prophetically, Muhammad mostly threatened future judgment on the unbelievers without getting into a lot of details. Occasionally, he did prophesy things that seem very unlikely. The Hadith describes an event that the Messenger affirmed. The story is that while a shepherd was amongst his sheep, suddenly a wolf attacked a sheep and took it away. The shepherd pursued the wolf. All of a sudden, the wolf stopped, sat on its tail, and addressed the shepherd saying, “Be afraid of Allah. You have taken the provision from me which Allah gave me.” The shepherd then went to Medina to tell the people what had happened. Muhammad overheard the story and said, "He (the shepherd) has spoken the truth. By Him (Allah) in Whose Hands my soul is, the Day of Resurrection will not be established till beasts of prey speak to the human beings, and the stick... and the shoe-laces of a person speak to him and his thigh informs him about his family as to what happened to them after him” (Hadith Vol. 1 p. 17). This seems a bit incredible.

Another prophecy, "The Prophet said...," A time will come upon the people when a person will wander about with gold as Zakat (i.e. an offering) and will not find anybody
to accept it, and one man will be seen followed by forty women to be their guardian because of scarcity of men and great number of women" Hadith Vol. 2, Book 24:1414, p. 288. This has not happened yet.

Not only did Muhammad deliver these apparently false prophecies, but he also made even more bizarre claims which make us question his emotional and mental stability. Here are just twenty things Muhammad said, or did, or asked others to do. These have been prayerfully collected, not by critics of Islam, but by Muslim scholars and written down in the Hadith as an example for the believers in faith and practice. There are many more bizarre ideas than these that could be cited.

1. Muhammad said Adam was created 90' tall.

   The Prophet said, "Allah created Adam, making him 60 cubits tall (Volume 4, Book 55, Number 54). No mention is made of Eve's size but one can see why that would be a problem.

2. Muhammad said passing gas prevents one from praying until after a cleansing ablution. This is still a commonly accepted practice in Islam today.

   "Allah's Apostle said, "The prayer of a person who does, Hadath (passes, urine, stool or wind) is not accepted till he performs (repeats) the ablution" (Volume 1, Book 4, Number 137).

3. Muhammad said Hell is full of women for being deficient in intelligence.

   I have seen that the majority of the dwellers of Hell-fire were you (women)." They asked, "Why is it so, O Allah's Apostle?" He replied, "You curse frequently and are ungrateful to your husbands. .. I have not seen anyone more deficient in intelligence and religion than you. A cautious sensible man could be led astray by some of you." The women asked, "O Allah's Apostle! What is deficient in our intelligence and religion?" He said, "Is not the evidence of two women equal to the witness of one man?" They replied in the affirmative. He said, "This is the deficiency in her intelligence. Isn't it true that a woman can neither pray nor fast during her menses?" The women replied in the affirmative. He said, "This is the deficiency in her religion." (Vol. 1, book 6, chapter 304 p. 210).

4. Muhammad said burn down the houses of those who do not go to prayer meeting.
Allah's Apostle said, "By Him in Whose Hand my soul is I was about to order for collecting fire-wood (fuel) and then order Someone to pronounce the Adhan for the prayer and then order someone to lead the prayer then I would go from behind and burn the houses of men who did not present themselves for the (compulsory congregational) prayer... (Volume 1, Book 10, Number 644 p. 371-372 USC Volume 1, Book 11, Number 617).

5. When the Meccans asked Muhammad for a miracle he supplied one.

So Muhammad cut the moon in half (Hadith Vol. 4, Bk. 61: 3637, p. 501-502).

6. Muhammad was superstitious concerning his practice of going to the bathroom. Only an odd number of stones were to be used as toilet paper and cleaning must only be done with the left hand.

The Prophet said, "... whoever cleans his private parts with stones should do it with odd number of stones" Volume 1, Book 4, Number 161 p. 147. Today this practice is still faithfully followed in Egypt. As I was entering a public restroom in Cairo, Egypt, I was met by a restroom matrons who very carefully lifted up a roll of toilet paper before my eyes and then counted, "one, two, three," tearing off each square as she counted and then handed me the toilet paper.

Mohammad is the example in all areas of life.

I placed water for the bath of the Prophet. He... poured water on his left hand and washed his private parts (Volume 1, Book 5, Number 257p. 191). Never extend your left hand to a Moslem for this is their personal hygiene hand.

7. Another alleged miracle of Muhammad's was...

When they ran out of water Muhammad put his hand in the bucket "I saw the water flowing from among the fingers of Allah’s Messenger..." (Hadith Vol. 4, Bk. 61: 3579, p. 472)

8. Another alleged miracle of Muhammad's was when...

Food used to glorify Allah when Muhammad ate it. (Hadith Vol. 4, Bk. 61: 3579, p. 472)

9. Muhammad used to deliver talks while standing under a date-palm tree. His followers made him a pulpit and he began to deliverer talks from there. This apparently made the trunk of the date-palm tree start crying so Muhammad reportedly went over to the tree and rubbed it to stop if from crying. (Hadith Vol. 4, Bk. 61: 3583, p. 475, cf. also Vol. 2:918)

10. Muhammad claimed a bump, tumor or cyst between his shoulders was a sign of Prophethood.
“My aunt took me to the Prophet . . . I stood behind him and saw the seal of Prophethood between his shoulders, and it was like a small . . . Egg of a partridge” (Hadith Vol. 1 Bk. 4 Chapter 190 p. 162).

11. Muhammad said all babies cry at birth because they are touched by Satan.

Abu Huraira said, "I heard Allah's Apostle saying, 'There is none born among the off-spring of Adam, but Satan touches it. A child therefore, cries loudly at the time of birth because of the touch of Satan, except Mary and her child." Then Abu Huraira recited: "And I seek refuge with You for her and for her offspring from the outcast Satan" (3.36) (Volume 4, Book 55, Number 641).

12. Muhammad said Satan sleeps in noses at night.

The Prophet said, "If anyone of you rouses from sleep and performs the ablution, he should wash his nose by putting water in it and then blowing it out thrice, because Satan has stayed in the upper part of his nose all the night." (Hadith Volume 4, 516)

13. The Angel Gabriel used to make regular visits to Muhammad.

The angel "Gabriel . . . used to meet him on every night of Ramadan till the end of the month. The prophet used to recite the Noble Qur'an" (Hadith Vol. 3, Book 30: 1902, p. 83).

14. Muhammad said Satan circulates in your blood system.

"The Prophet replied, "Satan circulates in the human being as blood circulates in the body, and I was afraid lest Satan might insert an evil thought in your minds" (Volume 3, Book 33, Number 254.)

15. Muhammad said when the call for prayer occurs Satan flees so fast that he breaks wind.

Allah's Apostle said, "When the call for prayer is made, Satan takes to his heels passing wind ... (Volume 2, Book 22, Number 323).

16. Muhammad colorfully described what happens to those who sleep through morning prayers.

A person . . . had kept on sleeping till morning and had not got up for the prayer. The Prophet said, "Satan urinated in his ears" (Volume 2, Book 21, Number 245).

17. Muhammad warned what happens if you accidentally wet your pants?
Once the Prophet, while passing through one of the grave-yards of Medina or Mecca heard the voices of two persons who were being tortured in their graves. The Prophet said, "These two persons are being tortured not for a major sin (to avoid)." The Prophet then added, "Yes! (they are being tortured for a major sin). Indeed, one of them never saved himself from being soiled with his urine . . . (Volume 1, Book 4, Number 216[ 215] p. 172)

18. Muhammad threatened those who lift their heads up too early in prayer with this surprise.

The Prophet said, "Isn't he who raises his head before the Imam afraid that Allah may transform his head into that of a donkey or his figure (face) into that of a donkey?" Volume 1, Book 10, Number 691 p. 393 (USC Volume 1, Book 11, Number 660:)

19. Muhammad gave this medical advice about Camel Urine and milk.

Anas said, "Some people of 'Ukl or 'Uraina tribe came to Medina and its climate did not suit them. So the Prophet ordered them to go to the herd of (Milch) camels and to drink their milk and urine (as a medicine). . . (Volume 1, Book 4, Number 234)

20. Is Muhammad sadistic in his punishment? Do some of his followers feel justified for similar actions?

". . . So they went as directed and after they became healthy, they killed the shepherd of the Prophet and drove away all the camels. The news reached the Prophet early in the morning and he sent (men) in their pursuit and they were captured and brought at noon. He then ordered to cut their hands and feet (and it was done), and their eyes were branded with heated pieces of iron, They were put in 'Al-Harra' and when they asked for water, no water was given to them." Abu Qilaba said, "Those people committed theft and murder, became infidels after embracing Islam and fought against Allah and His Apostle " (Volume 1, Book 4, Number 234).

At this point, a reasonable person has to question whether Muhammad's teachings were really inspired by the biblical God without being considered hateful. The ideas Muhammad expressed were ridiculous and seem to completely disqualify him as a true prophet of God. Muhammad's teachings seem to indicate a break with reality, or at the very least, they represent a person with a creative imagination and an amazing ability to speak authoritatively on matters he knows nothing about. He only had to convince his superstitious peers who enforced his teachings on others. The reading of the Qur'an
sends the same kind of message to the non-Muslim. The Qur'an is not a collection of wise sayings and advice. Instead, it appears to this author to be a series of dictations by an angry god made after the image of a mad man.

The Qur'an, in spirit, agrees with the Hadiths, but is also of a different nature. The Qur'an is a collection of the 114 messages given verbatim from Allah's messenger to Muhammad. The Qur'an is less about Muhammad's deeds and focuses more on threats against Jews, Christians, pagans and hypocritical Muslims. Along with some cultural rules, the best description of the Qur'an is that it is a long series of harangues against the infidels with repeated calls for jihads against them. A harangue is,

1. a scolding or a long or intense verbal attack; diatribe.
2. a long, passionate, and vehement speech, esp. one delivered before a public gathering.
3. any long, pompous speech or writing of a tediously hortatory or didactic nature; sermonizing lecture or discourse.

It is small wonder that fundamentalist Muslims today are angry and aggressive toward the West. The Qur'an teaches them to be. No matter what others tell you about the Qur'an, haranguing or calls for jihads against the unbelievers are recurring themes in every chapter except four. It is evident to this student of the Bible that unless God has had an emotional breakdown between the New Testament and the reciting of the Qur'an, these words are not inspired by the same God. Pick any chapter, save four, and you will

---

89 Put this to the test. Go to http://www.usc.edu/schools/college/crcc/engagement/resources/texts/muslim/ and select any chapter and see if you do not find a " a scolding or a long or intense verbal attack; diatribe" against one of Allah's enemies.
find this to be true. One cannot go through every chapter to prove the haranguing nature of the Qur'an and the repeated calls for jihad; thirteen examples should illustrate the point.

1. Surah 2:6-7, 15 “As for disbelievers, whether thou warn them or …not…they believe not. Allah hath sealed their hearing and their hearts, and on their eyes there is a covering. Theirs will be an awful doom… Allah (Himself) doth mock them, leaving him to wander blindly on in their contumacy.”

2. Surah 5:60 “Shall I tell thee of a worse (case) than theirs for retribution with Allah…Allah hath turned some to apes and swine [literally].”

3. Surah 9:49,”…Lo! hell is all around the disbelievers…It is not for the Prophet, and those who believe, to pray for the forgiveness of idolaters even though they may be near of kin (to them) after it hath become clear that they are people of hell-fire.”

4. Surah 10:5 “…as for those who disbelieve, theirs will be a boiling drink and painful doom because they disbelieved.’

5. Surah 13:41 “See they not how We [Allah] visit the land, reducing it of its outlying parts (when) Allah doometh there is not that can postpone his doom, and He is swift at reckoning.”

6. Surah 14:48-52 On the day when the earth will be changed. . . Thou wilt see the guilty on that day linked together in chains, Their raiment of pitch, and the Fire covering their faces, That Allah may repay each soul what it hath earned. Lo! Allah is swift at reckoning. This is a clear message for mankind in order that they may be warned thereby, and that they may know that He is only One Allah, and that men of understanding may take heed.

7. Surah 18:30 we read this graphic description of hell. “(It is) the truth from the Lord of you (all). …We have prepared for disbelievers Fire. Its tent encloseth them. If they ask for showers, they will be showered with water like to molten lead which burneth the faces. Calamitous the drink and ill the resting-place!”

8. Surah 21:39-40, declares disbelievers would change, “if those who disbelieved but knew the time when they will not be able to drive off the fire from their faces and from their backs, …but it will come on them unawares…neither will they be reprieved”

---

90 At this point it is interesting to note which surahs do not include some type of threat. They are surahs 93, 94, 97, 112. These surahs are very short only 11, 8, 5 and 4 verses respectively, making it very difficult to get a condemnation in.
9. Surah 37:67, 97, And afterward, lo! thereupon they have a drink of boiling water...They said: Build for him a building and fling him in the red-hot fire.

10. Surah 38:57-71, Hell, where they will burn, an evil resting place. Here is a boiling and an ice-cold draught, so let them taste it, and other (torment) of the kind in parts (the two extremes)!...Say (unto them, O Muhammad): I am only a warner...It is revealed unto me only that I may be a plain warner.

11. Surah 40:46-50, The Fire; they are exposed to it morning and evening; And when they wrangle in the Fire, the weak say unto those who were proud: Lo! we were a following unto you; will ye therefore rid us of a portion of the Fire? Those who were proud say: Lo! we are all (together) herein. Lo! Allah hath judged between (His) slaves. And those in the Fire say unto the guards of hell: Entreat your Lord that He relieve us of a day of the torment. They say: Came not your messengers unto you with clear proofs? They say: Yea, verily. They say: Then do ye pray, although the prayer of disbelievers is in vain.

The second to the last chapter chronologically written by Muhammad abrogates all previous verses on the subject.

12. Surah 9:13-14 Will ye not fight a folk who broke their solemn pledges, and purposed to drive out the messenger and did attack you first? What! Fear ye them? Now Allah hath more right that ye should fear Him, if ye are believers. Fight them! Allah will chastise them at your hands, and He will lay them low and give you victory over them, and He will heal the breasts of folk who are believers.

The last chapter chronologically written by Muhammad is the final word on the subject.

13. Surah 5:33 "The only reward of those who make war upon Allah and His messenger and strive after corruption in the land will be that they will be killed or crucified, or have their hands and feet on alternate sides cut off, or will be expelled out of the land. Such will be their degradation in the world, and in the Hereafter theirs will be an awful doom;

When most Jews, Christians, and non-Muslim pagans heard Muhammad's claim and listened to his threats, they thought he was crazy. In the introduction to Surah 93, Pickthall, the converted Muslim translator of the Qur'an, summarized the feelings of many people in Mecca when he wrote, "The Prophet had been a leading citizen of Mecca until
he received his call [610]. Now he was regarded as a madman.” 91

In Surah 23:24-28 we learn what many Arab chieftains originally thought of Muhammad.

But the chieftains of his folk, who disbelieved, said: This is only a mortal like you who would make himself superior to you. Had Allah willed, He surely could have sent down angels. We heard not of this in the case of our fathers of old. He is only a man in whom is a madness, so watch him for a while….He is only a man who hath invented a lie about Allah. We are not going to put faith in him.

We are told specifically that unbelievers laughed at him in Surah 83:29.

Lo! the guilty [Jews, Christians, etc.] used to laugh at those who believed [i.e. Muslims], And wink one to another when they passed them; And when they returned to their own folk, they returned jesting; And when they saw them they said: Lo! these have gone astray.

Surah 31:6-7
Allah's way . . . [is made] the butt of mockery. . . . And when our revelations are recited unto him [Jew, Christian, etc.] he turneth away in pride as if he heard them not, as if there were a deafness in his ears. So give him tidings of a painful doom.

This skeptical and critical response by non-Muslims is a perfectly natural response considering Muhammad's extravagant claims. With all the threats made by Muhammad, against the non-Muslim, one would either be forced to fearfully submit to him or be dismissive of him. From a Judeo-Christian perspective, more people should be dismissive of him. Sadly, that has not been the case either then or now. This dismissive attitude of non-Muslims apparently generated a great deal of bitterness in Muhammad and his followers. That bitterness is still being expressed against Jews, Christians and unbelievers, whom they call infidels or kafirs today.

Is it possible that Muhammad was not delusional but was himself truly deceived?

In many of the histories of Muhammad’s life, the idea is conveyed that Muhammad was troubled by the idea that he might be possessed by a demon or spirit called a jinn. This so

troubled Muhammad, that Islamic historians note he planned to commit suicide. Ibn Ishaq, (c.707-773) Islam's earliest historian, wrote of Muhammad's initial self loathing.

And I awoke from my sleep, and it was as though these words [i.e. Read/Recite in the name of the Lord Sura 96:1-5] were written on my heart. (Now none of God's creatures was more hateful to me than an (ecstatic) poet or a man possessed: I could not even look at them. I thought, Woe is me poet or possessed- Never shall Quraysh [a polytheistic Arab tribe of Mecca] say this of me! I will go to the top of the mountain and throw myself down that I may kill myself and gain rest."

As the story goes, Muhammad began to carry out his plan when he reports that an angel stopped him and said, "O Muhammad! thou art the apostle of God and I am Gabriel." Imagine how the world would have been different if Muhammad had followed through on his planned suicide. Whatever the motivation, for the next twenty-two years (610-632) Muhammad claimed to receive 114 revelations which have been recorded in the Qur'an. It is impossible that the revelation came from Jehovah, the God of both the Jews and the Christians because the revelations do not correspond with previously given revelations. Much more likely, the revelations came from the "Father of lies," the devil. In the Gospel of John, chapter 8, Jesus is debating with the Jews, who are insisting that they are children of Abraham, and surely, they were, physically.

"If you were Abraham's children," said Jesus, "then you would do the things Abraham did. As it is, you are determined to kill me, a man who has told you the truth that I heard from God. Abraham did not do such things. You are doing the things your own father does. We are not illegitimate children," they protested. "The only Father we have is God himself."

Jesus said to them, "If God were your Father, you would love me, for I came from God and now am here. I have not come on my own; but he sent me. Why is my language not clear to you? Because you are unable to hear what I say. You belong to your father, the devil, and you want to carry out your father's desire. He was a murderer from the beginning, not holding to the truth, for there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks his native language, for he is a liar and the father of lies.

92 Guillaume, The Life of Muhammad, p. 106.
93 Ibid.
Yet because I tell the truth, you do not believe me! Can any of you prove me guilty of sin? If I am telling the truth, why don't you believe me? He who belongs to God hears what God says. The reason you do not hear is that you do not belong to God.”

Jesus’ test for whether the Jews were truly children of Abraham was, “If you were Abraham's children,” said Jesus, "then you would do the things Abraham did.” Jesus' test is just as valid for Muslims who also claim to be children of Abraham. Who was the Jews’ father? Jesus answers that question as well. Jesus said, “Why is my language not clear to you? Because you are unable to hear what I say. You belong to your father, the devil, and you want to carry out your father's desire. He was a murderer from the beginning, not holding to the truth, for there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks his native language, for he is a liar and the father of lies.” These men wanted to carry out their father’s desire and murder the Messiah, Jesus. These Jews’ father was the devil.

The implication and application is that since so many of the Muslims want to murder and have murdered millions of Christians over the last 1,400 years, their father must also be the devil as well! Both these Jews and now these Muslims were and are doing this demonic behavior without understanding who is inspiring them. They are actually believing the lies of the devil. The above seems to parallel the state of radical Muslims perfectly. This confirms the idea that whether or not Muhammad and Islam were “demon possessed,” the words and deeds are certainly reflecting their lack of congruency and understanding of truth found in both the Old and New Testament. Their words and deeds seem to follow the language of the devil.

Muslim doctrine declares lies about Jesus being only a prophet supportive of Islam. The proof that they are the anti-Christ is their longing for the murder of both Jews and Christians. Certainly, the degree and duration of bloody carnage brought about by Muhammad and this religion over the past 1,400 years seems to indicate something more
than mere human influence.

Non-believers of Muhammad's day were convinced that he was delusional. Surah 33:12 "... Allah and His messenger promised us naught but delusion." In Surah 68:2 one can deduce that a rumor was going around that Muhammad was mad or possessed; for in this verse he is being assured that he is neither of the above.

YUSUFALE: Thou art not, by the Grace of thy Lord, mad or possessed.

PICKTHAL: Thou art not . . . a madman.

SHAKIR: By the grace of your Lord you are not mad.

Again in Surah 68:6 we read of his counter charge against his accusers. He asks them,

YUSUFALE: Which of you is afflicted with madness.

PICKTHAL: Which of you is the demented.

SHAKIR: Which of you is afflicted with madness.

Surah 81:22 Is a clear denial of possession.

YUSUFALE: And (O people!) your companion is not one possessed;

PICKTHAL: And your comrade is not mad.

SHAKIR: And your companion is not gone mad.

After the death of Khadijah (c. 620), Muhammad had a change in life direction that could be described as having a mid-life crisis. One of the aspects of this crisis was that he went from monogamy to poligamy. Allah gave marriage directions in Surah 4:3, "...marry of the women, who seem good to you, two or three or four...". One would think this would be fairly easy to confine oneself to that number of women, especially since all it took to divorce a wife was to say, "I divorce you, I divorce you, I divorce you."

Muhammad himself broke his own rule and acquired sixteen wives [some say 11], two slave concubines and had four more women who gave themselves to him. One Hadith
records Muhammad, in his fifties, had the sexual appetite of 30 men. Reasonable people today could rightly conclude that Muhammad seems to have had an unhealthy preoccupation with sex. Muslims, in contrast, seem to see this as a sign of virility and view it positively.

The Prophet used to visit all his wives in a round, during the day and night and they were eleven in number." I asked Anas, "Had the Prophet the strength for it?" Anas replied, "We used to say that the Prophet was given the strength of thirty (men)." Volume 1, Book 5, Number 268:

This apparent unhealthy preoccupation with sex led him to behaviors that caused Muhammad to cross clear lines of right and wrong in Bedouin culture. For example, Muhammad became attracted to Zaynab bint Jahsh, his adopted son's wife. Apparently, Muhammad had originally promoted the marriage to Zeyd but because of her discontent with Zeyd, or her desire for Muhammad, the marriage had to be undone. However, this posed an ethical problem, for it was illegal in Arabic law for a father to marry the wife of a son.

Since Zaynab was the wife of Muhammad's adopted son, pre-Islamic practices . . . considered such a marriage to be a taboo. Such a view considered a biological son to be the same as an adopted one. These ideas considered Muhammad's marriage to Zaynab as incest, as she was the wife of his adopted son, and the adopted sons were counted the same as a biological son.94

Muhammad received a "timely" revelation from Allah clearing the way for this unethical union. The new revelation from Allah reads as follows:

So when Zeyd had performed that necessary formality (of divorce) from her, We [i.e. Allah] gave her unto thee[i.e. Muhammad] in marriage, so that (henceforth) there may be no sin for believers in respect of wives of their adopted sons, when the latter have performed the necessary formality (of release) from them. The commandment of Allah must be fulfilled. (Sura 33:37f.)

To make sure there would be no future problems with restrictions on whoever Muhammad desired to marry, or the numbers of wives Muhammad could marry, Muhammad was initially given an itemized list of those he could marry. Then Allah decided to just give Muhammad a "privilege for thee only" and gave Muhammad a a blank check on who he could marry and the number of wives he could marry (Surah 33:50-51). Numbers have been added to the text to differentiate the types of wives he could now choose from.

O Prophet! Lo! We [Allah] have made lawful unto thee [1] thy wives unto whom thou hast paid their dowries, [2] and those whom thy right hand possesseth [3] of those whom Allah hath given thee as spoils of war, [4] and the daughters of thine uncle on the father's side and the [5] daughters of thine aunts on the father's side, [6] and the daughters of thine uncle on the mother's side and the [7] daughters of thine aunts on the mother's side who emigrated with thee, [8] and a believing woman if she give herself unto the Prophet and the Prophet desire to ask her in marriage - a privilege for thee only, not for the (rest of) believers - We are Aware of that which We enjoined upon them concerning their wives and those whom their right hands possess - that thou mayst be free from blame, for Allah is ever Forgiving.

Merciful[9] Thou canst defer whom thou wilt of them and [10] receive unto thee whom thou wilt, and whomsoever thou desirest [i.e. a blank check] of those whom thou hast set aside (temporarily), it is no sin for thee (to receive her again); that is better; that they may be comforted and not grieve, and may all be pleased with what thou givest them. Allah knoweth what is in your hearts (O men), and Allah is ever forgiving, Clement.[emphasis mine]

Muhammad's sexual appetite also took him in a terrible direction. Muhammad married a six year old girl and consummated his marriage with her when she was nine years old. Consequently, Rev. Jerry Vines called Muhammad a pedophile.95 This drew much national attention. Nevertheless, what Rev. Vines said was true. According to the American Heritage Dictionary, “Pedophilia is the act or fantasy on the part of an adult of

---

engaging in sexual activity with a child or children.” 96 So the act of touching is not required to class one as a pedophile. If Muhammad’s desires were simply paternal, then he should have adopted Aisha as his daughter and not married her as a wife. However, this would have been unnecessary, for her father Abu Bakr, actually outlived Muhammad and was the first caliph (632-634) following Muhammad's death. Muhammad certainly did not treat her as a daughter, at least by age nine. Today, Muhammad would also be brought up on sexual assault charges.

“Specific laws vary by state, but sexual assault generally refers to any crime in which the offender subjects the victim to sexual touching that is unwanted and offensive. These crimes can range from sexual groping or assault/battery, to attempted rape.” 97

Muhammad’s testimony is that he waited until Aisha was nine years old before having sexual intercourse with her. When forced to do so, one would regretfully imagine Muhammad was forced to wait for the child to grow from age six to age nine (i.e. from first grade to fourth) to make this sexual act even possible.

It is helpful to cast Muhammad into today’s culture to appreciate what he did. If he lived today, he would have been age 53 when he had sexual intercourse with a nine-year-old child. If discovered, Muhammad would be charged with statutory rape: “… states make it unlawful for an adult to engage in sexual intercourse with a person who has not reached the age of consent (usually 18 years of age).” 98 Today, we would see a picture of Muhammad in an orange jumpsuit on the 6 p.m. news, and we would all shake our heads.

at such a pathetic man. Muhammad would then be sentenced to prison, but he would have to be segregated because even prisoners hate child molesters and, given the chance, they would kill him. These are the facts of the founder of Islam of whom more than a billion people regard as a prophet of God. This fact alone should dismiss him from being considered a true prophet of God. The chart below gives a timeline of the change that occurred in Muhammad's dealing with non-Muslims.

From Trader (595-622) to Raider (622-632)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>619/20</td>
<td>Trader: Uncle Abu Talib, Muhammad’s protector in Mecca and his wife Khadija, his balance, both died. Muhammad becomes increasingly fanatical and generates hostility with Meccans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622</td>
<td>to Raider Meccans seek to kill Muhammad bringing about the Hijra/Hegira or flight 280 mi. north to Yathrib/Medina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td>Meccan Caravans robbed, booty desired led to Battle of Badr. Jewish Bani Qaynuka tribe nearly massacred but Muhammad was talked into the expelling of the Jewish Bani Qaynuka from Yathrib/Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>Battle of Uhud Muhammad defeated, Jewish Tribe of Bani Nadir expelled from Yathrib/Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627</td>
<td>Battle of the Trench Bani Quraish 800 surrendered Jewish men beheaded, women and children sold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>Khaybar Jewish Oasis robbed. Muslims today still celebrate this as a model for the impending defeat of the nation of Israel. Treaty of Hudaybiyyah grants privilege of Muhammad and Muslims to pilgrimage to the pagan shrine of Mecca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>Muhammad’s conquest of Mecca expulsion of all the idols but his father’s Allah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>On June 8th Muhammad dies at age 62 in the arms of Aisha his 18 year old wife.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Muhammad arrived in Yathrib/Medina sometime during the year 622. He was invited to arbitrate between Arab polytheists, who were constantly feuding, and Jews who tended to join up on one side or the other of the Arab conflicts. Muhammad seemed like he would be a good choice for an arbitrator. Muhammad was Arab, so the Arabs would appreciate that. But Muhammad had rejected polytheism, so the Jews could appreciate
that. Nevertheless, Muhammad was not a good choice because in a very short time, Muhammad demanded submission of both Arabs and Jews to his new religion of Islam. Non-compliant Arabs and Jews faced expulsion or death. The Meccans tired of their caravans being robbed and their workers murdered by this gang of Muslims, formerly from Mecca. Consequently, they sent out 1,000 men to fight against 313 Moslems. Apparently, neither side wanted to fight that badly for in the Battle of Badr (624) only a few were actually killed on either side. The hadith reports that among those who were singled out and killed were all the thugs who had mocked Muhammad in Mecca during his salat prayer by putting camel intestines on his back. The battle turned into an opportunity to settle some scores and all the mockers were stuffed down a well. Early on Muhammad demonstrated his blood lust, for he desired to execute the Jewish tribe Banu Qunuqa after Badr. He was forcefully persuaded not to do so by an Arab friend. A year later, in 625, after the Battle of Uhud, Muhammad expelled the Nadir, a second Jewish tribe, from Yathrib/Medina. Less than twenty four months after that, after the Battle of the Trench (627), Muhammad got an opportunity, through a third party, to have all the post adolescent and adult male Jews beheaded. It took them into the evening hours to decapitate approximately 800 in all. The women and children were sold into slavery. Muhammad could have prevented this from occurring but refrained from stopping this. Islam was bloody during the time of Muhammad.

Muhammad’s pillaging and robbing did not end here. In 627, Muslims conquered the Jews at the Khaybar Jewish Oasis. Muslims still celebrate this as a model for today’s impending defeat of the nation of Israel. In 628, Muhammad signs a ten year treaty with the Meccans called the Treaty of Hudaybiyyah. It granted Muhammad and Muslims the
privilege of pilgrimage to the pagan shrine of Mecca. In 630 he broke the treaty and
marched into Mecca relatively unopposed. He threw out all the idols except his father’s
namesake god, Allah. Abdullah means servant of Allah. On June 8th Muhammad died in
the arms of his favorite 18 year old wife, Aisha.

What can one conclude about Muhammad? Don Richardson, anthropologist, author
and Christian missionary writes that Muhammad was involved personally in 47 battles.
He writes, "There are at least 109 identifiable war verses in the Koran. One out of every
55 verses in the Koran is a war verse. War verses are scattered throughout Mohammad's
chapters like blood splatter at a crime scene."99 Allah encourages the taking of lives if it
advances his cause and forces “submission” to Islam among the infidel.

Those who claim Islam is a peaceful religion either know very little about the last
decade of Muhammad’s life, the Qur’an, the Hadith, and Islamic history, or are dishonest
or deceived. Islam is not a peaceful religion that has been taken over by radical
fundamentalists in modern times. Islam is a violent religion marketed to the West by
Muslim apologists and multiculturalists as a peaceful religion. One can only guess at the
motivations for this, but some are surely attempting to appease Islam, win lucrative oil
deals, become a power balance to the United States and/ or diminish the West’s Judeo-
Christian heritage. Whatever the motivation for deluding the public about Islam’s
ultimate goals, it is a dangerous practice. To a very large extent pro-Islamic
multiculturalists have been very successful in promoting multiculturalism and
subordinating our Judeo-Christian culture in Europe and the United States. This will have
tragic ramifications if this trend is not reversed.

99 Richardson, Secrets of the Koran, pp. 10, 28.
Author's Evaluation

Perhaps now this author can share some of his conclusions about the man Muhammad without being seen as someone using hate speech. If any one of these conclusions are true it should disqualify mankind from regarding Muhammad as a "great" religious leader. That conclusion is great in a good sense. The contention is that all these charges against Muhammad are true and could be proven in a legal or historic sense beyond a reasonable doubt. These crimes are all well documented but they are currently being ignored for a variety of reasons, none of them good reasons.

1. From a biblical perspective, Muhammad is a false prophet not keeping with the spirit or teaching of either the Old or New Testaments. In Galatians 1:8 Paul the Apostle wrote, “But even if we or an angel from heaven should preach a gospel other than the one we preached to you, let him be eternally condemned!”

2. Muhammad claimed to be greater than Jesus. He was either a deceiver or deceived, or delusional or demon possessed. It does not matter. What he said was false and damning in the here and the hereafter. “Jesus answered, ‘I am the way and the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me.’” (John 14:6) Acts 4:12, "Salvation is found in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given to men by which we must be saved."

3. In the last decade of Muhammad's life (622-632) he was an angry, sadistic, criminally violent man robbing caravans, dispossessing and beheading people, in order to acquire for himself and his followers the booty, including their wives or wealth.

4. Muhammad was sexually promiscuous, causing him to break good Arab taboos as well
as innate laws, or natural revelation, put into the hearts of men by God.

John 1:9 “This was the true light that gives light to every man who comes into the world”

Romans 1:20, “For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse.”

Muhammad’s marriage to Aisha, when she was but six, meant that he was a pedophile at age fifty. Muhammad was a sexual assaulter, as he fondled her, for the next three years and a statutory rapist when he consummated the marriage with the nine year old when he was fifty-three. No peace be upon him.

5. Muhammad was a superstitious man who was frightened of storms, even numbers, eclipses and the evil eye.

6. Muhammad was a man unduly preoccupied with bodily functions such as menstrual cycles, passing wind, urination and defecation. Vast amount of pages in the Hadith are given over to describing what a man, woman or child should do about these bodily functions. Imagine Jesus was able to get through the entire New Testament without giving detailed instructions.

7. Muhammad is a man with a very low opinion of women finding them deficient in intelligence and religion. He taught that husbands could have four wives, divorce them easily, and could beat them. He stated that hell was full of women because they criticized their husbands.

8. Muhammad was an egomaniac who allowed naive people to believe he had the ear of God and whatever he said was true and came directly from God. He allowed this deception to go on throughout the latter years of his life.

9. Muhammad was a racist who owned slaves. He called black people "raisin heads
The Prophet said, "Listen and obey (your chief) even if an Ethiopian whose head is like a raisin were made your chief." *(Volume 1, Book 11, Number 662)*

Allah's Apostle said, "You should listen to and obey, your ruler even if he was an Ethiopian (black) slave whose head looks like a raisin" *(Volume 9, Book 89, Number 256)*.

10. Of all the men who have ever lived, Muhammad and his teachings and followers have caused more pain and suffering to the world, both in the here and in the hereafter, than any other. The tragic reality is this, for the past 1,400 years devotees of Muhammad have been losing their souls and taking the lives of others while believing they are doing the will of God. The Apostle Paul wrote,

> But even if we or an angel from heaven should preach a gospel other than the one we preached to you, let him be eternally condemned! As we have already said, so now I say again: If anybody is preaching to you a gospel other than what you accepted, let him be eternally condemned!

What is the prescribed penalty in Islam for telling this truth which they call blasphemy? A famous Imam named Qadi 'Iyad (d. 1149), defines explicitly what blasphemy is and the consequences of it.

> All who curse Muhammad. . ., or blame him or attribute imperfection to him in his person, his lineage, his 'deen' [religion] or any of his qualities, or alludes to that or its like by any means whatsoever, whether in the form of a curse or contempt or belittling him or detracting of him or finding fault with him or maligning him," these persons should be killed. In the case that "someone intentionally calls the Prophet a liar in what he said or brought or denies and rejects his Prophethood or his message and its existence or disbelievers in it," this person is treated like an unbeliever and must be killed. The Iman can choose to cut off the head, burn or crucify someone who curse or disparages the Prophet. Repentance cannot remove the sanction. If *dhimmis* curse the Prophet or minimize his message, they should be killed- unless they become Muslims."^{100}

---

^{100} Bat Ye'or, *Eurabia* (Cranbury, New Jersey: Associated University Press, ), 197-198.
Is there any wonder Muhammad and Islam get special treatment when there are followers of Muhammad who are ready, willing, and able to carry out this judgment. For this reason alone Western Civilization should rethink its open immigration policy. This Islamic doctrine will not permit freedom of speech, or debate regarding Islam.

Discussion Questions:

1. Who was Thomas Patrick Hughes and what was his life's ministry?

2. Muhammad's childhood can only be described as what?

3. Someone coined the phrase, "hurting people hurt people." Can this be fairly applied to Muhammad?

4. What do the letters p.b.u.h. stand for and are they justified?

5. Morey suggests that there are four conflicting stories as to who initially met with Muhammad. Who are the four parties?

6. What do we learn about Satan in II Corinthians 11:12-15, and could this explain Islam?

7. What is the test for being a prophet found in Deuteronomy 18:21-22? List a couple of unusual prophecies.

8. Briefly list some of the bizarre ideas attributed to Muhammad. Are they credible? What is the significance to Islam?

9. For the author, the Qur'an appeared to be a series of harangues. What is that? What did the author challenge you to find?

10. Summarize the mood of the 13 Qur'anic passages cited. How would you feel if you believed they were from God?

11. What did non-Muslims, Jews and Christians think Muhammad's own words indicate about him? What did Muhammad contemplate doing?

12. Jesus proposed a test as to who were children of Abraham. What was the test and what does it demonstrate about Islam?

13. Surah 4:3 set a limit on what? How did Allah change or abrogate this rule for Muhammad in Surah 33:37? How did Allah further abrogate this in 33:50-51?
14. Muhammad has an unhealthy preoccupation with what? What was said of him that demonstrates this?

15. How did Reverend Vines describe Muhammad? Was he fair and accurate in his description? What other charges would be brought against Muhammad if he were being tried in our country today?

16. Muhammad went from ______________(595-622) to ______________(622-632).

17. Why would Muhammad initially appear to be a good arbitrator between Arabs and Jews? Was he?

18. What did Muhammad permit to happen after the Battle of the Trench in 627? What does this tell us about him?

19. What did anthropologist Don Richardson discover about Muhammad and Jihad in the Qur'an?

20. The author lists 10 personal conclusions that he argues disqualify Muhammad as a true prophet of the Biblical God. Which do you agree or disagree with?
Muhammad left no clear successor to his newly founded religion. Upon Muhammad’s death, Islam was led by four individuals, or caliphs: Abu Bakr (632-634), Omar (634-644), Uthman (644-656) and Ali (656-661). These four caliphs are often spoken of in hushed tones of reverence and are called the Rightly-Guided Caliphs. Unfortunately, this could not be further from the truth. Each of these men were simply men, and from a Judeo-Christian perspective not even noble men at that. The following information justifies this assessment.

Abu Bakr (632-634) was the one who gave his six year old daughter, Aisha, to the fifty year old Muhammad as a wife. What noble man would do this? What noble man would accept a six year old as a wife? Abu Bakr was also the man who fulfilled Muhammad’s command, “No two religions are to exist in the Arab Peninsula.” Bakr sought to expel or kill every member of every other religion inside the borders of Arabia. The hadith records a fit where Bakr threatened to kill anyone who shorts their jizya tax because Muhammad has died. Rather than being portrayed as intolerant and imperialistic, Bakr is honored by Muslims and spoken of reverently by all who want to appease Muslims. Upon Bakr’s death, Umar took over.

Umar (634-644) initially rejected Islam and physically beat his sister for embracing it.

---

Later, partly because of her devotion in spite of the beating, he himself embraced Islam.

He built upon Bakr’s foundation and quadrupled the Islamic territories through violent jihad. In Ergun Caner’s chapter entitled *The Story of Islam: A Trail of Blood*, he writes that Umar “extended the Muslim empire through conquest of [Israel, after A.D. 135 called Palestine, and] Syria (634), Iraq (636), Egypt (639), and Persia (642).”

By 644, Umar's border in the East will reach the Indus River in Northwest India with Umar's armies invading Sindh, Baluchistan (today Pakistan) and Balkh (Afghanistan). There is an interesting discussion Umar has with a messenger who has just returned from that area after the defeat of a Hindu King. It explains why Umar decided to stop his *jihad* at

---

the Indus River. Umar asks about the land on the other side of the river and the messenger replies,

'O Commander of the faithful! It's a land where the plains are stony; Where water is scanty; Where the fruits are unsavory Where men are known for treachery; Where plenty is unknown; Where virtue is held of little account; And where evil is dominant; A large army is less for there; And a less army is useless there; The land beyond it, is even worst (referring to Sind [i.e. Pakistan today]).

The messenger's opinion of the land was that it was barren, poor, miserable and not worth sending an army to conquer. Thus Umar gave orders that the Islamic army was not to cross the Indus River. Uthman followed this example as well.

It is regrettable that so many scholars do not condemned Umar for forcing Islam upon others. Caner observes that Umar is actually honored by Muslims for his practice of jihad. “Most Muslims still venerate him as the most just of the caliphs. [Thus] setting the example of mercy toward non-Muslims. . .” Caner quotes the University of Southern California’s fairly positive description of Umar’s pact. “Protection” was annually given to Christians after they paid their protection money through the jizya tax.

The protection is for their lives and properties, their churches and crosses, their sick and healthy and for all their co-religionists. Their churches shall not be used for habitation, nor shall they be demolished, nor shall any injury be done to them or to their compounds, or to their crosses, nor shall their properties be injured in any way. There shall be no compulsion for these people in the matter of religion.

Caner explains. . .

These rights were given to non-Muslims [only] after their surrender. Only after peace (defined as Islamic rule) was established could unbelievers be protected. . . Therefore, jihad (holy war) is completed only when the entire world is placed under the submission of Allah and when his laws reign supreme. The laws of mercy were not as compassionate as they seem. A contemporary chronicler of

---
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Umar, Ibn Timmiya, noted the restrictions enacted within ‘acts of mercy’: Christians have no right to build new places of worship. Christians have no right to remodel a church in conquered lands. Muslims could confiscate places of worship in towns taken by storm. Muslims could destroy every church in the conquered land. . . When the chronicler asked the merciful Umar what should happen to those who violated the rules, he asserted, ‘Anyone who violates such terms will be unprotected. And it will be permissible for the Muslims to treat them as rebels or dissenters namely, it is permissible to kill them.’

The University of Southern California site went on to state that Christians

Shall not build, in our cities or in our neighborhood, new monasteries, churches, convents, or monk’s cells, nor shall [they] repair, by day or by night, such of them as fall in ruins or are situated in the quarters of the Muslims; [Christians] shall not manifest religion publicly nor convert anyone to it . . .[Christians] shall not prevent any of [their] kin from entering Islam if they wish it; [Christians] Shall show respect toward the Muslims, and shall rise from seats when [Muslims] wish to sit.

Who among us would consider this “protection” and who would consider this

“enslavement?” Umar’s reign came to an end when he was stabbed to death in 644 by a Persian who did not like being a Muslim slave, living in this “protected” state of dhimmitude.

After the battle of Nihawand, many Persians, men, women, and children were taken as captives by the Muslims. The captives were sold as slaves. One of these slaves was Firoz alias Abu Lulu. He was purchased by Mughirah Shu’bah the Governor of Basra. This Firoz was a craftsman, a carpenter, an iron smith and a painter. Umar did not allow non-Muslim adult captives to reside in Madina. Mughirah sought special permission for the residence of Firoz in Madina on the ground that as he was a skilled craftsman, he would be of service to the people. Umar gave the permission as a special case. One day, Firoz waited on Umar and complained that the tax which his master Mughirah was exacting from him was too high. He wanted the Caliph [Umar] to reduce the levy. Umar enquired what work he did. He said that he worked as a carpenter, painter, and . . . When Firoz called on Umar again, Umar explained to him that as the levy was not excessive, no reduction therein was called for that made Firoz angry. There were Persian children slaves in Madina. Seeing them, Firoz would say, "You have been enslaved at such a tender age. This Umar . . . [has] eaten my heart. I will take his heart out". He made for himself a dagger with a very sharp edge and smeared it

107 Ibid. p. 69-70.
108 Ibid. p. 175.
with poison. On the 1st of November 644 A.D. at the time of the morning prayer, Firoz went with his dagger to the Prophet’s mosque and hid himself in a corner in one of the recesses of the mosque. When the faithful stood for prayer after straightening the lines, and Umar took up his position as the Imam to lead the prayer, Firoz emerged from his place of hiding and rushed at Umar. Firoz struck Umar six consecutive blows with his dagger, and Umar fell on the floor profusely bleeding. Other persons rushed at Firoz, but he had the fury and frenzy of a desperate man about him. He struck right and left, and thirteen Muslims were wounded, some of them fatally, before Firoz could be overpowered. At last realizing that he could not escape, Firoz stabbed himself to death with his own dagger.\textsuperscript{109}

If this story does nothing else, it demonstrates the frustration, grief, and homicidal rage of someone who has been enslaved by Islam. It illustrates the lie that those conquered by Islam liked it. He did NOT feel as if he and the Persian youth were in a protected state but rather a deplorable state. The story exposes the desperation of a dhimmi craftsman and the deception of the idea that the conquered actually feel liberated.

Uthman (644-656) replaced Umar. Uthman continued the policy of jihad, expanding Islam’s borders into Northwest India. In Uthman’s day Northwest India was called Baluchistan, today this area is called Pakistan. Regardless, between 652-654, major portions of this area were conquered by Islam.

Caner writes of the character and the demise of this third caliph.

Uthman was seen as a selfish ruler only concerned with his own kin. By the end of his tenure Muslims were badly divided. Rebels killed the caliph Uthman in his own home while he was reading the Qur’an. (Uthman codified the Qur’an into its final form. Modern editions still bear his name.) Hatred for him was so intense that his body was left unburied for days, a great sin in the Qur’an. He was finally buried in his blood-stained clothes, a symbolic recognition of his martyrdom.\textsuperscript{110}

The final minutes of Uthman’s life are retold in Islamic literature:

\textsuperscript{109} http://www.witness-pioneer.org/vil/Articles/companion/19_umar_bin_al_khattab.htm (accessed July 17, 2009) Copyright © 2002 WPONLINE.ORG Last modified: November 05, 2004
\textsuperscript{110} Caner, Unveiling Islam, p. 70.
Muhammad b. Abi Bakr (Abu Bakr’s son), came with thirteen men and went up to Uthman. He seized his beard and shook it until I heard his teeth chattering. . . Uthman said, “Let go of my beard, son of my brother! Let go of my beard!” . . . Another man, named the Black Death, entered Uthman’s presence and throttled him and slapped him. Then he went out and said, “By God, I have never seen anything softer than his throat. By God, I throttled him until I saw his soul shaking in his body like the soul of a jinn.” Then he went out. A certain man went in to Uthman, in front of whom lay the Quran, and he said, “The Book of God is between you and me.” The intruder went for him with his sword; Uthman protected himself with his hand and it was cut. I do not know whether he sliced the hand clear off or cut it without severing it. Then he said, “Yea, by God, this is the first palm which has crossed the Quran.” As to Amr b. al-Hamig, he jumped on Uthman and sat on his chest – he was still barely alive – and stabbed him nine times. Amr said, “I stabbed him three times for God’s sake, and six times because of the anger in my breast against him.” ¹¹¹

Led by Abu Bakr’s son, Uthman is brutally assassinated by fellow Muslims. Lest you think this is a gratuitous violent story, remember this is standard operating procedure for some Fundamentalist Muslims from that day to this. One can go online and see the assassination of Anwar Sadat of Egypt who was shot on October 6, 1981.¹¹² His crime was signing a treaty with Israel on March 26, 1979. Sadat’s act of recognizing Israel’s right to exist got him shot and Egypt thrown out of the Arab league. In Pakistan on February 21, 2007, a minister of social welfare was shot in the head for not dressing conservatively enough. Dress code violations are taken very seriously in Pakistan.

Zilla Huma Usman, the minister for social welfare in Punjab province and an ally of President Pervez Musharraf, was killed as she was about to deliver a speech to dozens of party activists, by a “fanatic”, who believed that she was dressed inappropriately and that women should not be involved in politics, officials said. Usman, 35, was wearing the shalwar kameez worn by many professional women in Pakistan, but did not cover her head. ¹¹³

¹¹² http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nwQL3N57TQE
More recently, on December 28, 2007, former Pakistan Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto, a strong advocate for democracy, was gunned down by a fundamentalist Muslim. Bhutto was hoping to recapture the premiership. Bhutto, 54, was shot three times in the head by an unknown gunman who opened fire and according to witnesses and police, then blew himself up, killing 20 other people. Musharraf, the new Prime Minister, blamed Islamic terrorists, pledging in a nationally televised speech that "we will not rest until we eliminate these terrorists and root them out." President Bush, who spoke briefly by phone with Musharraf, looked tense as he spoke to reporters, denouncing the "murderous extremists who are trying to undermine Pakistan's democracy."\(^{114}\)

Like it or not, Islamic politics is lethal for Muslims, and more often than not, the assassins are fellow Muslims. Even the very word assassin is an Arabic word. The etymology of the word is quite interesting.

The term 'Assassin' derives from the Arabic word Hashshashin. . . , a militant Ismailite Persian sect, . . . active in the Northern parts of Iran. . . from the eighth to the fourteenth centuries. This mystic secret society killed members of the Abbasid and Seljuk elite for political and religious reasons. It is commonly believed that the assassins were under the influence of hashish and opium during their killings or

\(^{113}\) "Female Pakistani Minister Shot Dead for Refusing to Wear Veil" Fox News, Wednesday, February 21, 2007By Devika Bhat and Zahid Hussain http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,253125,00.html (accessed July 17, 2009)

\(^{114}\) Fox News Dec. 27, 2007, Bhutto Assassination Throws Pakistan into Chaos http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,318510,00.html (accessed July 17, 2009) See footage if this assassination at this site http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vq-DwHXx4oI
during their indoctrination and that assassin derives from *hasishin*.\(^{115}\)

Ali (656-661), Muhammad’s cousin and son-in-law, husband of Fatima, had his reign as Caliph marked with civil war as well. His major opponent was forty-seven year old Aisha. Caner writes,

Muslim fought against Muslim in two major battles that ended without a victor. In 661, Ali was assassinated, and since that time, Islam has been divided between Ali’s followers, the Shi’ites and traditional Muslims, the Sunnis.\(^{116}\)

**The Islamic World**

Like Muhammad, all four men were very violent Islamic men. They continued the policy of conquest and suppression begun by Muhammad. As the maps show, their conquests were not of empty lands but of lands full of Jews and Christians and people throughout the Middle East and North Africa who would rather make their own choices.

All Jewish Settlements in the Middle East Conquered by Jihad

Islamic apologists and multiculturalists pass over these conquests as if they were wars of liberation. Ismail Raji al-Faruqu, says, “Compared with the histories of other religions, the history of Islam is categorically white as far as toleration of other religions is concerned.”

It is interesting to note that al-Farqui was a mentor of John L. Esposito. Esposito is the head of Georgetown University's Islamic Studies program and was given twenty million dollars from Saudi Arabia for the construction of a facility to spread this message.

Nevertheless, these Islamic conquests were anything but wars of liberation; they were wars of conquest and enslavement of Jews and Christians. American students should see

---
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them as such. The maps show the Christian lands that were subjugated by Islam. The defeated people were given three choices: first, accept Islam and become Muslims, second, pay an annual jizya tax (i.e. literally protection money for those now living as dhimmi, we call this extortion in American courts), or third, accept martyrdom.

**All Christian Settlements in Middle East Conquered by Jihad**

Al-Wansharishi, a fifteenth century Morocco mufti, put it this way in one of his fatwas [i.e. legal decisions]:

God Almighty [i.e. Allah], the one, the All-Conquering, has created abasement to be inflicted on the accursed unbelievers [i.e. Jews and Christians] fetters and chains for them to drag from one place to the next as a demonstration of his power and the superiority of Islam, and to honor his chosen Prophet . . . an effort to distance oneself from the enemies of God.  

---
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Bat Ye’or writes,

*Jihad* ideology embodies the concept of perpetual war. Therefore, it requires perpetual enemies, which the *umma* [i.e. Islamic community] is obliged by religion to fight and subject. Its joint concept of *dar al-harb*, the land of war that must be conquered by the *dar al-Islam*, [i.e. the house of Islam] incites constant hostility against the infidels leading to razzias or war on their territory. 122

On the map on page 85 you can see the brownish area that Muhammad conquered by his death in 632. The four Caliphs 632-661 approximately quadrupled the land holdings, all at the expense of the Jews and Christians. Ye’or writes,

*Jihad* has been a devastating and genocidal war throughout history; millions of people have been massacred, abducted, enslaved, deported and dispossessed of their land and countries. The ensuing colonization of conquered territories is an endless and agonizing history, chronicled by its contemporaries, victims and perpetrators. There is no lack of reliable testimony . . . Muslim authors, who recorded the sufferings of infidels as a divine retribution for their stubbornness in sin, provide detailed descriptions. Yet despite massive evidence of atrocities recorded by Muslims themselves, Muslims scholars continue to maintain the ethical perfection of *jihad* . . . Such wishful thinking ignores the rivers of blood that characterize the historical reality of *jihad* . . . In academia, noble words and dreamy inconsistencies have replaced the hard moral discipline of confronting historical truths. 123

The Subjugated peoples or *dhimmis* have suffered, and are still suffering, many inhumane indignities. Ye’or is the premier expert on dhimmitude. Which one of us would like to live in this “protected” state? She writes,

A brief summary of the *dhimmi* cultural pattern . . . The core element pertains to the premise of Muslim superiority over all other religious groups. . . In Muslim lands governed by the *shari’a*, Jews and Christians had to acknowledge the superiority of Islam at all times. Criticism of *shari’a* law drew severe punishment. *Dhimmis* adopted a servile language and obsequious [i.e. “showing servile complaisance or deference”124] demeanor for fear of retaliation and for their self-preservation. Specific laws ordained permanent inferiority and humiliation for the *dhimmis*. Their lives were valued at considerably less than that

122 Ye’or, *Eurabia*, p. 204.
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of a Muslim, usually one half, and half again for dhimmi woman. The penalty for murder was much lighter if a dhimmi was the victim. . . . A dhimmi was forbidden to possess arms and to defend himself if he was physically assaulted by a Muslim; he could beg for mercy. He was deprived . . . the right to defend himself in an Islamic law court, which refused dhimmi testimony in relation to a Muslim. . . . Dhimmis were forbidden to have authority over Muslims, to own or buy land, to marry Muslim women, or to have Muslim slaves or servants. In the social domain, they had to be recognizable by their clothes, the shape, color, and texture of which were prescribed from head to foot; the color and size, as well as the location of their homes was also strictly regulated. Riding a horse or a camel was prohibited to dhimmis, as these animals were too noble for them. A donkey could be ridden but only astride, and only packsaddles were allowed; when sighting a Muslim, the dhimmi had to dismount. A dhimmi had to hurry through the streets, always passing to the left (impure) side of a Muslim, who was expected to force him to the narrow side or into the gutter. He had to walk humbly with lowered eyes to accept insults without replying, to remain standing in a meek and respectful attitude in the presence of a Muslim and to leave him the best place. If he was admitted to a public bath- forbidden in many regions such as Morocco- he had to wear bells to signal his presence. Stoning Jews and Christians was not unusual in Muslim domains . . . disrespectful attitudes toward them were customary. Some regional rules represent an aggravation of this pattern: In Morocco and Yemen, Jews were forbidden any footwear outside their segregated quarter. In Iran, Jews and Christians, considered impure, could not go out in the street on rainy days. These laws are the basic regulations set down in the classical texts on dhimmis. They had to be enforce throughout the lands of Islam/dhimmitude. Muslim jurists, including Andalusian [i.e. Spanish] authorities, strongly condemned any alleviation of these measures whenever it occurred.125

It is clear from the above that not only was Muhammad bloody, but so were the four Caliphs who followed him. The reality is in stark contrast to what we are often told. The next chapter on the Umayyad Caliphate (661-750) will demonstrate that they followed the jihadist example of Muhammad and the four caliphs as well.

Discussion Questions:

1. Who succeeded Muhammad as leader of Islam and what were their dates?

2. Could and should they be described as the Rightly-Guided Caliphs? Explain.

125 Ye’or, Eurabia, p. 192,193.
3. Who is Aisha and what happened to her?

4. Abu Bakr extended Islamic borders throughout what area?

5. Umar extended the Islamic borders all the way to where?

6. What do you think of Umar's Pact with the conquered peoples?

7. Uthman is known for standardizing the Qur'an and destroying all the variant readings. How did this man of the book meet his end?

8. Ali eventually replaced Uthman as Caliph for a short time. In what year did he die and what was the political and religious schism that resulted in Islam to this very day? What percent of Islam are reflected in each party?

9. How did Muhammad, Umar, Uthman and Ali die? What is the significance of this to the question of Islam being a peaceful religion?

10. How did Ismail Raji al-Faruqu portray this Islamic expansionism during this period? Do you agree? Explain.

11. Who was mentored by al-Faruqu and how was he rewarded by the Saudi's for spreading this interpretation of Islamic history?

12. Who was Al-Wansharishi, when did he live, and what does he argue Allah wanted for Jews and Christians?

13. Jihad ideology embodies what for how long? What is dar al-harb and dar al-Islam and what does this have to do with the world?

14. Who is Bat Ye’or, and what is she an expert on?

15. Summarize Ye’or's description of the restrictions placed on the dhimmi.

16. Are many of those restrictions still in place in Islamic countries today?

17. How would you like to live with those restrictions? Are these restrictions compatible with American democracy and culture?
CHAPTER 6 THE UMAYYADS
(661-750)

The violent and expansionist
Umayyad years are seen by
Shi'ite Muslims as years of rule
by a false Caliphate. With the
assassination of Ali, Muawiya
(661-680), the first Umayyad
Caliph, did not get elected to the
position, but seized power
and set up a militaristic
dynasty solving the
succession of ruler
question. For a brief time
the Shi'ites revolt.

"In 680, Ali's younger son
Husayn revolted against
the majority rule of the
Sunnis and was killed in a
massacre at KarbAllah
[Karbala], Iraq. Shi'ites
still commemorate his death annually on the tenth of Muharram. This split and

126 Shi'ites are those that are loyal to Ali and believed that the Caliph must be a blood
relative of Muhammad. Today they often reflect that they are in this lineage by wearing black turbans as a
sign of honor.
subsequent political struggle eventually defined the first division of Islam. . . the division remains to this day.  

The remembrance of the death of Husayn [Hussein], grandson to Muhammad, is called Ashura and is commemorated with a great deal of self inflicted bloodletting as the pictures from Lebanon demonstrate. We recoil at the images, but Islam for many is a bloody religion and we need to understand that Shi’ite Muslims desensitize their children to it starting at a very young age.

Altogether, fourteen Umayyad Caliphs rule over the next eighty-nine years. The Arab Umayyad Caliphate continues to attempt to conquer the world for Allah, testing the borders of their Christian neighbors. They only settle for borders with nations that could

---
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militarily prevent Umayyad expansion. For political and religious reasons the Umayyads move the capital from Mecca and Medina, Arabia to Damascus, Syria. Two of the Caliphs, Malik (685-705) and Walid (705-715), constructed three famous mosques. The two on the Temple Mound in Jerusalem, pictured on page 87, are the Dome of the Rock constructed in 691 and the Al-Aqsa mosque, completed around 705. Walid constructed a third mosque in Damascus, Syria in 715. The mosques served both as a religious and political statement. Caner writes,

"First, the Dome of the Rock was built in Jerusalem on the Jewish Temple Mount in 691 to demonstrate the superiority of Islam over Judaism. Second, in 715 the Great Mosque of Damascus replaced the Cathedral Church of St. John to demonstrate the superiority of Islam over corrupt Christianity."

---
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The Umayyad, like all the Muslims before them, are a people of *jihad* and they continued to spread Islam by the sword. Caner lists some of the Umayyad conquests:

After Ali’s death, as internal strife subsided, Islam gained a larger vision—conquest of the known world. Through 732 that goal seemed within reach. Expansion swallowed Cyprus (647), Tunisia and Kabul in modern Afghanistan (670), the island of Rhodes (672), the siege of Constantinople (677), North Africa (700), Spain (711), the Chinese Turkestan border (715), and Morocco (722) By the end of its first century, Islam stretched to the western borders of China and the southern borders of France. North Africa was dominated completely.  

Islamic armies pushed out in every direction, South, North, West and East, following the directions found in the Qur’an and seeking to conquer the world for Allah. Nehemiah Levtzion describes the bleak situation that befell the Christian church at this time.

In the seventh century, when Islam began its expansion into Africa, Christianity was the dominant religion in the lands that extended along the Mediterranean, from Morocco to Egypt, in the hinterland of Egypt and of the Red Sea, in Nubia, and Ethiopia. . . . By the twelfth century the last indigenous Christians disappeared from North Africa west of Egypt. . . In Egypt the Christians, who still formed about half of the population in the tenth century, were later reduced to a minority of no more than fifteen percent.

---

p. 139.


In the South, across the Red Sea from Mecca, Muhammad had been aware of the Christian kingdom of Abyssinia (modern day Ethiopia\footnote{http://www.lib.utexas.edu/maps/world_maps/world_pol_2008.pdf 9 (accessed July 18, 2009)}. In 615, he sent some of his band of believers to them to get some relief from the persecution at the hands of the polytheistic Quraish Arabians. Muhammad knew his men would be treated well for this kingdom had a Christian king named Armah. Muhammad encouraged his small group of followers with these words, “If you go to go to Abyssinia (it will be better for you), for the king will not tolerate injustice and it is a friendly country until such time as Allah shall relieve you from distress.”\footnote{A. Guillaume, \textit{The Life of Muhammad: A Translation of Ibn Ishaq} (Pakistan, Oxford University Press, 1967) p. 146.}

Unfortunately, the followers of Muhammad did not reciprocate this kindness when they came into power in Arabia. Ethiopia was also marked for forced submission during the Umayyad years. Muslims infiltrated Ethiopia mostly through commerce. Levtzion writes, “As early as the eighth century the island of Dahlak Keibir was the outlet for Arab trade and a point of departure for the diffusion of Islam to the Ethiopian hinterland.”\footnote{Esposito, John L., \textit{The Oxford History of Islam}. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. p. 501.} Throughout the next five centuries, Christians in Ethiopia had an open door policy with the Muslims who continued to immigrate to Ethiopia and establish Islamic communities within Ethiopia’s borders. Christian Ethiopia continued to treat Muslims fairly and even protected them as they settled into their Islamic communities. Levtzion observes “By the thirteenth century, [six hundred years after Muhammad sent some of his followers into Ethiopia], there were Muslim communities in the Ethiopian highlands that traded under ______
the protection of the Christian state.”137 After the Islamic community grew sufficiently large, Levtzion then describes the inevitable Islamic-Christian conflicts that transpired there over the next several hundred years. This is a pattern that appears quite naturally following peaceful Islamic immigration. This period of immigration is followed by civil unrest and eventually by civil war. This cycle has been repeated multiple times in history and the immigration part of the cycle is already well advanced in Europe. The United States has just begun to open her borders with the Hart-Celler Immigration Act of 1965 that abolished national-origin quotas. This is not to say that your Muslim classmates are knowingly a part of some grand conspiracy. They are probably just like you, interested in the upcoming school events and all the issues of high school life. What is being described here is just a natural consequence, generated from Islamic theology. This cycle occurs after permitting large numbers of Islamic immigrants into any country, because Islam sees itself as the superior replacement for Judeo-Christian theology. Islam expects one day to rule the earth and they get offended if Muhammad or Islam is challenged or criticized.

If enough Muslims live in a certain area and they become offended or radicalized, this naturally leads some to civil war. Your Islamic friends may even be "Americanized" enough, and appreciate democracy and freedom enough, that they would oppose such a progression, hopefully so. But if they do oppose such action, they would also be targeted and considered kafir, or unbelievers, by fundamentalist Muslims promoting shari'a Islamic laws and culture. At this point, some may take issue or reject the historic reality of the description of the cycle described above. It is therefore necessary to support this

137 Esposito, p. 501.
idea by citing three genuine Islamic scholars. Each grew up in an Islamic country. Mark Gabriel grew up devoutly Islamic in Egypt. After receiving an extensive Islamic education, he began to question Islam and eventually converted to Christianity. Brigitte Gabriel grew up a Christian in war torn Lebanon. Walid Pharis remains a Muslim. All of them support the idea of this gradual jihad cycle.

Mark Gabriel verifies this cycle in a chapter entitled, *The Three Stages of Jihad: How a Weakened Muslim Minority Takes Over*,

If you look at Muslim countries around the world, you will see that they are in one of the following three stages of jihad. . . Weakened Stage: This stage applies to Muslims when they are a weak, small minority living in a non-Islamic society. . . (Surah 2:256). . . The Preparation Stage: This stage is when the Muslims are a reasonably influential minority. Because their future goal is direct confrontation with the enemy, they make preparations in every possible area- financial, physical, military, mental . . . * Against them make ready your strength to the utmost of your power . . .* Surah 8:59-60. . . Jihad Stage: At this stage every Muslim's duty is to actively fight the enemy, overturning the system of the non-Muslim country and establishing Islamic authority. . . Surah 9:5. . . *Fight and slay the Pagans wherever you find them. . .*  

Brigitte Gabriel¹³⁹ wrote a book describing her personal hellish experience growing up in Lebanon during the Lebanese Civil War between Christians and Muslims. Lebanon went through this cycle rather rapidly. The title of her book is rather long but is also quite descriptive. It reads as follows,

As an Arab Christian, and victim of radical Islam during the Lebanese Civil War, I refuse to stand by and let the same thing happen to my adopted country, the United States. Even after 9/11, there are those who say that we must "engage" our terrorist enemies, that we must "address their grievances." Their grievance is our freedom of religion. Their grievance is our democratic process. Islamic religious authorities and terrorist leaders repeatedly state that they will destroy the United States and Western civilization. Unless we take them at their word, and

---

¹³⁹ No relationship to Mark Gabriel who chose that name after becoming a Christian.
defend ourselves, they will succeed... Because They Hate.\textsuperscript{140}

Brigitte Gabriel goes on to describe the purpose of her writing as follows,

This book is a warning. It is a warning that what happened to me and my country of birth could, terrifyingly, happen here in America, my country of adoption. It is a warning about what happened to countless other non-Muslims in the Middle East and what should never happen again anywhere or to anyone else.\textsuperscript{141}

Walid Phares, a courageous educated moderate Muslim, also describes this pattern in his book, \textit{Future Jihad}.

Against the opinion of a majority of scholars and intellectuals, I argued throughout the 1990s that there was a history and an ideology behind the jihadists, that they have strategically positioned themselves to move against the United States and the West, and that they do have strategic approaches to this task. However, I came to realize early on that instead of having just one strategy with which to confront the United States, the jihadists have... six tracks [that] can be detected in the jihadist strategic approach.

1. Economic jihad: oil as a weapon
2. Ideological jihad: intellectual penetration [controlling curriculum in high schools, colleges and universities]
3. Political jihad: mollification of the public
4. Intelligence jihad: infiltration of the country
5. Subversive jihad: Behind enemy lines and protected by laws [C.A.I.R]\textsuperscript{142}
6. Diplomatic jihad: controlling foreign policy\textsuperscript{143}

These three are global thinkers and understand the long term aspirations of radical Islam. While they are concerned with the present threat of radical Islam, we must now turn back to our study of early Islam and the country of Ethiopia. When the number of Muslims grew sufficiently large in Ethiopia, some fundamentalist Islamic leaders called for jihad. One of those who called for \textit{jihad} was Ahmad Ibrahim al-Ghazi of Harar,
known as Ahmad Gran (1506-43). Gran eventually subdued most of the Christians in the Ethiopian state. Gran failed, however, to consolidate his victory and upon his death (1555) the country returned to Christianity. “In . . . 1630 a Portuguese missionary estimated that Muslims constituted one-third of Ethiopia’s population."\textsuperscript{144} Levtzion describes some of the tensions and new policies the Christians of the 17th century felt were necessary to protect themselves from the Islamic population.

The emperor of Ethiopia, Yohannes I (r. 1667-82), who sensed the threat of the expansion of Islam, took measures to isolate the Muslims. He ordered that Muslims live in separate villages and town quarters, and that Christians must not eat with Muslims or drink from cups used by Muslims. They greeted Muslims with the left hand, as a sign of contempt.\textsuperscript{145}

These isolationist or ghetto policies are not compatible with Western civilization culture and should not serve as a model for modern Islamic-Christians relations today. However, the comments do illustrate the inevitable tensions between the two cultures as the numbers of Christians and Muslims begin to be similar in size, and as Islam vies for supremacy. Christians do not feel like they need to force their religion on anyone. Christians can even seek to appease Islam, but it is hard to appease the appetite of a bully; Islam is a bully. Another insight to be gained from Levtzion’s comments is the understanding that while Ethiopia did fall to an Islamic army temporarily, it did not and would not fall to Islam by a sudden defeat at the hands of an Islamic army. Rather, Ethiopia had been put into grave danger of Islamic conquest through their open door immigration policies that allowed for gradual immigration of non-Christians and Muslims into their land. The Oromo people were originally economically motivated to move to Ethiopia inserting themselves between the Muslims and the Christians. The Oromo were

\textsuperscript{144}Esposito. p. 501-502.
not originally, Christian or Islamic but over the years, have converted to Islam. Levtzion writes, “By the eighteenth century, the Oromo gradually became Muslim and played an active role in the expansion of Islam in the region. Their chiefly families embraced Islam... make[ing] Islam increasingly an integral part of their subject’s lives.” 146 Consequently, the immigration of non-Christians, hundreds of years ago (who were open to conversion to Islam), have put Ethiopia at risk of becoming conquered by Islam today. One wishes the Orthodox Christians had had more of an impact on the Oromo peoples, for the Oromo people’s sake and for Ethiopia’s sake. Without the truth of the Scriptures in the Oromo people's hearts, they were more susceptible to the militant pressures of Islam and Islam is clearly the predominate power in this part of the world.

Today, according to the CIA Fact Book, the number of Ethiopians by religion are as follows: “Christian comprise 60.8% (Orthodox 50.6%, Protestant 10.2%), Muslim 32.8%, traditional 4.6%, other 1.8% (1994 census)”147 The Islamic-Christian tensions continue to this day. One missionary who recently returned from a visit to Ethiopia said, "Years ago, when I served on the Ethiopian field, mosques were few and far between, but today you see them all over."148 From a Christian perspective, this is not a good sign. Again, gradual immigration, and a successful militant evangelism program to non-Christians is still an invasion of sorts and the end is the same. The idea of restricting immigration of Islamic people, while encouraging immigration of Christian people from any nation around the world, is a good idea. This immigration policy for Ethiopia, or for

145 Ibid. p. 502
146 Ibid.
148 This anecdote was from a personal conversation with Brandon Edgar on July 17, 2009, who learned this from his uncle. Brandon and I were visiting about Islam. Brandon’s parents are currently
the United States, would simply be an attempt by Christians, who appreciate their freedoms, to protect their nation from becoming embroiled in the typical Muslim vs. Christian civil war. Even secularists should appreciate the freedom afforded to them by the wisdom of our Christian founding fathers. Such freedom would be lost under an Islamic government. Can politicians and liberal theologians (Islamic and Christian) change the nature of Islam and the clear intended understanding of the Qur’an? If the Lord Jesus does tarry, Christians should be concerned about the convoluted faith of our nation. This generation will be passing it on through the schools to the next generation of children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren. If current immigration policies are not restored to what they have been in the past, prior to 1965 Immigration Act, the culture and the amount of conflict between cultures will surely increase in the United States. Increased Islamic immigration and the threat of suit will also restrict the teaching of anything but revisionist history about Islam. Upcoming generations will not be able to ignore the coming storm and the present generation will have placed the future generations in a much less tenable position to deal with it

Another example of Islamic aggression and conquest that comes out of Africa occurs with the Christian nation of Nubia (i.e. formerly, southern Egypt and northern Sudan). Nubia’s skilled archers gave Islam its first defeat in 652. Nubia resisted Islam for four hundred years, but it also permitted gradual immigration of Muslims, which after centuries led to its eventual downfall to Islam. Levzion writes, “Arab and Muslim penetration into the country south of Egypt was not by means of military conquest but through gradual infiltration . . . By the tenth century [c. 900s] Muslims represented a

________________________

missionaries in Ecuador.
quarter of the merchants in the capital of the Christian kingdom of Nubia.”\textsuperscript{149} Levtzion goes on to observe that, “By 1174 this zone had a majority of Muslims [in Nubia] and was recognized officially as an Islamic Province under an Arab dignitary\textsuperscript{150}

Suddenly or gradually, the end result is the same for those who let down their guard against Islam. This region is now completely under Islamic domination and Christians are forced to live under the dhimmitude system of Islam. Muslims take the long perspective in this struggle. They teach their youth to believe this struggle for world dominance should and will continue until the end of the world. Most Christians do not appreciate this long term strategy and are focused on the immediate. Opening the borders of the United States to Islamic immigration will create less Judeo-Christian influence and more Islamic influence, just as it has in Ethiopia and Nubia. If this concerns you, it is important to pray about the situation often. Prepare yourself to witness, with love, and effectively share the Christian Gospel with your Islamic peers. Many of the most knowledgeable and effective witnesses are those Christians who have come out of Islam. Eventually, you will have the opportunity to vote for candidates who understand the issues and who will vote for, or appoint, judges that appreciate our Judeo-Christian heritage. One last bit of advice, go to a Bible honoring college or university. Secular schools promote multiculturalism while rejecting the reliability of the Bible. Give yourself an honest chance to grow in knowledge and wisdom. You and our culture will be blessed as a result of this choice.

In the North, Muslims were halted at Constantinople after a hard fought victory under the leadership of the Christian emperor Leo III in 718. The technology of \textit{Greek Fire} was

\textsuperscript{149} Esposito, Levtzion \textit{The Oxford History of Islam}. 497-498.
\textsuperscript{149} Ibid. p. 498-499.
a benefit in keeping Constantinople safe for centuries. For the next seven hundred years, throughout the rest of the Umayyad Caliphate 661-750, throughout all the Abbasid Caliphate (750-1258), and into the period of Fragmentation of Islamic Lands (1258-1517), Constantinople was forced to defend itself against Islamic aggression. But in 1453, Constantinople finally fell into the hands of an Islamic conqueror accompanied by a great slaughter of Christians. The United States complains of conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan lasting seven years, while Muslims see victory coming in seven hundred years. They teach this historical perspective and so should we.

In the West, Muslim armies crossed into Spain in 711 from North Africa and eventually conquered that land. The eighth caliph of the Umayyad Dynasty, Umar Abd al-Azis (717-720), wrote to his lieutenants these sentiments:

Umar sends you greetings. He cites to you from the Book of Allah, about which there is not uncertainty” “O ye who believe! The non-Moslems are nothing but dirt. Allah has created them to be partisans of Satan . . . [He] Gave [many] orders [among them] . . . Leave neither churches nor chapels standing anywhere, be they ancient or recent. . . [He] issued decrees prohibiting Christians to raise their voices while chanting in their churches, for these are the most distasteful hymns to the Most High [i.e. Allah]¹⁵¹

Not content with Spain, the Islamic invaders crossed the Pyrenees Mountains marching through France. Charles Martel, “the hammer,” led a coalition of Catholic Christians who fought bravely and were successful in defeating the Muslims at Tours, France concluding the battle on October 10, 732. As a result, all Europe was saved from Islamic conquest. B.K. Kuiper's description of the battle is dramatic.

Charles, the leader of the Franks, sent out a call for every man in all the Frankish lands able to bear arms to come to his aid. There was a general sense of the

greatness of the danger threatening all that men held dear. Even Frisians and
tribes across the Rhine responded to the call. A great "Christian" army under the
command of Charles met the countless Mohammedan hosts on the plain of Tours
in the 732. Both sides felt that tremendous issues would be decided by the one
single battle that was impeding. For seven days the two armies faced each other.
Neither side dared to begin the attack. At last on a Saturday in October the battle
lines were formed. The Arab army was composed mainly of cavalry; the Frankish
army of foot soldiers. The hosts of Islam . . . had behind them one long unbroken
series of victories extending over a hundred years. They had conquered country
after country in that time. Why should they not likewise win this battle?

The Franks drew up their army in close order. Nowhere was there a gap in
their ranks. All day long, in charge after charge, the wild and expert Arab
horsemen swept down headlong and furiously upon the Frankish army. Over
their heads fluttered the crescent banners of Islam. It was becoming evident that
the crescent was destined not to become full. Helplessly the charges of the Arab
horsemen broke against the Frankish army as against a wall. The banners of the
cross continued to wave defiantly. When night fell both sides retired exhausted to
their camps. Heaps of dead covered the bloody field of Tours. But the most
furious attacks of the Arabs had been battled. As the Franks left the battlefield
they still brandished their swords.

Early the next morning the Franks again drew up in battle array, but no Arab
horsemen appeared. Fearing an ambush, the Franks sent out searching parties.
For miles around no enemy was to be seen. In the deserted Arab camp they found
piles of plunder from many lands. The Arabs had retreated behind the Pyrenees
into Spain. Tours was the high-water mark of the Mohammedan tide. 152

Charles Martel’s name should be recognized as a hero of Western civilization, but
how many of you recognize the name? Eventually, seven hundred years later, in 1492,
the Muslims are expelled from Spain by the Catholic Monarchs Ferdinand and Isabella.
This victory enabled the monarchs to fund a journey to the New World by a man named
Columbus. Unfortunately, this occasion was also used to expel the Jewish population
from Spain and many migrated to different parts of Europe, especially Israel.

In the East, Islam continued to commit what can only be described as genocide
against the peoples of India. Beginning in 664, with Islamic raiding parties, Muslims
took what they wanted from India for nearly the next millennium. Will Durant, the

152 B.K. Kuiper, The Church in History (Grand Rapids, Michigan, The National Union of
famous historian, summed up India’s fate at the hands of Islam with these words.

    The Islamic conquest of India is probably the bloodiest story in history. It is a
discouraging tale, for its evident moral is that civilization is a precious good,
whose delicate complex of order and freedom, culture and peace, can at any
moment be overthrown by barbarians invading from without or multiplying
within.  

Koenraad Elst, the German historian writes in "Negation in India,"

    The Muslim conquests, down to the 16th century, were for the Hindus a pure
struggle of life and death. Entire cities were burnt down and the populations
massacred, with hundreds of thousands killed in every campaign, and similar
numbers deported as slaves. Every new invader made (often literally) his hills of
Hindus skulls.

    The graphic details await other historic periods, but this is the ultimate consequence
for a lack of a strong multifaceted defense against Islamic encroachment. Durant
summarizes the entire period of Islamic carnage on Islam with these words, “The bitter
lesson that may be drawn from this tragedy is that eternal vigilance is the price of
civilization. A nation must love peace, but keep its powder dry.”

Peter N. Stearns describes the transitions to the next historic period as follows,

    The mainstay of Umayyad dynastic power was the ruling class consisting of
an Arab military aristocracy, who formed a privileged class greatly
outnumbered by non-Arabic converts to Islam - Egyptians, Syrians, Persians,
Berbers, and others. Many of these converted peoples possessed cultures much
more advanced than that of the Arabs, and the economic and cultural life of
the Arab empire came to be controlled by these non-Arab Muslims (mawali).
Because they were not Arab by birth, they were treated as second-class
citizens. High government positions were closed to them. They paid higher
taxes than Arabs, and as soldiers they received less pay and loot than the
Arabs. Resentment grew among the non-Arabic Muslims who objected to their
lesser status as a violation of the Islamic laws of equality. Eventually the

154 Daniel Pipes, http://www.danielpipes.org/comments/32812 , submitted by Ayesha, Jan. 27,
155 Durant p. 459-463.
resentment of the mawali helped bring about the downfall of the Umayyads.\textsuperscript{156}

One Christian high school text also describes the transition as follows,

Discontent over Umayyad rule soon mounted: a growing number of non-Arab Muslims were dissatisfied with being treated as second-class citizens by Arab rulers... In addition, many Arab Muslims did not consider the Umayyads, the rightful successors of Muhammad. In 750 Abbas, a descendant of Muhammad’s uncle, overthrew the Umayyad caliph and founded the Abbasid (AB uh sid) Caliphate. . . Under the Abbasids, Arab supremacy within the Muslim empire gradually declined. The Abbasids appointed many non-Arabs to high government positions. Also, non-Arabs became increasingly influential in Islamic society. The Abbasid Caliphate marks the peak of the Muslim empire. The Muslims controlled more territory than the ancient Romans did. Its new capital, Baghdad, became one of the world’s leading commercial centers, rivaling the Byzantine capital of Constantinople. Likewise, during the Abbasid rule, Islamic culture flourished.\textsuperscript{157}

Discussion Questions:

1. Did the Sunni Umayyads peacefully get along with their fellow Shi'ites?
2. What is Ashura and how is it commemorated today?
3. What does the Dome of the Rock Mosque and the Al-Aqsa Mosque of Israel demonstrate to Muslims?
4. What does the Great Mosque of Damascus, Syria demonstrate to Muslims?
5. Caner had a long list of areas conquered lands during the Umayyad 661-750 caliphate. What should this tell us about Islam's ability to get along with other cultures?
6. How was Constantinople able to remain independent of Islamic control from 718-1453? What happened then?
7. Who was Abd al-Azis (717-720) and what was his sentiment towards Christians?
8. Who was Charles Martel "the hammer" and what role did he play in France's ability to remain Christian after 732?

\textsuperscript{157} David A. Fisher, World History for Christian Schools (Bob Jones University Press, 1994) p.139.
9. What did the Spanish do in 1492? Was this a good or bad thing?

10. How was Nubia able to remain independent of Islamic control from 652-1174? What happened then?

11. How was Ethiopia able to remain independent of Islamic control from before 615 to the present? What happened between 1506-1503?


13. What did Brigitte Gabriel want to warn us about? Why?

14. What did historian Will Durant say about the Islamic conquest of India?

15. What lesson did historian Will Durant want us to learn from the Islamic carnage?

16. Is it legal and moral to control who comes into your house? Into your nation?

17. Would it have been wrong to exclude Nazi's from immigrating to the United States before WWII? Implications?

18. From a Judeo-Christian perspective, what mistakes did Nubia and Ethiopia make?

19. From a Judeo-Christian perspective, what did Leo III and Charles Martel do correctly?

20. From this historic period does it appear that multiculturalists and liberal theologians of both Islam and Christianity are correct that both religions can learn to appreciate each other and live in harmony?

21. What other thoughts, concerns, criticisms has this reading generated?
CHAPTER 7 THE ABBASID CALIPHATE (750-1258)

When the Abbasid Caliphate came to power, the capital was moved from Damascus, Syria, the former Umayyad capital, to Baghdad (Arabic for "city of peace\textsuperscript{158}"), Iraq. This move was made in 762. The new capital was far from an idyllic place and descriptions of it are often inflated myth. The Abbasids were inclined to use and build upon the culture of the dhimmi peoples they conquered, yet they continued to be an oppressive Islamic culture. The Abbasids should not be used or described as an utopian role model for our day.

Bernard Lewis writes, “The replacement of the Umayyads by the Abbasids in the headship of the Islamic community was more than a mere change of dynasty. It was a revolution in the history of Islam, as important a turning point as the French and Russian revolutions in the history of the West.”\textsuperscript{159} This change was not positive. The French (1789) and the Russian (1914) revolutions were both implemented by atheists and led to massacres in both countries. During the French Revolution, which began in 1789, thousands were beheaded on the guillotine which was invented in 1792 during the \textit{Reign of Terror}. The deaths of three to six million followed in the wars of Napoleon (1799-1815). Between nine and ten million also died in the Russian Revolution. Likewise, the Abbasid coup was accompanied by mass murders and the deaths of untold millions during the Abbasid period. The historian Fregosi gives more gory details about the

\textsuperscript{158} Smith, \textit{Islam in America}, p. 31.
transition of power than what is usually disclosed.

It was an operation which was carried out in a massive blood bath by the first Abbasid ruler, Abu al-Abbas who prided himself on his sobriquets [i.e. nicknames] "The Shedder of Blood" and "The Butcher." He overthrew the last Umayyad caliph, Marwan II, whose corpse was discovered after a battle near Saida by a seller of pomegranates, who cut off the caliphs' head and presented it to the victorious Abbasid general. The brain and other organs in Marwan's head were removed, his tongue was fed to a passing weasel, and the head was embalmed and shipped off in a jeweled box to the new caliph. It's all a bit ghoulish, but very interesting. One does often wonder, however, what all this has to do with religion, with the love of God and man. One is sometimes aghast at the ferocious overtones that religions can sometimes take, and none has done so more than Islam for many centuries, and it is still continuing today, . . . The new caliph was, after, all the head of Islam, the deputy on earth of Allah the Merciful. He also happened to be a sadistic mass murderer. Fearing that one of the surviving Umayyads scattered throughout his dominions might lead a revolt against him, al-Abbas had every single Umayyad tracked down and exterminated.

Many of the Umayyads lived in Basra [Iraq] and were easy to locate and kill, and their bodies were afterwards dumped in a field outside the town to be eaten by wolves and wild dogs. Ninety of them, however, managed to evade their executioners. Abbas knew how to deal with them. He claimed the executions were all a terrible mistake, carried out by people who misunderstood his orders, and invited the survivors to a banquet to plead in person for their pardon. All of them came except the future emir [Abd al-Rahman I] of al-Andalus [i.e. Andalusia or Spain]. When all the guests were comfortably ensconced around the table. Abbas summoned his soldiers and executioners, who surrounded the ninety guests and flogged every one of them to death. Carpets were then rolled over the dead or dying victims and Abbas invited his followers to gorge themselves on the uneaten food which was thus served while the guests reclined on the bodies of the last of the Umayyads.\footnote{160}

It is deeply troubling that the above facts are commonly ignored. There appears to be no end of revisionist historians and theologians, busy promoting the myth that the Abbasid period was a \textit{Golden Age} and that it should be used as a model for Islamic-Christian relations today. The unpleasant truth never gets told. Our own President Obama affirmed this myth in a recent speech June 4, 2009, in Cairo, Egypt.

\footnote{160} Paul Fregosi, \textit{Jihad In the West: Muslim Conquests from the 7th to the 21st Centuries} (Amherst, New York, Prometheus Books, 1998) p. 23-26.
Islam has a proud tradition of tolerance. We see it in the history of Andalusia and Cordoba during the Inquisition. I saw it firsthand as a child in Indonesia, where devout Christians worshiped freely in an overwhelmingly Muslim country. That is the spirit we need today. People in every country should be free to choose and live their faith based upon the persuasion of the mind and the heart and the soul. This tolerance is essential for religion to thrive, but it's being challenged in many different ways.\(^\text{161}\)

President Obama was surely taught this when he went to school in Indonesia.\(^\text{162}\) He clearly believes this characterization of Andalusia. To believe this mischaracterization, one has to ignore the bloody history of Islam in general. Ignoring Islamic history promotes the Abbasid utopian myth. The literal meaning of the word utopia is from the compound Greek ou "not" plus topos "place."\(^\text{163}\) If historians and theologians can ignore the bloody nature of Muhammad, the four caliphs, and the Umayyads, it should be expected the same could happen for the Abbasid period. The period was certainly not a golden age in the eyes of the non-Muslim dhimmis. It should not be considered a golden age in the eyes of the Muslim world because it was a time of dozens, if not more, bloody dynastic wars throughout Islam.

Nevertheless, multiculturalists and Muslims routinely describe this period in such a manner. For example, Jane Smith writes, "Muslims in the West today take pride in recalling the glory of the 'Abbasid days' especially its accomplishments in the arts, science, philosophy, mathematics and medicine."\(^\text{164}\) Ziauddin Sardar, in his book, What Do Muslims Believe? writes "The Abbasid period, which is commonly regarded as the


\(^{162}\) Recently, February 18, 2010, the news reported that President Obama's in an Indonesian Park has been relocated to the Indonesian school where he attended.


Golden Age of Islam, provides us with numerous other examples of the genuine application of Islam." 165 One high school site repeats the common theme,

Golden Age
Islamic civilization experienced a golden age under the Abbasid Dynasty, which ruled from the mid 8th century until the mid 13th century. Under the Abbasids, Islamic culture became a blending of Arab, Persian, Egyptian, and European traditions. The result was an era of stunning intellectual and cultural achievements.166


Another Islamic site raves,

The Golden Age was a period of unrivaled intellectual activity in all fields: science, technology, and (as a result of intensive study of the Islamic faith) literature - particularly biography, history, and linguistics. Scholars, for example, in collecting and reexamining the hadith, or "traditions" - the sayings and actions of the Prophet - compiled immense biographical detail about the Prophet and other information, historic and linguistic, about the Prophet's era. This led to such memorable works as Sirat Rasul Allah, the "Life of the Messenger of God," by Ibn Ishaq, later revised by Ibn Hisham; one of the earliest Arabic historical works, it was a key source of information about the Prophet's life and also a model for other important works of history such as al-Tabari’s Annals of the Apostles and the Kings and his massive commentary on the Quran.167

Both multiculturalists and Muslims speak of this Abbasid period as a model of what can, could, and should be the ideal relationship between Islam and the West. They neglect to mention the bloody battles that existed as one warlike dynasty conquered, subdued, and established their new dynasty over the previous dynasty. All of this is with the passive approval of the Abbasid Caliphate. Even more egregious is the fact that it

---

appears multiculturalists and Muslims ignore the horrific suffering and deaths of literally millions of Jews, Christians, Hindus, and others who were ruthlessly slaughtered as Islam suppressed all dissidence by their dhimmi population. They also invert justice by blaming Christians for finally striking back in the Crusades after centuries of Islamic brutality and expansion up to the very gates of Constantinople.

The call for a Crusade came after the Seljuk Turks had defeated the Byzantine Army at Manzikert in eastern Turkey in 1071. Constantinople felt so vulnerable that they asked for help from Rome. Constantinople would eventually fall due to the persistence of Islamic Armies in 1453. The Crusades can be condemned for theological reasons and for the way the battles were waged but not on the basis that Islam was a victim. Nothing could be further from the truth. What is also conveniently ignored are the centuries of Islamic invasions prior to and after the Crusades. Consequently, the current generation of multiculturalists and Muslims working to implement the acceptance of Islam in the West, who feel Islam can be placed in its rightful place of honor, need to be politely reminded of some of the facts surrounding the Abbasid period.

It is important for Christians to look at this age and see if the historic reality matches the flowery rhetoric. This chapter will be divided into six sections and will attempt to reasonably deflate some of the more common, but exaggerated, claims and charges made about the Abbasid period. First, the myth that the Abbasid Golden Age was a period of peace and unity in Islam is completely false. They were at war with themselves and others. Second, the Utopian myth surrounding Andalusia or Spain is exposed. This period might have been better than most, but it is not a time that should be duplicated (it is more typical of Islam than atypical.) Third, technological plagiarism is really not evidence of a
great Golden Age by Islam. Fourth, a balanced view of what transpired before, during, and after the Crusades (1095-1291) is necessary to really appreciate what the real significance of the Crusades should be and how they are unfairly being used today. Fifth, the Abbasid Caliphate permitted repeated invasions of India by Muslim Mahmud of Ghazni (997-1030) and later by the Ghurid Sultanate (1148-1215), who defeated the previous Gaznavid dynasty. These invasions led to the death of millions of Hindus demonstrating clearly the willingness of Islam to be bloody even during the Abbasid period. Sixth, A.D. 1258 is evidence of the truthfulness of Jesus' words, "Those who live by the sword died by the sword".

**Abbasid Golden Age**

First, the myth that the Abbasid Golden Age was a period of peace is completely false. The Abbasid Caliphate\(^{168}\) was really a period of a fractured caliphate with multiple regional dynasties. They fought externally and internally during these years. There are so many dynasties that rise and fall that it is easy to get confused. Let us walk through enough of the rises and falls of these dynasties so you get an accurate impression of the fractured nature of this caliphate. Remembering all the names and locations is not as important as remembering Islam was at war with itself and with others at this time resulting in the deaths of thousands of their own and millions of others.

The Abbasid Caliphate was marginally held together in various degrees of unity for five centuries, ruled over by thirty-seven different Caliphs. In 1258, when the Caliphate did come to an end, it was at the hands of Shamanist Mongol invaders, not from an inward collapse. One group of Islamic scholars writes, "This longevity speaks well of the Abbasid system of government, particularly in terms of its ability to accept the development of separate, regional dynasties in order to preserve the Abbasid core in Baghdad." Another encyclopedia describes the situation a little less optimistically, "During the rule of the Abbasids, the Muslim world lost its political unity, as first Spain and then the North African countries set up caliphates independent of Baghdad."

Many different Islamic Dynasties or Sultanates arose, seized power from fellow Muslims by force in a particular area, and continued to rule that area as long as they could hold it by force from other Muslim dynasties. These Dynasties ruled under the distant and occasionally adversarial watch of the Abbasid Caliphate in Baghdad, Iraq. Among the larger dynasties of this period, but surely not all, are the following: The Umayyad Dynasty (750) that barely survived the Abbasid attempted genocide against them, fled, and eventually flourished in the tip of Spain for three hundred years. The Aghlabid Dynasty, (800-908) which ruled over eastern Algeria, Tunisia, and Tripolitania. The Ghaznavids (975-1187), who ruled much of Persia, Transoxania, and Northern India. The Seljuks ruled parts of Central Asia and the Middle East from the 11th to 14th centuries. The Fatimid Dynasty (908-1171), Shi’ites who were actually adversarial with


the Sunni Abbasid Caliphate and ruled over Western Arabia and Egypt to Morocco. *The Almoravid dynasty* (1040-1147) ruled northwestern Africa and the tip of the Iberian Peninsula. *The Almohads* (1050-1250) ruled the southern tip of Spain and the northwest shore of North Africa from Fez to Tripoli. These dynasties were all in different states of flux loosely connected to the Abbasid Caliphate or in conflict with it so it is more accurate to call the Abbasid Caliphate, as one group of scholars did, "the Fractured Caliphate and the Regional Dynasties." 171 Throughout all these years, and down to the present, Islam was often at war with different parts of itself and this was true during the Abbasid period as well. For example, the Fatimid Dynasty172 claimed they should be the ones to rule Islam for they were descended from Fatima, Ali's wife, rather than through Abbas who was an obscure cousin of Muhammad's. One source states,

As Shi'ites, the Fatimids were both theologically and politically opposed to the Sunni rule of the Abbasids in Baghdad. The Fatimids caliphs considered themselves to be divine rulers, sent by God to rule on earth and ensure the prevalence of Islamic justice. As direct descendants of the Prophet's daughter, the Shi'ite Fatimids believed that they should rule the world. . . and that the Sunni Abbasids were simply usurpers. The Fatimids are known for their strict enforcement of Islamic laws regarding dietary restrictions and acceptable behavior for Muslims.173

---

172 medievalcoins.ancients.info/Maps.htm (accessed July 31, 2009).
The Ayyubid Sultanate,\textsuperscript{174} made up of Kurdish-Turks from Syria seized control of Egypt from the Fatimid Dynasty and held it from 1169-1250. The Ayyubid Sultanate took its name from Ayyub, brother of Shirkuh and father of the famous Saladin. At one time the Abbasid court actually had arrest warrants out for both of the brothers who had to flee for safety. Fregosi also writes about these five centuries, "Islam was in shambles, disunity reigned. Islam had almost ceased to be a religion and instead had become a battlefield for competing, power-hungry dynasties."\textsuperscript{175} So what is the significance of pointing out Islam was fragmented and at war with itself during these Abbasid years? The first point is Islam is not a religion of peace even when there are only fellow Muslims with which to fight. The second point is Islam was not truly experiencing a \textit{Golden Age}. Actually, it was as has been described above: in shambles and disunity at this time because of many competing power-hungry dynasties.

\textbf{The Myths Surrounding Andalusia/Spain}

\textsuperscript{174}medievalcoins.ancients.info/Maps.htm (accessed July 31, 2009)
\textsuperscript{175}Fregosi. p. 153.
Fregosi continues his narrative by describing the one Umayyad that got away. After 750, the Abbasids massacre the Umayyad and Abd al-Rahman, the sole surviving Umayyad Caliph, and those loyal to him, fled from Baghdad traveling through Egypt and North Africa and appear in Spain in 756. He defeated the fellow Islamic emir of Cordova [Cordoba], claiming all of Islamic Spain for himself. The people of Cordova readily accepted this new powerful leader. The Abbasids were quite naturally not happy about Rahman's escape and sent an army to kill him, but instead, they were crushed. "Abd al-Rahman destroyed their army, executed their leaders, packed their decapitated heads in a large bag with notes attached to their ears identifying each head, and sent the package to the caliph in Baghdad. From then on al-Andalus was safe from the Abbasids." Abd al-Rahman I, established a dynasty that lasted centuries, as the new leader of Andalusia.

176 Ibid. p. 124.
Abd al-Rahman I started to make Cordova into what became, two or three centuries later, probably the most sophisticated city in Europe. . . Muslim, Jewish, and Christian- gathered together, sometimes in conviviality, [i.e. friendly, agreeable] living well together and prospering, sometimes in hostility, clashing to the death in a bizarre Holy War ritual of massacre, assassination, and decapitation.

As Richard Fletcher reminds us, "Moorish Spain was more often a land of turmoil that it was a land of tranquility." Cordova, . . . enjoyed its cultural eminence for about a century, during a period of tolerance that started with Abd al-Rahman III's accession to power in 912. The city acquired a library of four hundred thousand volumes and a prestigious reputation for scholarship. Students, including a future pope, came from all over the Christian empire to study in this Muslim haven; however, it didn't last. In the end, religious antagonism proved too strong.177

Bat Ye’or, in her book *Eurabia*, wrote a chapter entitled *The Andalusian Utopia*. In it, she describes how modern multiculturalists and Muslims misuse and mischaracterize this period as an excuse for embracing Islamic immigration and multiculturalism. She writes,

The Euro-Arab policy planned by numerous Euro-Arab organizations strove to legitimize the growing Muslim settlement in Europe by invoking the centuries of Muslim presence in European countries. Muslim domination—whether in the Iberian Peninsula178 or the Balkans—was depicted as benign and enlightened governance. Islam, in this view, had a historic legitimacy in Europe: it was not a foreign hostile intruder imposed by war and conquest. It belonged to

\[\text{177} \quad \text{Ibid. p. 123-124.}\]

\[\text{178} \quad \text{http://www.teflcourse.com/images/seville/seville_map.jpg. Internet; accessed 10 March 2009.}\]
Europe, and Europe was its rightful homeland. It was therefore only just to grant to Arab and Muslim countries a privileged status as sources of immigration to Europe.

Apologists for Muslim immigration invoked the invaluable historic contribution the Muslims had made to European civilization and the alleged tolerance of the Arab Andalusian caliphate. The peaceful coexistence over centuries of Muslims, Christians and Jews in the Iberian Peninsula under benign Islamic rule became a compulsory nostalgic illusion. This “golden age” of blissful Andalusian dhimmitude for the Christian Spanish majority and the Jews in the Middle Ages would provide a model for the social and political projects of Euro-Arab fusion in the twenty-first century.\(^{179}\)

Ye’or then goes on to explain what really happened in the Spanish and Portugal Peninsula, known as Iberia to the Christians, and Andalusia to the Muslims.\(^{180}\)

Iberia, with Portugal, was conquered in 710-216 CE by Arab tribes originating in northern, central and south Arabia. Massive Berber and Arab immigration and colonization of the peninsula followed the conquest. Most churches were converted into mosques. Although the conquest had been planned and conducted in conjunction with a powerful dissident royal faction, including a bishop, it proceeded along the lines of a classic jihad- with massive pillaging, slavery, deportations, and killings.\(^{181}\)

The Christian and Jewish populations of Andalusia were eventually brutally subdued at the point of death through Islamic jihad. That is not the idyllic paradise as advertised.

Toledo, [North of Cordova] . . . revolted in 713. The town was punished by pillage; all its notables had their throats cut. In 730, the Cerdagne (. . . near Barcelona) was ravaged and a bishop was burned alive. By the end of the eight century, the rulers of North Africa and Andalusia had introduced Malikism one of the most rigorous schools of Sunni Muslim jurisprudence. . . Jews and Christians were tolerated as dhimmis . . . they were forbidden . . . to build new churches or synagogues or restore old ones. Segregated in special quarters, they had to wear distinctive clothing that easily marked them out for discrimination. Subjected to the jizya tax mandated by Islamic law (Qur’an 9:29) and other heavy ransoms, the Christian peasantry formed a servile class attached to the Arab domains. . . Harsh reprisals accompanied by mutilations and crucifixions prevent the Mozarabs (Christian dhimmis) from calling for help from the Christian kings of Europe. Moreover, if one dhimmi harmed a Muslim, the whole community would lose its

\(^{179}\)Ye’or, Eurabi, p. 164f.


\(^{181}\)Ye’or, Eurabia, p. 165.
status of protection - leaving it open to pillage, enslavement and arbitrary killing. The humiliating status imposed on the dhimmis and the confiscation of their land provoked many revolts, punished by massacres as in Toledo (761, 784-86, 797). The insurgents were crucified, as prescribed in the Qur’an (5:37) a punishment still applied in the Sudan today. . . 182

"Contrary to the prevailing myth, Al-Andalusia represented the land of jihad par excellence. Every year, and sometimes twice a year, the Muslim rulers sent raiding expeditions to ravage the Christian Spanish kingdoms to the north."183

Let these words sink in. Andalusia was a typical oppressive Islamic culture.

Thousands of people were deported to slavery in Andalusia, where the caliph kept a militia of tens of thousands of Christian slaves brought from all parts of Christian Europe. . . and a harem filled with captured Christian women. . . Despite brilliant cultural achievements and occasional periods of tolerance in the tenth and eleventh centuries, Andalusian history is one of cruelty, war, and slavery. 184

Jews and Christians can and have learned to live as a subjugated dhimmi people because their scriptures direct them to do this when conquered. But this is not true harmony, this is learning how to survive in an abusive authoritarian system. This is not desirable, and this is not a model for the future. Those who try to make it appear as if this was a sustained idyllic state are practicing wishful thinking rather than looking honestly at what has historically transpired. History clearly demonstrates opening up any culture to large numbers of Islamic immigrants will inevitably lead to serious social conflict. This will eventually occur, for this is the clear and intended teaching of the Qur’an and the hadiths.

182 Ibid. p. 165-166.  
184 Ye’or. Eurabia p. 165-166.
Technological Plagiarism

Muslims make tremendous claims about their contribution to science and culture in the Abbasid period. These claims have been picked up and repeated so often that it requires some research to question this assertion.

Robert Spencer describes a typical claim made by multiculturalists and Muslims.

Muslims invented algebra, the zero, and the astrolabe (an ancient navigational instrument). They blazed new trails in agriculture. They preserved Aristotelian philosophy while Europe blundered through the Dark Ages. Virtually every field, the Islamic empires of bygone days far outstripped the achievements of their non-Muslim contemporaries in Europe and elsewhere.¹⁸⁶

May 2, 2003, Sheik Jamal Shakir Al-Nazzal in his Friday message declared in the Great Mosque in Falouja, Iraq,

I would like to say that it was the Islamic State that established the beacon of science for all humanity in the spheres of engineering and law. The era of the Islamic State became a golden age, at a time when Europe was living a life of ignorance, like beasts. . . Islam arrived and illuminated the minds of man. Andalusia is testimony to this.¹⁸⁷

Another 2003 speech, in-line with the one above, was given by the outgoing Malaysian Prime Minister in October of that same year. He said,

The early Muslims produced great mathematicians and scientists, scholars, physicians and astronomers etc. And they excelled in all the fields of knowledge of their times. Besides studying and practicing their own religion of Islam. . . At the time of Europeans of the Middle Ages were still superstitious and backward, the enlightened Muslims had already built a great Muslim civilization. . . . The Europeans had to kneel at the feet of Muslim scholars in order to access their own scholastic heritage .¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁵ "the act of taking the writings of another person and passing them off as one's own. . . ."
¹⁸⁷ Ye’or, Eurabia, p.196.
¹⁸⁸ Ibid. p.175.
Ye'or comments that,

Such statements abound not only from sheikhs, but also in speeches and books by Europeans who have adopted today's new "enlightened" view. European politicians continually harp upon the Islamic superiority over Christendom in art, science, civilization, and religious tolerance.  

On October 8, 1998 British Foreign Secretary, Robin Cook, speaking of the Islamic Ismaili Center, at the Ismaili Center, in London, stated,

It is the most wonderful reminder in the very heart of London that the roots of our culture are not just Greek or Roman in origin, but Islamic as well. Islamic art, science and philosophy have helped to shape who we are and how we think, (after stressing ) the debt our culture owes to Islam (he added) laid the intellectual foundations for large portions of Western civilization.  

Ye'or objects, however, stating that,

Cook's assertions were in fact groundless. Islam actually inherited most of its knowledge from Greece, Rome, and the Judeo-Christian, Armenian, Persian, and Hindu civilizations that Muslims conquered and colonized and upon which they built their own contributions. During the Middle Ages, [Christian] Byzantine science, literature, and arts flourished in Anatolia and the Balkan region, reaching to Italy and Armenia with a brilliance that Abbasid and Andalusian Arab caliphs envied, as is clear from Muslim contemporary writings.  

This view of knowledge is called the Islamization of Knowledge. This view asserts that the Revealed Knowledge (Islam) is the source of all knowledge, and that its messenger, Muhammad, was entrusted to provide guidance to all humanity. Historically according to this view, the Islamization of knowledge allowed sciences and medicine to flourish in Muslim lands, ensuring a millennium of Muslim domination over the world. Western knowledge simply borrowed from Muslim science.  

On the surface, this is an amazing claim from a religion whose founder could not read or write and who made a variety of wrong scientific claims. Morey has referenced a number of unusual scientific claims by Muhammad which are laughable if he were not

---

189 Ibid. p.197.  
190 Ibid. p.172-173.  
191 Ibid. p.173.
the alleged prophet of over a billion Muslims who follow him as perfectly as they can.

For example, in Bukari's Hadith, volume 4, chapter 3, page 282, astronomers would be interested to learn, "The stars are created by Allah as missiles to throw at the devils." 193

Volume 1, Book 4, Number 234: Muhammad has a strange view of medicine.

"Some people . . . came to Medina and its climate did not suit them. So the Prophet ordered them to go to the herd of . . . camels and to drink their milk and urine (as a medicine)." 194

Volume 4, Book 54, Number 484: Muhammad has a strange view of fever which we know is usually caused by an infection. "I heard the Prophet saying, "Fever is from the heat of the (Hell) Fire; so cool it with water." 195

Volume 4, Book 54, Number 537: Muhammad has a strange view of what cures disease. The Prophet said "If a housefly falls in the drink of anyone of you, he should dip it (in the drink), for one of its wings has a disease and the other has the cure for the disease." 196

Volume 4, Book 55, Number 546: Muhammad has a strange view of genetics.

When 'Abdullah bin Salam heard the arrival of the Prophet at Medina, he came to him and said, "I am going to ask you about three things which nobody knows except a prophet: . . . Why does a child resemble its father, and why does it resemble its maternal uncle" . . . [Muhammad's answer] As for the resemblance of the child to its parents: If a man has sexual intercourse with his wife and gets discharge first, the child will resemble the father, and if the woman gets discharge first, the child will resemble her." 197

The claims Muhammad made about his scientific knowledge are obvious false.

192 Ibid. p.254.
193 Morey p. 205.
194 http://www.usc.edu/schools/college/crcc/engagement/resources/texts/muslim/hadith/bukhari/004.sbt.html (July 25, 2009)
195 http://www.usc.edu/schools/college/crcc/engagement/resources/texts/muslim/hadith/bukhari/054.sbt.html (July 25, 2009)
196 http://www.usc.edu/schools/college/crcc/engagement/resources/texts/muslim/hadith/bukhari/054.sbt.html accessed (July 25, 2009)
197 http://www.usc.edu/schools/college/crcc/engagement/resources/texts/muslim/hadith/bukhari/054.sbt.html
indicating Muhammad stated as fact things that are simply untrue. Since we know this, why should we trust him in spiritual matters which we cannot test? Today only 60% of the women in Arab countries know how to read. In Afghanistan, illiteracy was a major problem before the Taliban appeared, affecting 90% of girls and 60% of boys. . . the Taliban's gender policies only worsened an ongoing crisis.

Rabbi Daniel Lapin observed the following about science. “Virtually every major discovery in physics, medicine, chemistry, mathematics, electricity, nuclear physics, mechanics and just about everything else has taken place in Christian countries.”

Francis Schaeffer wrote,

"Indeed, at a crucial point the Scientific Revolution rested upon what the Bible teaches. Both Alfred North Whitehead (1861-1947) and J. Robert Oppenheimer (1904-1967) have stressed that modern science was born out of the Christian world view... As far as I know, neither of the two men were Christians, or claimed to be Christians, yet both were straightforward in acknowledging that modern science was born out of the Christian world view."

Balint Vazsonyi writes,

"It may be unfair; it may be cruel; it may be embarrassing; but the fact is that discoveries, inventions, creative activities of all kinds continue to pour forth from the accustomed source...Western Civilization...Goodness knows, everybody has been bending over backward to cover up the uncomfortable reality. We invented an entire mind game called multiculturalism. We wrote entire fictitious histories. We are ‘celebrating diversity’ day and night, Like children we cover our eyes and pretend no one can see.”

Ye’or describes the circumstances how the Islamic claim of scientific cultural superiority originated. "The tendency to overestimate the debt owed by Western

/055.sbt.html (accessed July 25, 2009)


200 Daniel Lapin, Mind Siege (Sisters, Oregon.: Multnomah, 1999 p. 157); 2000, p. 300.

civilization to the grandeur of medieval Islam, despite archaeological and historical
evidence to the contrary, first came to the fore in resolutions and recommendations issued
in the Arab world in September 1968.” A conference of Muslims met at al-Azhar
University in Cairo, Egypt and they made many resolutions. One of the resolutions read as follows,

The conference recommends the publication of a detailed book in diverse tongues,
to be circulated on a large scale, pointing out the viewpoint of Islamic civilization . . . The conference recommends the preparation of a historical and scientific study explaining the impact of Muslim civilization and teachings on the movements of political, social and religious reform in the West, since the age of European Renaissance.” 203

It is truly amazing how successful these Muslims have been in promoting this idea.
Ye'or continues, "Heeding this call--whether knowingly or motivated by other factors--a
spate of works written since the 1970's by distinguished Western Arabists has magnified
the Islamic contribution to European civilization."204 But not all agree with this view.

When Robert Spencer, author of The Politically Incorrect Guide to Islam (and the Crusades) hears these amazing claims of Western Civilization's debt to Islam during the Abbasid period, he questions, "Or did they?" and then concludes, "Well, not quite. Unless copying counts."205 He believes Islam built upon the discoveries of the peoples they had conquered and then took credit for them, this is called plagiarism. Spencer
explodes some politically correct myths about the Islamic culture.

PC Myth: Islam was once the foundation of a great cultural and scientific flowering. In fact Islam was not the foundation of much significant cultural or scientific development at all. It is undeniable that there was a great cultural and scientific flowering in the Islamic world in the Middle Ages, but there is no

203 Ye'or, Eurabia, p. 168.
204 Ibid.
205 Spencer, p. 87.
indication that any of this flowering actually came as a result of Islam itself. In fact, there is considerable evidence that it did not come from Islam, but from the non-Muslims who served their Muslim masters in various capacities.  

Architecture:

The architectural design of mosques, for example, a source of pride among Muslims, was copied from the shape and structure of Byzantine Churches. (And of course, the construction of domes and arches was developed over a thousand years before the advent of Islam.) The seventh-century Dome of the Rock, considered today to have been the first great mosque, was not only copied from Byzantine models, but was built by Byzantine craftsmen. There are plenty of other examples. . .

Navigation:

The astrolabe was developed, if not perfected, long before Muhammad was born.

Philosophy:

Avicenna (980-1037), Averroes (1128-1198), and other Muslim philosophers built on the work of the pagan Greek Aristotle. And Christians preserved Aristotle's work from the ravages of the Dark Ages such as the fifth-century priest Probus of Antioch, who introduce Aristotle to the Arabic-speaking world. The Christian Huneyn ibn Ishaq (809-873) translated many works by Aristotle, Galen, Plato, and Hippocrates into Syriac, which his son then translated into Arabic and wrote his own; his treatise The Reformation of Morals has occasionally been erroneously attributed to several of his Muslim contemporaries. His student a Christian named Abu 'Ali 'Isa ibn Zur'a (949-1008), also made Arabic translations of Aristotle and other Greek writers from Syriac.

Medicine:

The first Arabic-language medical treatise was written by a Christian priest and translated into Arabic by a Jewish doctor in 683. The first hospital in Baghdad during the heyday of the Abbasid empire was built by a Nestorian Christian, Jabrail ibn Bakhtishu.

First University:

---
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The World's first university may not have been the Muslims' Al-Azhar in Cairo, as is often claimed, but the Assyrian school of Nisibis.  

Spencer concludes this study with these insightful comments,

> There is no shame in any of this. No culture exists in a vacuum. Every culture builds on the achievements of other cultures and borrows from those with which it is in contact. But the historical record simply doesn't support the idea that Islam inspired a culture that outstripped others. There was a time when Islamic culture was more advanced than that of Europeans, but that superiority corresponds exactly to the period when Muslims were able to draw on and advance the achievements of Byzantine [i.e. Eastern Christians] and other civilizations. . . Are we to believe that these rough men entered their new surroundings with daring new artistic and architectural plans tucked under their arms?  

Ye'or in her second book on dhimmitude, *The Decline of Eastern Christianity under Islam: From Jihad to Dhimmitude*, affirms all that Spencer has written above. She writes,

> It is impossible to list here the innumerable artisans of this intellectual leaven, nor their fundamental contributions to every sector . . . Physician. . . Artists, architects, masons- all recruited from the local [i.e. Judeo-Christian] work force-swelled by contingents of captives contributed to the continuity of styles and techniques. . . This vast undertaking of transmitting knowledge by incorporating it into the Arabic language reach its apogee under the first Abbasids, whose court - under Iranian influence- strove to reproduce the splendors of Khosroes [a city in Iran]. This was the period of translations (750-850), encouraged by Al-Ma'mum, who created a library-translation office . . . in 830, where works were translated into Arabic from Sanskrit, Persian, Aramaic, and Greek. . . This intellectual movement constituted a "brain drain" from the communities by the Islamization of intellectuals anxious to retain favorable conditions for study.  

Ye'or's specialty is studying the dhimmi (i.e. the subjugated people conquered by Muslims). She credits the *dhimmi* for the Islamic Golden age as they became an increasingly subjugated people.

> Three centuries after the first Arab invasions, the decline of Christianity was particularly apparent in North Africa, where the number of bishoprics diminished

---

211 Ibid.
212 Ibid.
from five hundred to about forty. . . These dhimmi cultures. . . enabl[ed] Islam to build its greatness on foundations which the dhimmi elites had created before they themselves disappeared in contempt and oblivion. Consequently, these three centuries of symbiosis and golden age appear as the swan song of a brilliant moment in human history.214

This is a more balanced and realistic view of who should get credit for the Golden Age of Islam. The inflated claims about Islam birthing science, made by Muslims, are not honest or accurate.

Since we are discussing Islamic culture, let us also examine what Muhammad and some of his followers' views were on music and art. First music: one Hadith collected by Umudat al-Salik, (40.1) described how Muhammad forbade music and musical instruments.

Allah Mighty and Majestic sent me as a guidance and mercy to believers and commanded me to do away with musical instruments, flutes, strings, crucifixes. On the Day of Resurrection, Allah will pour molten lead into the ears of whoever sits listening to a songstress. . . When will this be, O Messenger of Allah? and he said, "When songstresses and musical instruments appear and wine is held to be lawful." There will be peoples of my Community who will hold fornication, silk, wine, and musical instruments to be lawful.215

In a another Hadith collected by Bukhari, Volume 7, Book 69, Number 494, we read similar sentiments confirming Muhammad's views on music.

...he heard the Prophet saying, "From among my followers there will be some people who will consider illegal sexual intercourse, the wearing of silk, the drinking of alcoholic drinks and the use of musical instruments, as lawful. And there will be some people who will stay near the side of a mountain and in the evening their shepherd will come to them with their sheep and ask them for something, but they will say to him, 'Return to us tomorrow.' Allah will destroy them during the night and will let the mountain fall on them, and He will transform the rest of them into monkeys and pigs and they will remain so till the Day of Resurrection." 216

---

214Ye'or, *The Decline of Eastern Christianity under Islam*, p. 234-235
In a Hadith collected by Sahih Muslim, *Book 024, Number 5279*, we read, "Abu Huraira reported Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) as saying: The bell is the musical instrument of the Satan."  

In 1979, the Ayatolla Khomeini, leader of Iran, who passed away in December 2009, spoke about the evils of music. "Music corrupts the minds of our youth. There is no difference between music and opium. Both create lethargy in different ways. If you want your country to be independent, then ban music. Music is treason to our nation and to our youth." This kind of thinking was not confined to Iran.

Ahmed Rashid's book entitled *Taliban* came out in 2000. He describes the Afghanistan view on music and art at that time and how their prohibition of it was enforced. In the summer of 1997, Rashid interviewed Qalamuddin, the man in charge of *The Department of the Promotion of Virtue and Prevention of Vice*. Qalamuddin is said to prefer the title, *The Department of Religious Observance*. "In the streets, people call the department's thousands of young zealots, who walk around with whips, long sticks and Kalashnikovs [i.e. Russian made rifles], the religious police and even more derogatory names." Among the prohibited activities was of course to, "blow a flute, clap to a beat."

The Taliban also banned every conceivable form of entertainment. . . Afghans were ardent movie-goers but movies, TV, videos, music and dancing were all banned . . . According to Education Minister Mullah, Abdul Hanifi, the Taliba 'oppose music because it creates a strain in the mind and hampers study of Islam.'

---
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Singing and dancing were banned at weddings. . .  

Now, what did Muhammad say about art? "I heard Allah's Messenger ... saying, "Angels do not enter a house wherein there is a dog or some images (or pictures etc.) of living creatures (a human being or an animal)." Rashid writes,

Nobody was allowed to hang paintings, portraits or photographs in their homes. One of Afghanistan's foremost artists, Mohammed Mashal, aged 82, who was painting a huge mural showing 500 years of Herat's history was forced to watch as the Taliban whitewashed over it. Simply put, the Taliban did not recognize the very idea of culture.

Rashid ends his chapter describing the deafening silence of the Islamic world at the abuses of Islam being perpetrated against the Afghan people.

Most Afghans felt demoralized by the fact that the Islamic world declined to take up the task of condemning the Taliban's extremism. Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and the Arab Gulf states have never issued a single statement on the need for women's education or human rights in Afghanistan. Nor did they ever question the Taliban's interpretation of Sharia. Asian Muslim countries were also silent.

It is hard to conceive of great works of art, literature, architecture and music coming out of a culture that compared music to opium and forbade any type of pictures.

**A More Balanced View of the Crusades (1095-1291)**

What are the Crusades? Kenneth Scott Latourette, church historian, writes of the root causes or motivations of the Crusades and the Crusaders.

Why were the Crusades? The causes were mixed and varied. . . It is the religious factors which are here chiefly our concern. They were undoubtedly potent. First of all in the minds of many was the rescue from the Moslem of the places in Palestine, especially Jerusalem, which were sacred to the Christian. For centuries Christians from the West... had been making them the goal of pious pilgrimages. . . Another phase of the religious motive was the protection of the Byzantine Empire against the Moslem Turks. As we have said, the Turks were threatening this historic bulwark of Christendom. The Byzantine Emperors appealed to the

---

221 Ibid. p. 115
Christians of the West for assistance and the Popes were disposed to give it. Intimately related to this second religious motive was a third, the desire of the Popes to heal the breach between the Western and Eastern wings of the Catholic Church and to restore Christian unity. . . In 1054 the friction had reached an acute point when, in negotiations between the Papacy and the Patriarchate of Constantinople, the Papal legates laid on the altar of Saint Sophia, . . . a sentence of excommunication of the Patriarch. The latter replied with a strong denunciation of the Latin position. The rupture was not necessarily final . . . but it was serious, and the Popes wished to remove it.  

More motivations for the Crusades:

Valid Reasons:

1. Centuries of Islamic conquests of Jewish and Christian lands developed genuine fear for the safety of Christendom. Al- Hakim (985-1021), sixth ruler of the Fatimid Caliphate, founder of the Druze sect of Islam, provoked animosity with Christians by his brutal attacks on Christians years earlier, earning the nickname of the mad caliph.
2. Constantinople had an Islamic army within striking distance and Emperor Alexius of Byzantine requests their fellow Christian Pope Urban II. It was a war to protect Christian brothers.
3. Christians were being killed as they pilgrimage to Jerusalem. It was a war to stop robbery, kidnapping and rape, enslavement and murder of Christian pilgrims. In 1065 Jerusalem was conquered by Moslem Turks and 3,000 Christian pilgrims were massacred.
4. This cooperation with the Eastern Orthodox church in her time of need could help inspire reunification with the Roman Catholic Church after the 1054 schism.
5. To serve God as a pilgrim and protect and liberate fellow Christians and the Holy Land from Islamic control. It was a war of service to God not unlike Christian soldiers today.

Invalid Reasons:

1. Desire for adventure
2. Desire for wealth
3. Population Control
5. Earn Salvation through Christian Jihad.

There are actually seven Crusades, plus two unofficial Crusades, making nine total.

---

226 Caner, Christian Jihad p. 119, observe that Justo L. Gonzalez, in his book The Crusades: Piety Misguided (Nashville: Graded Press, 1988, 5-13. Gonzalez lists the lure of romantic adventure, social factors, economic factors, unity of the masses, the unity to the cause, corporate expiation, the code of chivalry, and the vow of the doomed. . . . He never mentions the horrors suffered at the hands of the
• 1095-1096 The Peasants' Crusade: Not an official Crusade was led by Peter the Hermit. This group was a superstitious and unruly mob, who robbed and murdered Jews along the way and were eventually slaughtered by Muslims in Turkey.

• 1096-1099 The First Crusade: The East coast of Mediterranean Sea was conquered. Four small Christian Kingdoms were established (Edessa, Antioch, Tripoli and Jerusalem). The scene around the fall of Jerusalem sounds tragically unchristian. Once inside the city, the crusaders massacred their enemies without mercy. A terrible slaughter of the infidels took place. For seven days the carnage went on, at the end of which time scarcely any of the Moslem faith were left alive. The Christians took possession of the houses and property of the infidels, each soldier having a right to that which he had first seized and placed his mark upon."

• 1147-1149 The Second Crusade was prompted by the Fall of Edessa in 1144. William of Edessa tells of the Christian's final plight after Islamic bombings had created a breach in the wall. The slaughter continued with the fall of Edessa. "Their [Islamic] forces rushed together into the city. They slew with their swords the citizens whom they encountered, sparing neither age, condition, nor sex. Of caliphs.

\[227\text{ www.kena.org/hirams/ Pictures/Historical/Maps/ } (\text{accessed March 5, 2009})\]
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them it might be said: "They murder the widow and the stranger, they slay the orphan, the youth, and the virgin together with the old man." 229

The Caners write,

If the First Crusade achieved its goals because the Muslim forces were scattered and the Christian forces were united in the common endeavor, then the Second Crusade failed for precisely the same reason—in reverse. By the end of the Second Crusade in July 1148, the Christian armies were horribly divided and the Muslim armies were gathering once again. 230

- 1189-1192 The Third Crusade: The (Kings) Crusade, was called by Pope Gregory VIII following Saladin's capture of Jerusalem in 1187. 232 Three armies set out but Frederick Barbarossa would drown crossing a river. King Philip of France, and Richard the Lion-hearted would reach Israel. Richard conquered the Islamic city of Acre and then executed twenty-seven hundred Muslim men outside the city
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walls. Richard secured safety for pilgrimages but failed to retake Jerusalem from Saladin.

- 1202-1204 The Fourth Crusade: Venetians, who controlled the boats, took the Crusaders to Byzantine rather than Jerusalem and the Crusaders sacked fellow Christian city of Constantinople. Lewis notes that some Europeans were more loyal to the Muslims, perhaps for economic reasons, than to Byzantine Christians.

The Venetians, the Genoes, and the Pisans, he [i.e. Saladin] said, were bringing choice products of the West, especially arms and war material. This constituted an advantage for the Muslims and an injury for the Christians. The thunder of the church in Europe against this trade and the decrees of excommunication against those who engaged in it were ineffective.

- 1202-1212 The Children's Crusade: (Not an official Crusade) This is a story of two 12 year olds, one from France (Stephen) the other from Germany (Nicholas) who convinced fellow youths that God would part the seas and give them a miraculous victory over the Muslims. The Caners write,

> Yet the darkest hour in Christian history could have been 1212, when Rome allowed the launch of the Children's Crusade. Distressingly, Rome did nothing to stop the movement. . . . Against the pleadings of their parents, these children (some as young as age six) set out en masse. The result was horrifying. As many as fifty thousand were sold into [Islamic] slavery. Many died of starvation. . . . One thing is sure: that of the many thousands who rose up, only a very few returned.

- 1218-1228 The Fifth Crusade (Accomplished nothing.)
- 1228-1229 The Sixth Crusade (Accomplished nothing.)
- 1248-1254 The Seventh Crusade (Accomplished nothing.)

In 1291, the fall of Acre marked the end of the s in the Holy Land by Europe.

Now it is understandable why the Crusades are almost universally soundly criticized whenever they are spoken of. Atheist enlightenment thinkers regarded the Crusades as,

---

the product of a fanatical and quaintly superstitious age. Intellectuals looked on crusades with a mixture of sorrow and contempt. For Denis Diderot, the *encyclopediste*, the consequences for Europe of 'these horrible wars' were the 'depopulation of its nations, the enrichment of monasteries, the impoverishment of the nobility, the ruin of ecclesiastic discipline, contempt for agriculture, scarcity of cash and an infinity of vexations'. To David Hume they 'have ever since engaged the curiosity of mankind, as the most signal and most durable monument of human folly that has yet appeared in any age or nation'.

The Caners conclude, "The authentic Christian cannot defend the Crusades. . . " This does not mean they oppose all war with Islam. Regarding the current conflicts they write,

As we will state emphatically . . . in our opinion, the application of these [Just War] criteria qualified the wars declared by the United States in both Afghanistan and in Iraq as just, moral, and necessary military actions."

One might therefore possibly conclude that the Caners' position that the Crusades were "indefensible" has more to do with the killing of Jews in the Peasants' Crusade, the massacres of non-combatants in the First Crusade, the greed of the Fourth Crusade, and the naïveté of the Children's Crusade, than the fact that Christians needed to eventually go to war with fundamentalist, jihadist Muslims. All the crimes mentioned above are clearly inexcusable and indefensible.

Dinesh D'Souza brings some insight into the motivation of the Crusaders in his book, *What's So Great About Christianity*. He writes,

Let's begin with the Crusades, which are vividly described by James Carroll as "a set of world historical crimes" whose "trail of violence scares the earth and human memory even to this day." A Catholic, Carroll is an example of how many liberal Christians have absorbed the secular allegation that the Crusades illustrate the horrors of religion. Moreover, in fairly standard fashion, Carroll reserves his harshest language for the role of Christians in the Crusades. About the horrors perpetrated by the Muslim side, he is notably reticent. Here we have the familiar

---
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doctrine: religion is bad but Christianity is worse. But is it true? Let's remember that before the rise of Islam the region we call the Middle East was predominantly Christian... [after listing the regions conquered by Islam D' Souza references the Battle of Tours in 732] So serious was the Muslim threat that Edward Gibbon speculated that if the West had not fought back "perhaps the Koran would now be taught in the schools of Oxford, and her pulpits might demonstrate to a circumcised people the sanctity and truth of the Revelation of Mahomet." 239

D' Souza continues,

Who were the Crusaders? Historian Jonathan Riley-Smith disputes the idea that they were rapacious conquerors or murderers. Rather, he says, they were pilgrims. They were responding to Christ's call to Christians to "deny yourself and take up your cross and follow me." Many of them put their fortunes and their lives at risk. Their rulers provided nothing- the Crusaders were expected to bring their own horses, pack animals, and equipment. The proof that they were not in this for gain is that virtually all of them returned poorer than they left. Yes, there was looting and foraging on the way, but Riley-Smith says this is because the Crusaders had to make provision for their own survival. 240

Bernard Lewis, author of The Arabs in History, writes,

At the present time, the Crusades are often depicted as an early experiment in expansionist imperialism... To the people of the time, both Muslim and Christian, they were no such thing. When the Crusaders arrived in Jerusalem, barely four hundred years had passed since that city, along with the rest of the Levant and North Africa, had been wrested by the armies of Islam from their Christian rulers, and their Christian populations forcibly incorporated in a new Muslim empire. The Crusade was a delayed response to the jihad, the holy war for Islam, and its purpose was to recover by war what had been lost by war- to free the holy places of Christendom and open them once again, without impediment to Christian pilgrimage. 241

Christians did not enter into war lightly. The "Just War" criteria, developed by Augustine (354-430), Isadora of Seville (560-636), and Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), sought to give directions, then and now, for Christians and warfare. R.G. Clouse wrote,

"Augustine led the way in revising Christian attitudes toward war by formulating a series

240 Ibid.
241 Bernard Lewis, The Arabs in History (New York, Oxford University Press, 1993) pp. 163-
of rules to regulate violence and permit believers to fight for the empire." Using Augustine's ideas the Caners ask and answer a difficult question.

Exactly how could a Christian engage in a battle without violating his conscience and disobeying the admonitions of Jesus Christ to love one's enemies? The answer, according to Augustine, was in both intent and action. . . War should have as its goal the establishment of justice and the restoration of peace. . . Additionally, the conduct of believers in the military must be honorable. Looting of homes or businesses in the war zone and the killing of unarmed civilians were both prohibited in a just war. . .

Augustine's criteria for a *Just War* included:

1. A Just Cause
2. A War called by a Legitimate Authority
3. Right Intention (i.e. to establish peace)
4. Probability of Success
5. Proportionality of Violence
6. Used only as a Last Resort.

Later theologians added additional ideas, like the following:

1. There is a difference between a just war and a holy war.
2. The good consequence to be expected from going to war must outweigh the evils incurred.
3. The war must be waged in such a way that only the minimum force needed to achieve the aims of the war may be used.

Whatever one thinks or has been taught about the Crusades, it should be brought up that the European response to the brutal Islamic invasions and conquests was very slow in coming. I once heard a senior citizen describe the situation in this way, "Two brothers were sitting in the back seat of their family car while mom was driving down the road. The younger brother (Islam) kept hitting the older brother (Christianity). Finally, the older brother hits back and mom hears the disturbance and demands to know, "Who

---
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started the fight?" For centuries (i.e. 622-1094), Muhammad, Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman, Ali, the Umayyads, and now the Abbasids were all involved in the killing and subjugation of Jewish, Christian and Hindu populations. Finally, the Christians hit back and the first official Crusade was called for by Pope Urban II in 1095. This was 471 years after the Battle of Badr (624), when the first Jewish Bani Qaynuqa tribe was nearly executed, but instead expelled from their land at Yathrib/Medina by Muhammad’s orders.

The First Crusade was initiated 910 years ago and the last official Crusade was concluded 719 years ago. Yet as the Caners write, "“For many Muslims, the Crusades have never ended.” 246 Whatever, the Crusades were, they have become an emotional battle cry like, "Remember the Alamo!" "Remember Pearl Harbor!" or "Remember 9/11!" The Crusades are brought up in any conversation whenever Islam and Christianity are being debated. This happened a very long time ago. Christians do not keep bringing them up, but multiculturalists and Muslims do. Why? The reason seems fairly evident. The reference is intended to stir the emotions of Muslims, apparently with the ultimate goal to generate anger and bitterness toward Christians living today. The event begun 915 years ago can now be used to justify the modern day jihadist attack on 9/11/01, which was only nine years ago.

Several obvious points should be made about the Crusades. We can heartily condemn any atrocities inflicted by Catholic Europeans upon the Muslim world in the Middle East during these years. Second, we should also condemn atrocities inflicted by Muslims in the Middle East upon early Christians, Catholic Europeans, Jews and Hindus. This is up to and including the Crusade years. Third, no person living today had anything to do with

the Crusades. Fourth, it should be noted the United States had nothing whatsoever to do with the Crusades. The Crusades ended nearly five hundred [i.e. 485 yrs] years before the United States even became a nation. Why should Christians in the United States be asked to answer for whatever crimes happened in the Crusades? This linkage seems to be a new ruse (" A crafty stratagem; a subterfuge"	extsuperscript{247}). Jonathan Riley-Smith, in his book \textit{The Crusades}, writes about this new spin coming out of the Islamic \textit{umma} (community).

One often reads that Muslims have inherited from their medieval ancestors bitter memories of the violence of the crusaders. Nothing could be further from the truth. Muslims had hitherto not shown much interest in the crusades, on which they looked back with indifference and complacency. They believed, after all, that they had beaten the crusaders comprehensively.\textsuperscript{248}

Paul Fregosi, in his history book called \textit{Jihad}, insightfully writes about the Crusades. He observes the Crusaders' focus was only on the Holy Land, a truly small, barren, chunk of relatively worthless land on the Eastern shore of the Mediterranean, while the Muslims' desire was for world conquest. In comparison, the Christian Crusaders had minuscule aspirations while the Islamic invaders had an enormous appetite. This is never brought out when the Crusades are being discussed.

The Crusaders [1095-1291] wanted to establish themselves in the Holy land, formerly Christian. Islam's motives, through the Jihad, were far grander. The Muslims wanted to take and occupy Europe and, hopefully, to Islamize it. A large part of Europe was taken, occupied for centuries, sometimes devastated, and some of it was Islamized. Spain, Portugal, France, Italy, Sicily, Austria, Bosnia, Serbia, Croatia, Hungary, Rumania, Wallachia, Albania, Moldavia, Bulgaria, Greece, Armenia, Georgia, Poland, Ukraine, and eastern and southern Russia were all Jihad battlefields where Islam conquered or was conquered. Many of those lands were occupied by the Muslims, in some cases by Arabs and Moors, in
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others by the Ottoman Turks, usually for hundreds of years: Spain 800 years, Portugal 600 years, Greece 500 years, Sicily 300 years, Serbia 400 years, Bulgaria 500 years, Romania 400 years, and Hungary 150 years. . . By comparison, the European occupation of the Muslim countries of the Near and Middle East and of North Africa lasted less than a century and a half. . .

Presuming that both the Crusaders and Islamic invaders were wrong in what they did, then the Christian sin pales in comparison to the sin of the Islamic invaders. Fregosi finds it curious that multiculturalist of the West and Muslims are fixated on two centuries of Crusades while ignoring 1,400 years of Islamic Invasion and subordination of formerly Christian lands. However, the fact is Islam does not view their conquests as a sin. That is the thesis of this entire study and this religious worldview held true during the time of the Abbasids as well.

History has largely bypassed the Muslim attacks on and invasions of Europe that lasted from the seventh to the twentieth centuries, but has remained transfixed on the Christian Crusades to the Holy Land that lasted only from the eleventh to the thirteenth century. We could say that the historical perspective here is gravely out of focus. The spotlights have been on the less important places and the less significant events; this book is a modest endeavor to adjust the vision. This is not just an academic matter. For their perception of the Crusades- and later of colonialism - has greatly affected the attitudes and the modern political thinking of Muslims, particularly of those from the Middle East, toward the Christian West. When accusing the West of imperialism, Muslims are obsessed with the Christian Crusades but have forgotten their own, much grander Jihad.

The tragedy is not just that these realities are not taught in Islamic Madrasas but that these ideas are not even apparently being taught in most American high school Western Civilization history books and classrooms. Thus, Islam is portrayed as the victim and the imperialistic West as the aggressor.

In fact, they often denounce the Crusades as the cause and starting point of the antagonism between Christianity and Islam. They are putting the cart before the

\[250\] Ibid. p. 24.
horse. The Jihad is more than four hundred years older than the Crusades. Amin Malouf in *The Crusades through Arab Eyes* sees the sack of Jerusalem by the Crusaders in 1099 as "the starting point of a millennial hostility between Islam and the West." There is only passing mention of the Muslim capture of Jerusalem from the Christians in 638, of the invasion of Spain some seventy years later by the Arabs and Moors, or of their subsequent 800-year occupation in whole or in part of the Iberian peninsula.251

After the Ottomans had conquered a massive part of Europe and the Middle East, through near continuous war, and they had brutally subdued the people into dhimmi status, ignoring the appeals for fair treatment of their subjects by the Europeans, the Ottomans sided with Germany and Austria-Hungary in WWI. Following the loss of the war, the Ottoman Empire was broken up with the intended goal of making them independent nations. This period is called Colonialism by the Muslims and is also seen as a major crime against the Islamic world.

Colonialism, the other major cause of censure against the West . . . Simply put the Muslim East conquered much of Europe from the seventh to the nineteenth centuries, the Christian West and the Muslim East conquered and colonized each other during a large part of the nineteenth century. . . Western colonization of nearby Muslim lands lasted 130 years, from the 1830's to the 1960's. Muslim colonization of near European lands lasted 1, 300 years, from the 600's to the mid1960s. Yet strangely, it is the Muslims. . . who are most bitter about colonialism . . . and it is the Europeans who harbor the shame and the guilt. It should be the other way around.252

When the West seeks to understand the anger and bitterness of many Muslims worldwide and we ask the Muslim, "Why do you hate us?" the common response seems to be threefold: first, the Crusades, second, Colonialism and third, our support of Israel. Our support of Israel cannot be the cause for the hatred they have for us, for Israel has only existed as a nation for a little over sixty years. Fregosi is exactly correct when he says.
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The Muslim occupations of Europe have left a far deeper and more lasting trace of their former influence than any of the European occupations of Islamic North Africa and the Near and Middle East. . .

In Western Europe, Muslims today can worship in their own mosques; but in some Muslim countries, Christians are not allowed to practice their own faith or to build churches for their own worship. Judaism in some of them is even more strictly forbidden.\(^{253}\)

This author believes these are merely excuses to seek to justify a theology of aggression clearly taught in the Qur'an, the Hadith and by the imams on Friday.

Federer speaks insightfully about what to say when the Crusades are inevitably brought up in a discussion.

When an apologist for Islam brings up the subject of the Crusades, a question to ask is: "Are you condemning or defending?" Are you condemning the Crusaders who fought in the name of religion? If so, then you are also condemning Mohammed and the Caliphs, who fought in the name of religion. Or are you defending Mohammed and Caliphs who fought in the name of religion by saying some Christians did it too? Either way, the spreading of religion by force is contrary to Jesus' example, but not contrary to Mohammed's example.\(^{254}\)

**The Invasions of India**

The Abbasids also contributed to the massacres of India. As mention earlier, Durant summarizes the accumulative effect, "The Mohammedan conquest of India is probably the bloodiest story in history."\(^{255}\) Umar, Uthman, and Ali all sent their armies to rob and pillage India; this continued for centuries, up to and through the Abbasid period. Durant notes the people of India had made themselves more vulnerable because of the religions they chose to embrace.

The Hindus had allowed their strength to be wasted away in internal division and war. They had adopted religions like Buddhism and Jainism, which unnerved them for the tasks of life they had failed to organize their forces for the protection
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of their frontiers and their capitals, their wealth and their freedom, from the hordes of ... Turks hovering about India's boundaries and waiting for national weakness to let them in. For four hundred years (600-1000 A.D.), India invited conquest and at last it came.  

We, in the United States, should realize that ideological and religious division also weakens our ability to resist Islam. We need our Judeo-Christian foundation to repel multiculturalism and the eventual Islamization of the United States.

The Ghaznavid dynasty (963-1187) ruled under the Abbasid Caliphate (750-1258). The Ghaznavids were brutal and savage to the Hindus in India. Durant gives us some chilling details into one of the Ghaznavid rulers, a man named Mahmud of Ghazni (997-1030).

In the year 997 a Turkish chief by the name of Mahmud became sultan of the little state of Ghazni, in eastern Afghanistan. Mahmud knew that his throne was young and poor, and saw that India, across the border, was old and rich; the conclusion was obvious. Pretending a holy zeal for destroying Hindu idolatry, he swept across the frontier with a force inspired by a pious aspiration for booty. He met the unprepared Hindus at Bhimnagar, slaughtered them, pillaged their cities, destroyed their temples, and carried away the accumulated treasures of centuries. Each winter Mahmud descended into India, filled his treasure chest with spoils, and amused his men with full freedom to pillage and kill; each spring he returned to his capital richer than before. At Mathura ... he expressed his admiration for the architecture of the great shrine, judged that its duplication would cost one hundred million dinars and the labor of two hundred years, and then ordered it to be soaked with naphtha and burnt to the ground. Six years later he sacked another opulent city of northern India, Somnath, killed all its fifty thousand inhabitants, and dragged its wealth to Ghazni. In the end he became, perhaps, the richest king that history has ever known. Sometimes he spared the population of the ravaged cities, and took them home to be sold as slaves; but so great was the number of such captives that after some years no one could be found to offer more than a few shillings for a slave. Before every important engagement Mahmud knelt in prayer, and asked the blessing of God [Allah] upon his arms. He reigned for a third of a century; and when he died, full of years and honors, Moslem historians ranked him as the greatest monarch of his time, and one of the greatest [Islamic] sovereigns of any age.  
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Vincent A. Smith, author of *The Oxford History of INDIA*, says that sultans like Mahmud were not uncommon but were prevalent at this time.

Sultan Mahmud . . . was a zealous Muslim of the ferocious type then prevalent, who felt it to be a duty as well as a pleasure to slay idolaters. He was also greedy of treasure and took good care to derive a handsome profit from his holy wars. Historians are not clear concerning either the exact number or the dates of his raids. The computation of Sir Henry Elliot that Mahmud made seventeen expeditions may be accepted. Whenever possible he made one each year.  

Smith continues describing Mahmud's annual cycle of massacring Hindus.

It was the custom of the Sultan [Mahmud [997] ] to quit his capital early in October and utilize the cold weather for his operations. Three months of steady marching brought him into the heart of the rich . . . provinces and by the time he had slain his tens of thousands and collected millions of treasure he was ready at the beginning of the hot season to go home and enjoy himself. He carried off crowds of prisoners as slaves, including no doubt skilled masons and other artisans whom he employed to beautify his capital.  

Stearns gives additional information about Mahmud and the scars Islamic invasions have caused in the psyche of the Hindus in India.

Mahmud's raids and those of his successors became a lasting source of enmity between Hindus and Muslims in South Asia. After capturing and looting a rich Hindu temple in 1008, he became obsessed with the promise of treasure and the chance to strike a blow at the infidel Hindu faith, which the great temple complexes provided. His most spectacular raid was directed in 1024 at the massive Somanth temple in Gujarat. The temple was served by more than 1,000 Hindu priests and hundreds of temple dancers and singers, supported by 10,000 villages, and defended by nearly 50,000 warriors. Its capture marked the high point of Mahmud's career as general and religious zealot. After stripping the captured shrine of its legendary jewels and golden decorations, Mahmud ordered his followers to smash its idols and destroy the intricate complex of shrines and passageways that housed them. The main
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idol of the temple was cut into many pieces, and the parts were placed in the floors and stairways at the entrances to Muslim mosques, where the faithful would regularly trod on them when going to prayer. 

The Ghurid Sultanate violently brings the Gaznavid dynasty to an end in 1187. They had been battling with each other since 1149; thus again demonstrating the brutality of Islam vs. Islam violence during the Abbasid Caliphate. Muhammad Ghori was the governor and general of a large city (variously spelled Ghazna or Ghazni) from 1173-1192. The story of the fall of the Gaznavid dynasty and the rise of the Ghori Empire is a see-saw, back and forth contest for the cities of Ghazna and Lahore. The conflict began in 1149 when the Ghaznavids captured and killed Sayf ud-Dīn Ṣūrī of Ghor. Retaliation follows back and forth until the capture of Lahore and, like so many other Islamic dynasties before them, the Gaznavid dynasty comes to an end by the sword. The Ghurid Sultanate then invades India where he meets India's Prithvi Raj Chauhan's(1149-1192) army on the plain of Tarain, approximately 100 miles north of New Delhi.

Prithvi Raj defeated the Afghan ruler Muhammad Ghori in the First Battle of Tarain in 1191 CE. Ghori attacked for a second time the next year, and Prithvi Raj was defeated and slain at the Second Battle of Tarain in 1192 CE. After his defeat, India was open to invasion by Muslim invaders, and Delhi came under the control of the Muslim rulers. 

Based on the history we have just been reviewing, it is worth noting that this invasion still plays a role in the psyche of the Islamic Pakistan and Hindu India. That is why "On April 6, 1998, Pakistan named their missile, capable of carrying nuclear warheads, the Ghauri [ Ghori ].. It was symbolically named after Muhammad Ghori, who is highly
revered in Pakistan for invading and decimating India. "If India was not troubled enough about one nuclear missile pointed at them from an ancient invading Islamic enemy, Pakistan has since developed the Ghauri [Ghori] II and Ghauri [Ghori] III as well." 263

Both nations know the history of Muhammad Ghori, the 1192 invasion and conquest of India, and so should we. Upon Ghor's death, his most capable general, Qutb-ud-din Aybak, took control of Muhammad Ghor's Indian conquests and declared himself the first Sultan of Delhi. 264 More about this individual will be presented in the next chapter.

Again, Durant wants us in the U.S.A. to learn from the history of the suffering of India at the hands of the Muslims.

This is the secret of the political history of modern India. Weakened by division, it succumbed to invaders; impoverished by invaders, it lost all power of resistance, and took refuge in supernatural consolations; it argued that both mastery and slavery were superficial delusions, and concluded that freedom of the body or the nation was hardly worth defending in so brief a life. The bitter lesson that may be drawn from this tragedy is that eternal vigilance is the price of civilization. A nation must love peace, but keep its powder dry. 265

\[ \text{"Those who live by the sword will die by the sword"} \]

Those are, of course, the words of Jesus (Matt. 26:52) indicating that violence begets violence and the Abbasid Caliphate ends with it being mercilessly slaughtered by the Mongols in 1258. Arthur Goldschmidt gives this graphic account of the destruction of Baghdad, Iraq.

The Mongols pillaged the city, burned its schools and libraries, destroyed its mosques and palaces, murdered possibly a million Muslims (the Christians and Jews were spared), and finally executed the whole Abbasid family wrapping them in carpets and trampling them beneath their horses' hooves. Until the stench of
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the dead forced Hulegu and his men from Baghdad, they loaded their horses, packed the scabbards of their discarded swords, and even stuffed some gutted corpses with gold, pearls, and precious stones to be hauled back to the Mongol capital. It was a melancholy end to the independent Abbasid caliphate, to the prosperity and intellectual glory of Baghdad, and for some histories, to Arabic civilization itself.  

Stearns summarizes the last days as well,

In the early decades of the 13th century, a new threat arose at the eastern extremities of the original Abbasid domains. Another central Asian nomadic people, the Mongols, united by their great war commander, Chinggis Khan, first raided in the 1220s and then smashed the Turko-Persian kingdoms that had developed in the regions to the east of Baghdad. Chinggis Khan died before the heartlands of the Muslim world were invaded, but his grandson, Hulegu, renewed the Mongol assault on the rich centers of Islamic civilization in the 1250s. In 1258, the Abbasid capital at Baghdad was taken by the Mongols and much of it was sacked. The thirty-seventh and last Abbasid caliph was put to death by the Mongols, who continued westward until they were finally defeated by the Mamluks, or Turkic slaves, who then ruled Egypt. Baghdad never recovered from the Mongol depredations…

As Abu al-Abbas had wrapped up the last Umayyads in rugs after being beaten to death, so the last of the Abbasids received similar treatment. This was quite a shock to the psyche of the Muslims of the day. Why had Allah allowed this? Muslims operate with the presumption that God is on their side. Ron Geaves and Theodore Gabriel describe this Islamic mindset as the doctrine of Manifest Success. Muslims have historically responded to political or social crisis or invasion by non-Muslims forces, through religious revival. This reaction is built into the doctrine of 'Manifest Success' a theological position advocated in the Qur'an which links external success with the notion of being God's people. Early Muslims success, linked to the dramatic expansion of the Arab tribes out of Arabia. . . confirmed this special relationship with God. . . However, major setbacks such as the Mongol invasion in 1258. . . were to seriously challenge the Muslim religious psyche. . . The response to the political failure and cultural...
decline in a 'Manifest Success' theology can only be religious revival. To a mentality, confident throughout history, that they would inherit the earth as God's last people, the only reason for failure had to be a lack of faith and commitment to God's revelation. Thus, one response was to return to the ways of God as written in the Quran and the Sunna of the Prophet.\textsuperscript{268}

Geaves and Gabriel said the same thing happened in the colonial period when Europe was in North Africa and the Middle East. Not everyone felt this was Allah's judgment. Some felt it was because they had technologically fallen behind Europe. Those who felt this way argued that the Islamic world should,

...learn from the successes of the Europeans and establish their education, legal and political systems; a pragmatic solution that could lead to Islam becoming a private religion but losing its prominence in public institutions as had happened to Christianity in the West. These two responses [a return to the fundamentals or a leap into the modern age], as will be seen, provided the possibility of a serious clash of opinion, dividing the Muslim world into those who sought solutions through seeking rapprochements with Western political and cultural institutions, creatively borrowing in order to progress their own societies and those who saw this as a continuation of the failure to live by the tenets of Islam and thus doomed to failure in regard to any renaissance of Muslim life.\textsuperscript{269}

The importance of understanding this debate within the Islamic world is critical to understanding the tensions between the \textit{fundamentalist} and those we like to call \textit{moderate} Muslims. Bernard Lewis develops this theme, giving critically important analysis that any student of Islam should be aware of.

At the present time two competing diagnoses of the ills of the region are on offer, each with its own appropriate prescription for a cure, According to the one, the trouble is all due to infidels and their local dupes and imitators, and the aping of infidel ways. The remedy is a resumption of the millennial struggle against the infidel adversary in the West, and a return to authenticity, to their own God-given laws and traditions which they have foolishly and sinfully abandoned. According to the other, it is the old ways, now degenerate and corrupt, that are crippling them. The remedy is openness and freedom in the economy, the society, and the state-in a word, democracy. Both kinds of regime, liberal democracy and Islamic
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theocracy, are represented in the region and elsewhere. Both have their passionate proponents and opponents. The future place of the Arabs in history will depend, in no small measure, on the outcome of the struggle between them.  

With the destruction of Baghdad, the Empire inevitably began to break up. Braswell calls this period between 1258-1517 *The Fragmentation of Islamic Lands*.  

While Arthur Goldschmidt, describes this period as "one damn dynasty after another." This perhaps demonstrates his frustration at attempting to teach these dynasties to students who may not be as interested to learn of them as himself.

Discussion Questions

1. Would you describe the Abbasid age as a "Golden Age"?

2. How is Andalusia used by multiculturalists and Muslims today?

3. Was the period of Abbasid dominance (750-1258) a period of peace or an example of Islam being a peaceful religion?

4. Lewis compares the Abbasid period to what two other revolutions? What is the problem with this?

5. How did Fregosi describe the initial take over by the Abbasids?

6. Is it accurate to describe the Golden Age as a time of Islamic harmony ...  
   a. with fellow Muslims?  
   b. with Jews and Christians in Andalusia?

7. What did Ye'or discover about the treatment of those in Toledo, Spain in particular and dhimmis in general in Spain during the Andalusian period?

8. What did the Andalusian do every year or sometimes twice a year?

9. Muhammad made several scientific and medical claims. List several of them and how reliable they sound.

10. What did Lapin discover about the sciences?

---
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11. What did Vazsonyi observe?

12. What was the original source of Abbasid technology?


14. How have works of art been lost to the world because of fundamentalist Islam?

15. Crusades:
   a. What were the Crusades?
   b. What provocative behavior had been going on for centuries?
   c. What were the motivations or goals for those who called for them?
   d. How were they originally viewed by Muslims?
   e. How are they viewed today by Muslims? Why?
   f. When Muslims and Multiculturalists bring up the Crusades what do they always fail to bring up?
   g. Federer wants us to ask what question to apologists of Islam when they bring up the crusades? Explain why?
   h. What were some of Augustine’s criteria for war?

16. Who was Mahmud of Ghazni and what was his policy towards India?

17. What is the Ghori I, II, III and what was Ghori’s history?

18. How does Matthew 26:52 relate to the Abbasids?

19. What did Geaves and Gabriel say about the Islamic doctrine of Manifest Success. What challenges that doctrine and what is the typical result?

20. Lewis accurately described the current debate between moderate and fundamentalist Muslims. What is the issue and the solution disagreement?

21. What lesson(s) does Durante want the United States to take away from the Abbasid period? (e.g. Andalusia? India’s experience? etc?)
CHAPTER 8 THE FRAGMENTATION OF ISLAMIC LANDS (1258-1517)

With the massacre at Baghdad in 1258, at the hands of Hulegu, the Mongolian, the period of the Abbasid Caliphate comes to a violent end. From the perspective of a Kaffir, what arises from the ashes of the Abbasid Caliphate is more ashes and suffering as Islamic dynasty after Islamic dynasty rises, robs, oppresses and falls in their attempts to conquer the world during this next historic period of Islamic fragmentation. Braswell describes this two and one half century period as, "A succession of caliphates and dynasties [that] swept across the Muslim-dominated territories in the years from 1258-1517." In general, it is accurate to say most of the Islamic world will now be divided between the Mongolian Empires and the Turkic generated Empires, with the brutal Islamic Timur having a foot in each camp as a Mongolian with Turkic ties. The Mongols were originally enemies to Islam, but in a relatively short time, embraced it. As has happened elsewhere in the world, around 1242, the Chagatai Khanate was on the verge of becoming Islamic due to gradual infiltration and immigration. The Golden Horde became

---

273 Just a reminder that this chapter, like the one that preceded it, and the chapter that follows is full of historical details. It is more important to remember the time periods and a few specific examples rather than to attempt to memorize all the individual dates and details. This is just an introduction to the period. More importantly look at the mood of the period and examine how Islam dealt with fellow Muslims and with non-Muslims to help determine whether Islam was or is presently a peaceful religion.
Islamic in 1255 when Burke, Hulegu's cousin, took the leadership of that Khanate.

Within 40 years, Hulegu's Il-Khanate will itself become Islamic. One group of scholars identifies the major groups of Mongolians during this period as follows:277

...the Chagatai Khanate in Central Asia, the Golden Horde in southern Russia, the Il-Khanate in Persia and Iraq, and the Timurid [Mongolian/Turkic] Empire, which, under the leadership of Timur (known in English as Tamerlane), eclipsed all three of the preceding Mongol empires.278

These four Mongolian empires will develop alongside three other primarily Turkic empires: the Mamluks of Egypt and the Middle East, the Seljuks of Turkey, and the Delhi Sultanate of India, subdued primarily by Turkic peoples. Timur, not satisfied with Mongolian conquest, turned his eye toward India and robbed and massacred there as well. This chapter will focus on the above empires as well as a brief discussion of the Black Death, 1346-1350, the fall of

277 Memorizing the locations of the six groups and their lands locations will make this section reading much more intelligible.
Constantinople in 1453, and the Islamic expulsion from Andalusia, Spain and its impact on Columbus in 1492.

**The Mongolians**

For most, the place to begin our study of the Mongolian conquest of the Abbasid Caliphate is to discover where Mongolia is on the map (cf. below). Today, Mongolia remains a much smaller nation than during its empire building stage, but it is still the eighteen largest nation in the world situated between Russia to the North and China to the south.

Next, it is helpful to learn a little bit of its founder and its topography, climate and culture. The founder of the Mongolian empire was Genghis Khan (1162–1227). He is the individual who forged the nomadic peoples of Mongolia into a horse riding, arrow shooting, blitzkrieg conquering, Abbasid stomping army. In 1988, the University of Calgary Applied History Research Group put together a concise intelligible tutorial on The Islamic World to 1600.

The university group did a great job making the Mongolian Empire understandable to the non-specialist. A great deal of what follows, regarding the Mongolian empires, is an attempt to summarize their work even further while maintaining the integrity of their insights.\textsuperscript{280}

Genghis Khan is a title he was given in 1206, when he was forty-four years old, which means "Oceanic Ruler," or "Fierce Ruler." His name at birth was Timujin. His father was murdered when he was nine years old; he was raised by his mother. Like all Mongol youth, he was taught how to ride, shoot a bow and arrow, and care for his horse. Even as a young man, Timujin was charismatic; other youths were drawn to follow him because of his daring and courage. However, he showed he could be ruthless when it was to his advantage. "In fact, he even betrayed and killed blood brothers such as his childhood friend, Jamukha, and the Ong Khan of the Kereyid tribes."\textsuperscript{281} By 1206, he had eliminated all competition and became the undisputed leader of the Mongolian world. As Genghis Khan's army conquered city after city, he used a similar strategy in his conquests.

Typically, he would send envoys to an opponent demanding their submission. If they acquiesced, he usually allowed their rulers to remain in power, so long as they paid taxes, furnished labor, and provided military service. If an opponent remained defiant, he attacked. In 1219, he moved west with around 200,000 troops to confront the Khwarazmian shah of Central Asia.\textsuperscript{282}

Elsewhere, we learn what precipitated Genghis Khan's first major attacks on an Islamic shah.

\textsuperscript{280} I suggest that if you want to read more about a particular empire or need clarification that you go to http://www.ucalgary.ca/applied_history/tutor/islam/index2.html. The site is easy to maneuver through.
\textsuperscript{281} http://www.ucalgary.ca/applied_history/tutor/oldwrld/armies/khan.html (accessed Aug. 3, 2009)
In 1218 Genghis Khan sent some emissaries to the Khwarezmian shah. The Shah executed the Mongol diplomats in defiance of the emerging great power, and Genghis retaliated with a force of 200,000 troops. The Shah fled and sought refuge throughout Khorasan, and eventually died on an island on the Caspian Sea. By 1220 the Muslim state was eradicated and the Khwarezmians, like many other Turkic tribes, were forced to flee westward.  

There are at least four similarities between the Mongolian method of conquest and that of the Muslims. First, the founder of the Mongolian empire, Genghis Khan, and the self proclaimed Prophet of the Islamic world, Muhammad, were both capable but ruthless men willing to be extremely brutal to accomplish their goals. These men were very much unlike the Jesus of the Russian Orthodox Church to the north. Second, at the time of Mongolian conquests the leadership of the different cities that acquiesced were generally permitted to remain in power. Likewise, the Muslims granted the cities who accepted dhimmitude status without a battle more benefits than those who were forced into Islam (i.e. into submission) by force of arms. Third, Genghis Khan, as a part of the Shamanist religion, believed in one god with many different spirits. Genghis sought to acquire the, "protection and advice" and blessing of these spirits during his violent conquest of neighboring nations, just as Muhammad relied on the blessing of Allah during his jihads in spreading Islam. Muslims could be assured of Allah's blessings in holy war because of the multiple places in the Qur'an that call for and demand jihad.

- "Slay them wherever you find them...Idolatry is worse than carnage...Fight against them until idolatry is no more and God's religion [Islam] reigns supreme." (Surah 2:190)
- "Fighting is obligatory for you, much as you dislike it." (Surah 2:216)

---

• "If you should die or be slain in the cause of God, His forgiveness and His mercy would surely be better than all the riches..." (Surah 3:156)
• "Seek out your enemies relentlessly." (Surah 4:103)
• "Believers, when you encounter the infidels on the march, do not turn your backs to them in flight. If anyone on that day turns his back to them, except it be for tactical reasons...he shall incur the wrath of God and Hell shall be his home..." (Surah 8:12)
• "Make war on them until idolatry shall cease and God's religion shall reign supreme." (Surah 8:36)

Fourth, the demand for taxes by the Mongolians would match the demand for jizya or protection monies from the infidels by the Muslim jihadists. “When the sacred months are over slay the idolaters [kaffirs] wherever you find them. Arrest them, besiege them, and lie in ambush everywhere for them. If they repent and take to prayer and pay the alms-tax, let them go their way. Allah is forgiving and merciful.” (Surah 9:5)

All these violent Islamic practices of jihad would have been familiar to the violent Mongolians practices. This could, at least partially, explain why the Mongolians were so willing to quickly embrace the Islamic religion. Those of us in the West who come from a Judeo-Christian background have a hard time truly believing that this kind of religiously motivated violence really exists.

The Chagatai Khanate

Genghis Khan had four sons [cf. chart below], from oldest to youngest, their names were Jochi, Chagatai, Ogodei, Tolui.

It was the custom... that the eldest son, on reaching manhood, was given a wife and his share of the future inheritance; he then moved away and set up his own camp, independent but still allied to his family. The other brothers followed in due order, but each one nearer to the "home camp" than his next older brother. The youngest, as "guardian of the hearth and fire," remained with his parents until their death and received the residual heritage. 285

These rules of inheritance were followed by all the Mongolian dynasties. Family relationships bonded the dynasties together, but as we will see they did not always prevent civil war even between brothers, cousins and uncles as Islam entered the Mongolian culture. We should take note of this as well. The interfaith struggle is sparked when Tolui’s son, Mongke, becomes the Great Khan and sends his brother Hulagu to destroy the Abbasid Caliphate in 1258. This will cause a civil war between he and his cousin Berke, who has, by this time, converted to Islam. But within forty years, by 1295, Hulagu, destroyer of Baghdad, Iraq and the Abbasid Caliphate, will have his own lands, called the Il-Khanate; being ruled by an opportunistic grandson who converted to Islam.

When Genghis Khan died in 1227, Jochi had already passed away and Ogodei, the third oldest son, was made the Great Khan. Chagatai was given a smaller area in Central Asia to rule, which he did until his death in 1242. Chagatai’s Khanate (yellow) had already been infiltrated by Islam and was on the verge of becoming Islamic. The cities of
Bukhara and Samarkand had become a dispersion point of spreading Islamic doctrine and practice. A number of Turkish nomads had already converted to Islam and eventually a number of Mongol rulers had become Islamic as well. By 1326 when the Islamic Mongol leader named Tarmashirin took the throne, the Chagatai Khanate officially became a Muslim state. Subsequently, all Khans after him were Muslim. "With the conversion of the Chagatai Khanate, all three western Mongol empires, including the Golden Horde and the Il-Khanate . . . were Islamic."  

The Golden Horde (cf. map, orange) "The Golden Encampment" of Batu

Nearly a decade after Ogodei, Genghis Khan's son, became the Great Khan in 1227, he sent his nephew, Batu, to expand his khanate by invading Russia. Undaunted by the great distances, Batu complied and between 1236-1240 he had successfully invaded a number of Russian cities including Moscow and Kiev, and Batu did not stop there. By 1241, his horde had reached Poland and Hungary with plans on attacking Croatia. Before the attack could commence, Batu received a report the Great Khan Ogodei died and there was a succession fight going on among several contenders for the position, including his cousin, Mongke. Batu pulled the horde back to the steppe region north of the Black Sea, the home of the Islamic Volga Bulgars. Not until 1251 did Mongke prevail as the Great Khan. At that time, Batu was rewarded by his cousin Mongke for his loyalty and was given his own empire to enjoy. Batu called his empire the Golden Horde (i.e. the golden encampment). Batu built his capital on the Volga River and named it Sarai [note star].

---

Batu was a shamanist and remained so until his death. Eventually the leadership of the Golden Horde passed to his brother Berke, in 1255. Berke was the Golden Horde's first Muslim ruler and he became so three years before his cousin Hulegu, leader of the Il-Khan army, massacred Baghdad in 1258.

For Hulegu, who was a shamanist with Buddhist sympathies, the sacking of Baghdad was just another military conquest, but the Muslim Berke, watching from Sarai, was appalled. The resulting animosity between the two leaders led to several wars, the first to pit Mongol armies against each other. So intense was the rivalry that Berke reportedly ordered the troops he had loaned to Hulegu's army years earlier to defect to the Egyptian Mamluk army following the sack of Baghdad. The Mamluks then won a decisive victory over Hulegu in 1260. Additionally, Berke concluded a peace treaty with the Mamluks in 1261, in order for the two groups to ally themselves against Hulegu. It was the first alliance between a Mongol and non-Mongol state in which both parties were equal... Berke died in 1267, only a year after Hulegu, and the feud between the Golden Horde and the Il-Khans died down. Berke's immediate successors were not Muslim, and thus they were not as hostile to Hulegu's successors, who also were not Muslim. . . . By the end of the 13th century, Turkish had virtually replaced Mongol as the language of administration, and in 1313, with the ascension of a Muslim, Ozbeg, to the Khanate, Islam became the official religion of the Golden Horde.

The Golden Horde, officially becoming Islamic would, in the future, would put them onto a collision course with the more powerful Russians, who were theologically Christian Russian Orthodox. The Ottomans and the Russians would fight a number of wars with each other in the next historic period.

---

289 “Batu was a shamanist, like most Mongols at this time, which meant that he acknowledged the existence of one God, but he also viewed the sun, moon, earth, and water as higher beings.”


The Il-Khanate (cf. map, yellow) "The Subordinate Khanate" of Hulegu

The destroyers of Baghdad did so knowing that Chagatai (purple) and the Golden Horde (orange) had already embraced Islam. "[T]he Great Khan [Mongke] disliked the fact that his new Muslim subjects worshipped a man - the [Islamic] caliph [Musta'sim of Baghdad] - that they deemed [him] to be in a higher position than the Great Khan." 292

Thus, the destruction of the Abbasid kingdom in 1258 was partially motivated by a conflict of egos between the Great Khan Mongke and the caliph of Baghdad, Musta'sim.

Mongke decided to send his brother, Hulegu, into Iraq at the head of the invading Mongol army, with the goal of sacking Baghdad and destroying the Abbasid caliphate there. Hulegu set out in 1253, and en route he encountered the Muslim group known as the Assassins, an Ismaili sect that practised an extreme version of Shi'ism. . . . The Mongols easily destroyed the small Assassins force, . . . . Great Khan Mongke had instructed Hulegu to attack the Abbasid caliphate only if it refused to surrender to the Mongols. The Abbasids, led by the caliph, Musta'sim, indeed refused to surrender, making a battle inevitable. 293

The Abbasids were weakened from within and without. From within, they had the age old Sunni-Shi'ite division over who was the rightful caliph to lead Islam. The Shi'ites insisted they were to be blood relatives of Muhammad. Consequently, the Shi'ites actually supported the Mongols seeing them as potential liberators from the Sunnis in Baghdad. In fact, the caliph's vizier, the leader of the Baghdad forces, was himself a Shi'ite making some question whether or not his heart was in the fight. From without, the Mongols had the support of many Christians who rejected their dhimmi status in Baghdad. "Indeed, in return for Christian support, the Mongols - some of whom were
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Nestorian Christians themselves - spared Christian churches and communities from their pillaging. The Great Khan Mongke died August 11, 1259, setting up another succession fight between Hulegu's two brothers, Kublai and Arik-Boke. The differences in religion and politics led Hulegu and Berke to support different sides in the succession conflict. Hulegu was for Kublai and Berke for Arik-Boke. With Hulegu distracted, and perhaps at the encouraging of Berke, the Mamluks of Egypt used this as an occasion to expand their empire.

One reason for the Mamluk success was their status as professional soldiers. The Mamluk state featured very little cultural, intellectual, or administrative development; its existence was devoted solely to military training, and thus the quality of the Mamluk army easily matched that of the powerful Mongols. A second reason that has been suggested for the Mamluks' success is the fact that the Mamluks had been using horseshoes for their horses since about 1244. The Mongols did not use horseshoes, and the rocky terrain of Syria reportedly injured the Mongol horses' hooves to the extent that they were unable to fight effectively. Additionally, the Mamluks realized that grasslands were needed to pasture the Mongols' horses. Therefore, the Mamluks often burned grasslands in Syria in their wake, to prevent the Mongol horses from grazing.

Kublai Khan was the ultimate victor in the civil war, and in 1260, he became the Great Khan of the Mongolians. Just as the former Great Khan Mongke had rewarded Batu for his loyalty in the earlier succession conflict with the empire called the Golden Horde (orange) Khanate, Kublai will rewarded Hulegu with his own khanate as well (yellow). Out of respect and appreciation for this gift, Hulegu named his empire the

---

Nestorian, "theological doctrine, declared heretical in 431, that within Jesus are two distinct persons.


Il-Khanate, or "subordinate Khanate," as a sign of his allegiance to Kublai and the greater Mongol Empire. However, this did not stop the feuding.

By 1263, [the angry Islamic] Berke had negotiated an alliance between the Golden Horde (orange) and almost all other states surrounding Hulegu's Il-Khanate: the Mamluks in Egypt (red), the Byzantines in Constantinople, and even the Italian city-state of Genoa, which provided a much needed naval link between the Golden Horde and Mamluk Egypt. [Berke's] Golden Horde was soon fighting a full-scale war with [Hulegu's] Il-Khanate, which continued after the deaths of Hulegu in 1265 and Berke in 1266. 297

Abaqa, Hulegu's son, a Buddhist, continued the fight against the Muslims within his Il-Khanate empire, promoting Christians over Muslims to positions of leadership. But his favored religion was Buddhism, and he and his son Arghun oversaw the construction of Buddhist temples throughout Persia and Iraq. These temples were all subsequently converted into mosques when Arghun's son, Ghazan, converted to Islam.

Ghazan annexed power from [a competitor named] Baidu in 1295 with the help of the prominent Muslim Mongol Amir . . . who persuaded Ghazan to convert to Shi'a Islam, as a condition for the latter's military support in toppling Baidu. When he converted, Ghazan changed his first name to the Arab name Mahmud, and Islam gained popularity within Mongol territories. However, various sources stated that even with Ghazan's conversion to Islam, he still practiced Mongol Shamanism at large and worshipped Tengri. Because he honored his ancestors' worship of heaven as a kind of proto-Islamic monotheism. The Yassa code remained in place and Mongol Shamans were allowed to remain in the Ilkhanate. The shamans remained politically influential throughout the reign of both Ghazan and Oljeitu, but ancient Mongol traditions eventually went into decline after the demise of Oljeitu. 298

The tensions between the Golden Horde (orange) and the Il-Khan (yellow) were greatly reduced now that both were Islamic empires. But it was payback time. Ghazan imposed a choice on all the Buddhist monks and priests. They had to choose to either embrace Islam or flee to the Buddhist lands of India, Tibet or China. Before Ghazan's death in 1304, he changed the legal system from Mongolian law to Sharia law, just as many
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Muslims want to do in countries around the world today. Also like Muslims tend to do when the enemy from without is defeated, Oljeitu, Ghazan's brother, turned his focus inward and renewed the struggle between the Shi’ites and the Sunnis. Oljeitu was a Shi’ite who began oppressing the Sunni majority in his realm earning him the contempt of the Sunni Mamluks in Egypt. This would have led to war between the two Islamic empires but Oljeitu died in 1316 and his son, Abu Said, conveniently embraced Sunnism. Abu Said was,

...the first Mongol to have an Islamic name since birth. He restored Sunnism as the state religion of the Il-Khanate and made peace with the Mamluks. Peace to the west did not mean peace to the north, . . . Abu Said thus found himself involved in a . . . conflict with the Golden Horde over the territory of the Caucasus Mountains. Abu Said died in 1335 while at war with the Golden Horde, and his death marked the beginning of the Il-Khanate's decline and eventual collapse. A series of succession struggles after 1335 weakened the empire, as did the loss of soldiers and civilians to the Black Death, which had been ravaging Persia. . . . When Timur invaded from Central Asia in 1393, the Il-Khanate was swallowed up into his rapidly expanding empire. 299
The Timurid Empire

A Muslim named Timur (i.e. iron) lived between 1336-1405 (69 years) one of the most evil despots of all time. Timur got his nick-name "Timur the Lame" when,

An arrow wound suffered in his youth sufficiently injured his leg as to earn him the name Timur-i-Lenk in Persian, or Timur the Lame. In English that name later became corrupted into "Tamerlane." . . . He was born in 1336 in Samarkand, in the Chagatai Khanate, and by the late 14th century he had established an empire that rivaled Genghis Khan's in terms of its size, and the destruction it wreaked on its invaded territories throughout Asia. 301

All three of the previous Mongolian empires were beginning to collapse by the end of the 14th century. Timur felt the time was right for him to reunite them under his control.

Although he was of Mongol descent, Timur was really more Turkish than Mongol, in his language and religion. . . He was a Muslim, but that did not prevent him from attacking other Muslim empires, including the small principalities that had succeeded the Il-Khanate in Persia, the remnants of the Golden Horde, the newly formed Ottoman Empire in Asia Minor, and the Delhi Sultanate in India. Unlike his Mongol ancestors, however, Timur never established an administration for his vast empire. He spent his time planning and carrying out attacks, but following the inevitable victory he would often withdraw to Samarkand, his capital, rather than setting up the bureaucracy necessary to administer the newly acquired territory. . . 302
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First, Timur set out to become the ruler of his own Chagatai Khanate, which he accomplished in the 1360s. Always looking for more places to pillage, by 1385 he had subdued the Il-Khanate and by 1391, had absorbed the Golden Horde as well. Not satisfied with this, he set his sights on northern India and the Islamic Delhi Sultanate, which will be dealt with more fully later in this chapter.

As we have read in the previous chapter, Islam initially came to India with the jihadiist armies of Umar (644), Uthman (654) and Ali (660). There would be periodic raids for the next three hundred years. Eventually these raids turned into colonization and more systematic conquests by the Ghaznavids (975-1187) The First Islamic State in India followed by the Gurids [Ghorids] (1148-1215) The Second Islamic State of India. These were followed by the Delhi Sultanate (1206-1526). Throughout these historic periods Islam is confined primarily to the northwest corner of India, or since 1947, Pakistan, particularly the Sindh, Punjab and Delhi areas. Not until Timur's descendent Babur founded the Mughal Empire (1526-1857) does Islam really move passed Delhi to Southern India. The creation of Pakistan in 1947 was to accommodate the reality that Fundamentalist Muslims largely lived in northwest India anyhow and they did not like being ruled over by Hindus. So when a two state plan was adopted literally millions of Hindus in the Pakistan area were forced to moved south while millions of Muslims moved north and there were many clashes of civilization as the two groups passed by each other going opposite directions. One cannot understand the tensions between Pakistan and India without appreciating their history. By destroying the Islamic empires that existed before they came, the Mongols instigated a new era for the Islamic world, in which most of the region's power would fall to three great empires - the Ottoman, the Safavid, and the Mughal . . .

303 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Muslim_conquest_in_the_Indian_subcontinent (accessed Aug. 11, 2009)
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The Seljuk Turks

The Turkic people have a long history that extends from ancient Mongolia to the present. Throughout history, they have been a proud, vigorous and combative people often feared. They controlled two vast empires in the last 1,000 years, lasting for over five and a half centuries; the Seljuk Empire (1037-1194) and the Ottoman Empire (1517-1924). "Turkey is the only Turkic nation existing today." There are many "peoples of Asia and Europe who speak Turkic Languages." The Turks first appeared in history as a nomadic people from the Mongolia region of Eastern Europe. But they mingled with Europeans so that Turkish people today do not have a Mongolian appearance. The Turks first showed up in history in Chinese literature troubling the Chinese. In the fourth century, they were called the Huns, and caused terror among the Europeans for several generations. In the eighth century, they were called the Avars and were at war with Charlemagne. By the 10th Century, they were called the Seljuk Turks.

The tribal confederacy of Ghuz (or Oghuz) Turks, settled in the area that became known as Turkestan. The Seljuks, a tribe named for a 10th-century leader, became dominate among the Ghuz and by 1055 had conquered all of Persia and had been converted to Islam. In 1071 the Seljuks met the Byzantines in battle at Manzikert. the Seljuks won a victory that eventually gave them rule over most of Asia Minor. Pleas from the Byzantine [Eastern Christian]Empire to Europe for aid against the Turks resulted in the Crusades (1096-1291). For almost two centuries the Seljuks were at war intermittently with the Crusader armies.

---
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B.K. Kuiper writes of the Seljuks, that the Christians had been making pilgrimages to
the Holy Land for centuries with Arab permission, but the Seljuks would not accept that
arrangement. They were fundamentalist Muslims.

The attitude of the Arabs toward the pilgrims was much the same as that of
today’s resort owners toward tourists. To the Arabs, Christian money was just as
good as Mohammedan money. They did a very profitable business with the
pilgrims. When the Seljuk Turks took the Holy Land away from the Arabs, the
situation changed. The Turks were fanatics in religion. They hated the Christians
because they were Christians. They would have nothing to do with the pilgrims.
They did not want their money. They made it difficult for them to visit the sacred
places. Pilgrims upon their return told about their bad treatment at the hands of
the Turks. Their reports fanned into flame the resentment which had long been
smoldering in the hearts of the Christians of Western Europe.311

The Seljuk Turks were not any more immune to the rise of the Mongolians mentioned
above than the other nations in the path. "Before the Crusaders had been finally defeated,
Asia and eastern Europe were swept by the Mongol, or Tartar, invasion of Genghis Khan
and his heirs. . . All of the Turkic lands were conquered [by the Mongolians] and the last
to be absorbed was . . . in Asia Minor." 312 As the Mongol authority weakened, the
Ottomans reemerged as a force to be reckoned with for centuries. The Ottomans,
following the Qur’an, were in almost constant war, expanding their Ottoman empire into
Europe. The Ottomans eventually sided with the Central Powers: the German Empire,
the Austrian-Hungarian Empire, and the Kingdom of Bulgaria in World War I (1914-
1918). Following their defeat at the hands of the Allies, their empire was broken up by
the Allies into many of the nations we have today. The Asia Minor nation of Turkey is
the Turkic remnant of that once vast Ottoman Empire.
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312 Downey, p. T-470.
The Mamluks of Egypt (1250-1517)

The story of the Mamluks of Egypt is a story about those who had originally been bought and brought from Turkey by the Ayyubid Dynasty to serve as mercenaries. However, in time, the tables turned and the Mamluks seized power from the Ayyubids ending their dynasty and establishing their own. So, in a sense, this can be described as a rags to riches story. But that does not do justice to how truly tragic this story was. Not enough is made of how the system worked and the untold suffering that was experienced by hundreds of thousands of Christian youth and Christian families. Nor is enough made of what kind of people were involved in this kind of human trafficking. This system should be placed among the cruelest systems ever foisted on humanity. If a person knew nothing else about the religion of Islam, knowing the truth about this horrendous child slave system, accepted and practiced by Muslims for centuries, should alone convince the average person to dismiss Islam as a religion sent from the God of the Bible. So what was system? It was an organized system of kidnapping Christian youth between the ages of 8-20, depriving them of normal family relationships, forcing them to convert to Islam and training them to kill or be killed for Allah upon command. This slave system had three different stages of development. First, the Ghulam system used by the Abbasids in Baghdad (750-1258), second, the Mamluk system used by the Ayyubids in Egypt (1171-1341), and finally the Janissaries system, used by the Ottomans in Turkey (1517-1924).

The first mamluks served the Abbasid caliphs at the end of the 9th century [in] Baghdad. The Mamluk system was an evolution of a previous system, the Ghulam

---

system, invented by the Caliph al-Mu'tasim, in which Turkic prisoners of war became the caliphal guard. This system ended in disaster in the 860s with the murder of four caliphs in a row, and the Mamluk system was created on its ruins. The main difference was that the Mamluks were captured as children and then trained and molded within the Islamic world to ensure their loyalty to their masters. The Abbasids "recruited" (i.e., enslaved) them mainly from areas near the Caucasus (mainly Circassian and Georgian) in earlier periods, and in the 13th–14th centuries from areas north of the Black Sea (mainly Turkic, most of whom were Kipchak Turks). Those captured were of non-Muslim religious background. . . Mamluks lived within their garrisons and mainly spent their time with each other. 

The Ottomans continued using and developing this Christian youth slavery program.

The first Janissary units were formed from prisoners of war and slaves, probably as a result of the sultan taking his traditional one-fifth share of his army's booty in kind rather than cash. From the 1380s onwards, their ranks were filled under the devşirme system, where feudal dues were paid by service to the sultan. The "recruits" were mostly Christian youths, reminiscent of Mamelukes. Sultan Murad may have used futuwa groups as a model. Initially the recruiters favoured Greeks (who formed the largest part of the first units) and Albanians (who also served as gendarmes), usually selecting about one boy from forty houses, but the numbers could be changed to correspond with the need for soldiers. Boys aged 14-18 were preferred, though ages 8-20 could be taken. As borders of the Ottoman Empire expanded, the devşirme was extended to include Bulgarians. . .

[etc.], Janissaries trained under strict discipline with hard labour and in practically monastic conditions in . . . ("rookie" or "cadet") schools, where they were expected to remain celibate. They were also expected to convert to Islam. All did, as Christians were not allowed to bear arms in the Ottoman Empire . . . For all practical purposes, Janissaries belonged to the Sultan, carrying the title kapıkulu ("door slave") indicating their collective bond with the Sultan. Janissaries were taught to consider the corps as their home and family, and the Sultan as their father. Only those who proved strong enough earned the rank of true Janissary at the age of twenty-four or twenty-five. The regiment inherited the property of dead Janissaries, thus amassing wealth.

---

317 Devşirme or devshirme (derived from meaning "collection, gathering"); was the systematic collection of non-Muslim children and their involuntary conversion to Islam followed by their conscription as regular troops for the Ottoman Empire. http://www.reference.com/browse/wiki/Dev%C5%9Firme (accessed Aug. 12, 2009)
318 futuwa "that is, war bands or warrior societies. Some of these were just glorified bands of brigands." http://www.reference.com/browse/wiki/Futuwa (accessed Aug. 12, 2009)
Not only was it extremely cruel, but it was, at least in some cases, extremely perverse as these young boys were sexually used by some of their Islamic masters.

Muslim sultans were very fond of handsome young slaves whom they kept close to their persons as pages, service-boys, bodyguards, special troops and as gay companions. Infatuation for such slaves was a bane of the life of Muslim royalty and nobility in particular, although they considered it to be a fashion. . . . Instances of love of ghilman [i.e. youthful slave soldiers] abound in the history of medieval India and hence we need not narrate many of them or dilate upon them.\footnote{http://www.voi.org/books/mssmi/ch9.htm (accessed Aug. 11, 2009)}

But even more often was the opposite. Youth slaves were forcibly made into eunuchs.

Many if not most of the slaves were eunuchs. A Muslim king was unthinkable without his harem; a harem was inconceivable without eunuchs. Eunuchs were the guards and guardians of the harem. . . . They guarded the gates of the palace, checked and regulated ingress and egress of persons male and female. . . . There was no sphere of court and administration which was not concerned with the harem in one way or the other. Therefore thousands and thousands of eunuchs were needed to serve the Muslim king and his harem.\footnote{http://voiceofdharma.org/books/mssmi/ch9.htm (accessed Aug. 12, 2009)}

Based on the above, one can find some degree of satisfaction when the Mamluks took over Egypt from their former masters (the Ayyubid Dynasty) and created a Mamluk (i.e. slave) Dynasty in Egypt.

The last Ayyubid sultan built a powerful contingent of Turkish slaves, hoping thereby to give himself the military advantage, but upon his death in 1249 these slave troops seized power for themselves, marking the beginning of a powerful new regime based in Egypt- the Mamluks (1250-1517).\footnote{Esposito. p. 57}

The Islamic army of the Mamluks, former slaves and mercenaries, ended the dynasty of the Ayyubids in 1250 by overthrowing the last Ayyubid ruler, Al-Muazzam Turanshah. The Ayyubid Saladin\footnote{http://www.voi.org/books/mssmi/ch9.htm (accessed Aug. 11, 2009)} had themselves come to power by overthrowing the dynasty of the Fatimids being ruled by the youthful al-Adid in 1171. Al-Adid was
famous for shaking hands with the Christian Crusaders agreeing to a mutual defense
treaty with Christians in Jerusalem against another Muslim, the mighty anti Crusader
warrior Nur ad-Din,324 “a mighty persecutor of the Christian name and faith.”325 The
Mamluk Turks ruled from Cairo until they, in turn, were conquered by the Ottoman
Turks in 1517. The Mamluks’ land holdings were very extensive, encompassing a
number of nations today. 326 Nevertheless, the Mamluk’s nation was quite small
compared to the Ottoman empire, which was to follow. Now as our study leaves Egypt,
we can reflect on
Islam’s bloody
past with itself.
Egypt experienced
four civil wars
among four
different Islamic
dynasties. Each
one seized power
over the Jews and
Christians, who were forced to try and live through these changes in dynasty. Egypt
experienced Muslim slaying fellow Muslim, as we see over and over again in Islamic
history. Muslims were ready willing and able to go to war against each other. They did
this then, as well as now. This calls into question the claim that Islam is a great and

peaceful religion, as put forth today. This concludes our brief review of the Mamluks of Egypt and shortly we will touch upon the Mamluk dynasty of India, the founders of the Delhi Sultanate. The Delhi Sultanate continues the genocide against the Hindus in India that had begun centuries earlier.

**The Killing Fields of India**

It is fair to ask if this section title is hyperbole or history. Is it unnecessarily inflammatory? Certainly, if it is an untrue statement, then it would be inappropriate. Let's take a look at how the phrase *killing fields* has been popularly used and then compare it to the situation in India. You can decide if it is used appropriately.

*The Killing Fields* were a number of sites in Cambodia where large numbers of people were killed and buried by the [atheistic Marxists] Khmer Rouge regime, during its rule of the country from 1975 to 1979, immediately after the end of the Vietnam War. At least 200,000 people were executed by the Khmer Rouge (while estimates of the total number of deaths resulting from Khmer Rouge policies, including disease and starvation, range from 1.4 to 2.2 million out of a population of around 7 million).  

Koenraad Elst in his *Negationism in India: Concealing the Record of Islam* writes,

> The number of victims of this [Islamic] persecution [in India] surpasses that of the Nazi crimes. The Islamic campaign to wipe out Paganism could not be equally

---

326 medievalcoins.ancients.info/Maps.htm (accessed July 31, 2009)  
thorough, but it has continued for centuries without any moral doubts arising in the minds of the persecutors and their chroniclers. The Islamic reports on the massacres of Hindus, destruction of Hindu temples, the abduction of Hindu women and forced conversions, invariably express great glee and pride. They leave no doubt that the destruction of Paganism by every means, was considered the God-ordained duty of the Moslem community.\textsuperscript{329} 

Muslims have been intimidating those who teach about Islam for centuries. For example, in 1906, a Principal of Calcutta Madrasah,\textsuperscript{330} A.F. Rudolf Hoernle Ph.D., and former Headmaster of Calcutta Madrasah, Herbert A. Stark, wrote of the "wholesale massacres" committed by the Islamic conquest and Turkic empire between 1200-1525. But then these educators excused the atrocities. They chose not to attribute the violence to, "the faith of the invaders" which clearly directs and endorses such mass homicidal behavior.\textsuperscript{331} The Qur'an directs, "Make war on them [i.e. Hindus and Buddhists, Jews and Christians, etc.] until idolatry shall cease and God's religion shall reign supreme." (Surah 8:36) Instead of blaming the massacres on the teachings of the Qur'an, Hoernle and Stark wrote that the "wholesale massacres" was due to, what they call, "the fierceness of the natural temperament of the Arab and Turki races. . . " In 1906, the "violent nature of the Arab" argument may have been acceptable to a racist population, but today most would not believe Arabs and Turkic peoples are any more fierce by nature than any other people. Hoernle and Stark were undoubtedly concerned at being perceived as attacking the Qur'an and Islam. Attaching a causal relationship between the massacres and the teachings of the Qur'an, which is clearly the most logical explanation, would get them into trouble. Their words, in context, are as follows,

\textsuperscript{329} http://voiceofdharma.org/books/negaind/cover.htm (accessed Aug. 11, 2009)  
The advent of Islam in India was co-incident with a revolting departure from previous methods of warfare. Wholesale massacres of the male population of forts and towns, such as occurred at the time of their capture by Muhammadan armies, were a feature hitherto unknown in purely Indian warfare. Yet it would be wrong to set it down altogether to the account of the faith of the invaders. It was rather due to the fierceness of the natural temperament of the Arab and Turki races who were unable to brook stubborn resistance, and were apt to be carried away beyond all bounds by savage resentment. . . 332

Koenraad Elst calls Hoernle and Stark's attitude negationism,

Negationism means the denial of historical crimes against humanity. It is not a reinterpretation of known facts, but the denial of known facts. . . [And correctly notes] Genocide is not natural to any individual or nation. The behavior of human beings is conditioned not so much by their blood or ancestry or nationality, but by their thinking. Genocide is the outcome of an ideology. "333

Vincent Smith gave several reasons for the Muslims fighting so savagely.

Their fierce fanaticism, which regarded the destruction of Non-Muslims as a service eminently pleasing to God, made them pitiless, and consequently far more terrifying than the ordinary enemies met in India. They were themselves ordinarily saved from fear by their deep conviction that a Ghazi-a slayer of an infidel- if he should happen to be killed himself, went straight to all the joys of an easily intelligible paradise, winning at the same time undying fame as a martyr. . . The enormous wealth in gold, silver, and jewels, . . . fired their imagination and offered the most splendid conceivable rewards for valor. . . "334

Elst explains to what degree the Muslims carried out their carnage.

As a contribution to research on the quantity of the Islamic crimes against humanity, we may mention Prof. K.S. Lal's estimates about the population figures in medieval India (Growth of Muslim Population in India). According to his calculations, the Indian (subcontinent) population decreased by 80 million between 1000 (conquest of Afghanistan) and 1525 (end of Delhi Sultanate). More research is needed before we can settle for a quantitatively accurate evaluation of Muslim rule in India, but at least we know for sure that the term crime against humanity is not exaggerated.335

331 Surah 2:190, 216; 4:103; 8:36; 9:12,27,37,73, 121; 278; 48:29;
332 Hoernle, A.F. Rudolph, Herbert A. Stark, History of India (Cuttack, India, Orissa Mission Press, 1906) p. 79.
333 http://voiceofdharma.org/books/negaind/ch1.htm, Negationism in India Concealing the Record of Islam Chapter 1 "Negationism in General” p. 1f. (accessed Aug. 11, 2009)
334 Smith. p. 264-265.
335 http://voiceofdharma.org/books/negaind/ch2.htm , Negationism in India Concealing the
Vincent A. Smith, author of *The Oxford History of India*, summarizes his overall impression of Islam's impact in India, and what it is like to read and write about this time period.

The annals of the sultanate of Delhi, extending over nearly three centuries and a quarter (1206-1526), are not pleasant reading. The episodes of Chingiz Khan and Timur are filled with sickening horrors, and the reigns of several sultans offer little but scenes of bloodshed, tyranny, and treachery. All the sultans without exception were convinced Muslims, and acted as such.\(^{336}\)

Based on the above, it could be convincingly argued that the phrase *killing fields* is not an exaggeration, hyperbole or unnecessarily inflammatory, but an accurate historic description. Tens of millions more died in India than died in Cambodia. The massacres did not last for just a few years, but for centuries. If anything, the phrase, *killing fields*, may not be strong enough.

**Delhi Sultanate of India (1206-1526)**

The Islamic Delhi Sultanate ruled over India for three hundred and twenty cruel years.

The Delhi Sultanate refers to the many Muslim states that ruled in India from 1206 to 1526. Several Turkic and Pashtun (Afghan) dynasties ruled from Delhi: the Mamluk dynasty (1206-90), the Khilji dynasty (1290-1320), the Tughlaq dynasty (1320-1413), the [so-called] Sayyid dynasty (1414-51), and the Lodhi dynasty (1451-1526). In 1526 the Delhi Sultanate was absorbed by the emerging Mughal Empire.\(^{337}\)

The chart below can be extremely helpful at sorting out the different dynasties and the violent Islamic leaders referred to in the remainder of this chapter.

---

336 Smith, p. 263-264.
Delhi Sultanate (1206-1526)

Despite the name, the capital was repeatedly elsewhere than Delhi city, not always near

Mamluk dynasty of Delhi (1206-1290)
- Qutb-ud-din Aybak (1206-1210)
- Aram Shah (1210-1211)
- Shams-ud-din Ilutmish (1211-1236)
- Rukn-ud-din Firuz (1236)
- Raziyyat ud din Sultana (1236-1240)
- Muiz-ud-din Bahram (1240-1242)
- Ala-ud-din Masud (1242-1246)
- Nasir-ud-din Mahmud (1246-1266)
- Ghiyas-ud-din Balban (1266-1286)
- Muiz-ud-din Qaiqabad (1286-1290)

Khilji Dynasty (1290-1320)
- Jalal ud din Firuz Khilji (1290-1296), founder of the Khilji dynasty, defeated some invading Mongol armies
- Ala ud din Khilji (1296-1316), considered the greatest of the Delhi Sultans, unified India and defeated a number of invading Mongol armies
- Qutb ud din Mubarak Shah (1316-1320), the Delhi Sultanate had shrunk during his reign

Tughlaq Dynasty (1321-1398)
- Ghiyath al-Din Tughluq (1321-1325)
- Muhammad bin Tughluq (1325-1351)
- Firuz Shah Tughluq (1351-1388)
- Ghiyath al-Din Tughluq II (1388-1389)
- Abu Baker (1389-1390)
- Nasir al-Din Muhammad (1390-1394)
- Mahmud Nasir al-Din (Sultan Mahmud) at Delhi (1394-1413)
- Nusrat Shah at Firuzabad

Invasion of Timur in 1398 and the end of the Tughluq Dynasty as known earlier.

Sayyid Dynasty (1414-1451)
- Khizr (1414-1421)
- Mubarak II (1421-1434)
- Muhammed IV (1434-1445)
- Alem I (1445-1451)

Lodi Dynasty (1451-1526)
- Bahlul Khan Lodi (1451-1489)
- Sikandar Lodi (1489-1517)
- Ibrahim Lodi (1517-1526), defeated by Babur (who replaces the Delhi Sultanate with the Mughal Empire)

---

(accessed Aug. 9, 2009.)
The Mamluk Slave Dynasty of India (1206-90)

Hoernle and Stark describe how the conquest of India by the Muslims proves the proverbial wisdom, *united we stand but divided we fall*. That common phrase was actually inspired by Jesus in Luke 11:17. "Jesus knew their thoughts and said to them: 'Any kingdom divided against itself will be ruined, and a house divided against itself will fall.'" The United States needs to reflect upon this reality as well. Benjamin Franklin seemed to express this idea well in his patriotic cartoon.\(^3^3^9\)

"The Preceding period has already given us a glimpse of the impending conquest of India by the Turkis. It has shown us how ill-prepared India was to meet that crisis. We have seen it divided into a number of smaller kingdoms . . . fighting with one another. . . In the north there were five such kingdoms: those of Bengal, Kanauj, Bandelkhand, Malwa, and Gujarat." \(^3^4^0\)

The United States would be well advised to cherish her Judeo-Christian heritage. History has shown Americans love these values and are willing to fight and die to protect them. Multiculturalism divides and weakens the nation from threats both "foreign and domestic."\(^3^4^1\)

In the last chapter we read, "Muhammad Ghori, is the 1192 conqueror of northern India from the Pakistan region. Muhammad Ghori returned to Lahore after 1200. Upon his death his most capable general, Qutb-ud-din Aybak, took control of Muhammad's

\(^{3^3^9}\) [www.news-antique.com/?id=784137 (accessed Aug. 12, 2009)]

\(^{3^4^0}\) Stark, *History of India*, p. 81.

\(^{3^4^1}\) "I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic." – from the U.S. military officer oath [http://www.military.com/opinion/0,15202,165838,00.html (accessed Aug. 12, 2009)]
Indian conquests and declared himself the first Sultan of Delhi.\textsuperscript{342} We pick up the bloody story here with Qutb-ud-din Aybak [Kutb-d Din Aibak] (1150-1210). Durant describes the historic situation and Aybak as follows,

"In 1186 the Ghuri, a Turkish tribe of Afghanistan, invaded India, captured the city of Delhi, destroyed its temples, confiscated its wealth, and settled down in its palaces to establish the Sultanate of Delhi-an alien despotism fastened upon northern India for three centuries, and checked only by assassination and revolt. The first of these bloody sultans, Kutb-d Din Aibak, was a normal specimen of his kind-fanatical, ferocious and merciless. His gifts, as the Mohammedan historian tells us, "were bestowed by hundreds of thousands, and his slaughters likewise were by hundreds of thousands." In one victory of this warrior (who had been purchased as a slave), "fifty thousand men came under the collar of slavery and the plain became black as pitch with Hindus.\textsuperscript{343}

Qutb desired to build a great mosque in Deli. He looked around, wondering where he could get the materials for such a great mosque. Finally, he had an idea. "The materials of no less than twenty-seven Hindu temples were used in the construction of the 'Qutb' mosque.\textsuperscript{344} After only four years, Qutb died in 1210 from the effects of an accident on the polo grounds.\textsuperscript{345}

Qutb-ud-din Aybak's dynasty is called the Mamluk or slave dynasty because he and so many of the subsequent rulers of this dynasty started their careers as slaves of Mohammad Ghori.

\textsuperscript{342} http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Muslim_conquest_in_the_Indian_subcontinent (accessed Aug. 10, 2009)
\textsuperscript{343} Durant p. 461, (cf. also http://www.storyofpakistan.com/person.asp?perid=P045 (accessed July 30, 2009)
\textsuperscript{344} Vincent Smith, p. 238
\textsuperscript{345} Ibid. p. 237.
Another example of a former slave turned sultan is Shams-ud-din Iltutmish [Shamsuddin Al-Tamsh] (1211-1236). He was a Turkic slave and son-in-law to the former sultan Aybak. We get some idea of his devotion to Islam by his title Shamsuddin. This is a title he chose for himself which means, "the sun of religion." Iltutmish is also responsible for a magnificent mosque at Ajmer, built like that at Delhi from the material of Hindu temples. It is reported he was engaged throughout his long reign of 26 years in constant wars. This fact can be verified by examining the map and looking at just how much land Iltutmish conquered from the Hindu in Northern India during his Sultanate. He, like his predecessor, was very intolerant of Hinduism.

For example, Iltutmish invaded the region of Malwa in 1234 AD and destroyed an ancient temple at the city of Vidisha. One of the ancient records reported,

"Having destroyed the idol temple of Ujjain which had been built six hundred years previously, and was called Mahakal, he leveled it to its foundations, and threw down the image of Rai Vikramajit from whom the Hindus reckon their era, and brought certain images of cast molten brass and placed them on the ground in front of the doors of mosques of old Delhi, and ordered the people to trample them under foot..."

The Sultans of Delhi acted as true Muslims in all these violent deeds. They were orthodox in faith and practice. All the while they were committing these horrendous acts of violence against the Hindus; they were maintaining a positive relationship with the other Muslims in the Islamic world.

[^346]: Ibid. p. 238.
[^347]: Ibid. pp. 238-239.
[^348]: Hoernle, A.F. Rudolph, Herbert A. Stark, *History of India* (Cutta, India, Orissa Mission, 1906) p. 83
The Sultans of Delhi enjoyed cordial, if superficial, relations with Muslim rulers in the Near East but owed them no allegiance. They based their laws on the Quran and the Islamic sharia and permitted non-Muslim subjects to practice their religion only if they paid the jizya (poll tax). They ruled from urban centers, while military camps and trading posts provided the nuclei for towns that sprang up in the countryside.

There were actually ten sultans who ruled during the Delhi Sultanate. But before going on to the next dynasty, we conclude with a brief, but bizarre, description of the ninth sultan named Ghiyas-ud-din Balban (1266-1286). His behavior seems to be deranged. Durant writes,

"Another Sultan, Balban punished rebels and brigands by casting them under the feet of elephants, or removing their skins stuffing these with straw, and hanging them from the gates of Delhi."

This seems like insane behavior to us in the West, but, actually, it is not all that much more savage than the decapitations and torture being done by fundamentalist Muslims all around the world today. There are many examples of this, but two that made a lot of news were when Abu Musab al-Zarqawi decapitated Daniel Pearl on February 1, 2002 and Ahmed Omar Saeed Sheikh decapitated Nick Berg in May of 2004. Muslims around the world today justify their tortures by quoting the Qur'an. "Therefore strike off their heads

---

351 Sharia is the body of Islamic religious law. The term means "way" or "path to the water source". It is the legal framework within which the public and private aspects of life are regulated for those living in a legal system based on Islamic principles of jurisprudence and for Muslims living outside the domain. Sharia deals with many aspects of day-to-day life, including politics, economics, banking, business, contracts, family, sexuality, hygiene, and social issues. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sharia (accessed Aug. 12, 2009)


353 Durant. p. 461.

and strike off every fingertip of them. "(8:12) "So when you meet in battle those who disbelieve, then smite the necks until . . . you have overcome them. . . "(Surah 47:4)

Elsewhere we can read in the Qur'an,

> The only reward of those who make war upon Allah and His messenger and strive after corruption in the land will be that they will be killed or crucified, or have their hands and feet on alternate sides cut off, or will be expelled out of the land. Such will be their degradation in the world, and in the Hereafter theirs will be an awful doom. (Surah 5:33)

Fundamentalist Muslims can also defend their behavior, pointing out that Muhammad himself allowed the beheading of 800 Jewish male youth and men while their wives and children were sold into slavery after his victory at the Battle of the Trench in A.D. 627. Muhammad was not a prophet; he was a criminal. Mr. Pearl and Mr. Berg were Jewish, one a businessman and the other a reporter. Both were victims of an Islamic theology steeped in *jihad* and *decapitation*. Generally, we in the West do not want to believe this still goes on today. We, in the United States, who ignore and deny this traditional Islamic *modus operandi*, do so to our own peril.

V. Smith writes of Sultan Balban, "However horrible the cruelty of Balban may appear, it served its purpose and maintained a certain degree of order in rough times." The same could be said for Saddam Hussein, the *Butcher of Baghdad*, the former head of Iraq, before he was hung for war crimes against the Kurds, December 30, 2006. One write-up of the event commented,

---

355 Durant, p. 461.
357 Vincent Smith, *The Oxford History of India*. 
Saddam Hussein is no more. The ‘Butcher of Baghdad’ was hanged by Iraqi officials at 6:04 am Iraqi time. The man responsible for an estimated 2.5 million deaths finally met his own. . . He did not ask for anything. He was carrying a Quran and said: 'I want this Quran to be given to this person,' a man he called Bander."

The point is that fundamentalist Muslims, like Balban and Saddam Hussein, ruled in the same way for the same reasons. They both read their Qur'an and prayed five times a day. They saw no inconsistency between their behavior and the teachings of the Qur'an; nor should we.

This overdue judgment on Saddam Hussein was only made possible because of the brave and sacrificial efforts of American soldiers. Iraq has been given an opportunity for something better. It will be up to them to secure it, but I fear that, unless Christianity gets a foothold in that country, reform will not come from Islamic theology.

The Khilji dynasty (1290-1320)

This dynasty, like the Mamluks, was of Turkic origin. The name Khilji means various things but primarily "swordsmen." There were only three rulers in this dynasty, Jalal ud din Firuz Khilji (1290-1296), Ala ud din Khilji (1296-1316) and Qutb ud din Mubarak Shah (1316-1320). All of them were infamous in their dealings with the Hindus in India.

First, Jalal demonstrated no tolerance for the Hindu religion and sought to rub their faces in his contempt for it on every occasion. One Hindu site today describes what he did to their temples and idols.

Jalal -ud-din Firuz Khilji led an expedition to Ranthambhor in 1291 AD. On the way he destroyed Hindu temples at Chain. The broken idols were sent to Delhi to

---

be spread before the gates of the Jama Masjid.\(^{360}\)

Walking on the chards of broken idols became a common practice of Muslims in India to demonstrate the superiority of Islam over the Hindu religion. Their superiority was only true militarily, however. As Christians, we do not accept Hindu idols either, but vandalizing and robbing Hindu temples is not the way to express God's love to the Hindu people who desperately need to come to know Jesus as a Savior and Lord. Second, in 1292, Sultan Jalal-ud-din Firuz Khilji was able to secure a partial retreat of Mongols from India due to some military successes and effective negotiations. This was quite a feat, for the report was that there were more than 100,000 soldiers in the invading Islamic army.

Third, we learn why his reign was so short. Ala-ud-din, Jalal's nephew and successor, would go out on raids and then bring the booty back to Jalal. On one such expedition to Vidisha, in 1292, we read that Alauddin, 

...brought much booty to the Sultan and the idol which was the object of worship of the Hindus, he caused to be cast in front of the Badaun gate to be trampled upon by the people. The services of Alauddin were highly appreciated, [by his uncle and Sultan Jalal-ud-din Firuz Khilji ] \(^{361}\)

In 1296, Ala-ud-din, had been out on another successful raid in the Deccan area of India. While Ala-ud-din was returning from the battle with the spoils, his uncle and king Jalal-ud-din hurried to meet him at the city of Kara. This time the report is that upon his arrival at Kara Jalal-ud-din did not get his share of the spoils, but was murdered by his nephew, Ala-ud-din.\(^{362}\)

Ala-ud-din collected treasure to an amount unheard of, and showed no disposition to share it with his sovereign. In fact, his treasonable intentions were patent to everyone except his doting old uncle and father-in-law. Ultimately, Jalal-ud-din


was persuaded to place himself in his nephew's power at Kara in the Allahabad District. When the sultan grasped the traitor's hand the signal was given. He was thrown down and decapitated. His head was stuck on a spear and carried round the camp. Lavish distribution of gold secured the adhesion of the army to the usurper, and Ala-ud-din became sultan (July 1296). \[363\]

One thing to keep in mind, is that in the mind of fundamentalist Muslims, robbing and murdering of kaffirs, or even uncles, does not disqualify one from being the head of the Islamic religion anymore than it disqualified Muhammad from being the prophet of Islam. It is a fair question to ask, if it has not already been asked, "Is it not true that Christians commit crimes of murder and stealing as well as Muslims?" The answer, regrettably, is yes, some have. But there is a profound difference that must be mentioned each and every time this is brought up. Fundamentalist Muslims may do this kind of behavior and are accepting of this kind of behavior, if perpetrated against infidels. They feel confident Allah will not condemn them for this, for it is clearly directed in the Qur'an and modeled in the life of the prophet Muhammad. Whenever a Christian does this kind of behavior, they are condemned by all biblical Christians because it is condemned in the Bible; this behavior was not accepted or modeled in the life of Jesus. Christians who behave like this are deviating from Jesus' teaching and his example. Muslims are not condemned in the Qur'an for this. There is no cover or excuse for this sinful behavior for Christians. One would be arrested and imprisoned if this crime was perpetrated against any other person, no matter their religion, including Islam. But even here a truly repentant Christian can have a certain hope.

"For we do not have a high priest who is unable to sympathize with our weaknesses, but we have one who has been tempted in every way, just as we are—yet was without sin. Let us then approach the throne of grace with
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confidence, so that we may receive mercy and find grace to help us in our time of need." (Hebrews 4:15)

One of the most regrettable things about Ala ud din Khilji's (1296-1316) reign as Sultan is that it was so long. Consequently, he had such a long time to terrorize India. Ala ud din sent his armies to pillage both North and South India. His North Indian expeditions went to the regions of Gujarat, Ranathamvor, Mewar, Malwa, Marwar, Jalor. His Southern Indian expeditions went to the regions of Devagiri, Warangal, Darsamudra, and Pandiya. For most, due to our lack of knowledge of India geography, these ten region names have no meaning to us. Nevertheless, we can appreciate the terrible consequences that befell these regions due to the conquest of these ten Hindu regions by fundamentalist Islamic armies. Their defeat meant the decimation of hundreds of cities, equating to the death of hundreds of thousands of Hindu men, women and children. Gujarat is just one example from the Northern campaign.

In 1298 AD he [Alauddin] equipped an expedition to Gujarat. The invaders plundered the ports of Surat and

Cambay. The temple of Somnath, which had been rebuilt by the Hindus, was plundered and the idol taken to Delhi for being trodden upon by the Muslims. The whole region was subjected to fire and sword, and Hindus were slaughtered en masse.\textsuperscript{366}

Another northern site attacked by Alauddin was Chitor, Mewar,\textsuperscript{367} and the city which had never been conquered fell in 1303. The consequences to the people were horrendous.

"...(the conquerer [Alauddin]of Chitor,[Chittor,Malwa]) had all the males-fifteen to thirty thousand of them -slaughtered in one day."\textsuperscript{368}

Alauddin drew up an oppressive tax policy with the intended goal of depriving Hindus of their wealth. He believed poor people were easier to control. Native Hindu governments had taxed the people at 17% of their gross produce. Alauddin raised the taxes to 50% of their gross produce. People obviously did not want, or could not, pay that amount. "Blows, confinement in the stocks, imprisonment and chains, were all employed to enforce payment."\textsuperscript{369} The consequences of this policy for the Hindu culture, according to one Muslim historian, was that, "No Hindu . . . could hold up his head, and in their houses no sign of gold or silver . . . or of any superfluity was to be seen."\textsuperscript{370}

When one of his own advisers protested against this policy, Alau-d-din answered: "Oh, Doctor, thou art a learned man, but thou has no experience; I am an unlettered man, but I have a great deal. Be assured, then, that the Hindus will never become submissive and obedient till they are reduced to poverty. I have therefore given orders that just sufficient shall be left to them from year to year of corn, milk and curds, but they shall not be allowed to accumulate hoards and property."\textsuperscript{371}

After Ala-ud-din's invasion of Devagiri, in his Southern campaign, he determined the
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time was right to move against some of his uncle's allies, who most assuredly did not appreciate that he murdered his uncle.

'Ala-ud-din Khalji . . . took power by raiding wealthy Devagiri in the Deccan region, and he expanded and centralized the Delhi Sultanate. According to the historian Barani, after his authority was established, 'Ala-ud-din arrested the former officers of Jalal-ud-din [Firuz Khalji] who had joined him; some were imprisoned, some were blinded, and others were killed. 372

Before going on the next sultan, there is one more feature that should be touched upon about Alauddin, one that reveals another dark side to his character. V. Smith describes this as, "his addiction to disgusting vice." 373 He and the next sultan, Qutb ud-din Mubarak Shah, were among the ones K.S. Lal, in his book, Muslim Slave System in Medieval India, 374 talked about who were bisexual, pedophile sultans. One source notes that even though, "Alauddin Khilji was a practicing Muslim . . . His most beloved soldier was a, Malik Kafur, originally a slave boy from Gujarat who was captured in a raid by Alauddin. [Malik] Kafur was castrated, converted to Islam, and was taken into Alauddin's service." 375 Elsewhere we read, "Alauddin Khilji fell in love with the effeminate beauty of Malik Kafur, castrated and converted him to Islam. . . . The sultan had homosexual relations with Kafur." 376 K.S. Lal writes,

During Alauddin Khalji's invasion of Gujarat, his generals had brought immense booty from there including Raja Karan's consort Kamla Devi 377 and the handsome slave Malik Kafur Hazardinari. The Sultan fell in love with both. In the words of Farishtah, he converted Kamala Devi to Islam and married her, and treating [Malik] Kafur [Hazardinari] as a favourite tied the sacred thread . . . of his love in his own waist. So long as Alauddin

---
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held a firm grip on the administration, Malik Kafur [Hazardinari] served him with loyalty and won victories on his behalf in lands far and near. Once the king's health declined and he became dependent . . . the latter [Malik Kafur Hazardinari] managed or at least attempted to poison him.\textsuperscript{378}

The eunuch, Malik Kafur, then sought to legitimize his rule as a regent by placing an infant son of Alauddin's on the throne. Kafur, in an attempt to secure his position, "... imprisoned, blinded, or killed most of the other members of the royal family but his criminal rule lasted only thirty-five days. After the lapse of that time, he and his companions were beheaded by their slave guards."\textsuperscript{379}

Qutb-ud-din (1316-1320) was the confused son and successor after the murder of his father Alauddin. Unfortunately Qutb-ud-din was like his father and is described as follows,

The young sovereign was wholly evil. He was infatuated with a youth named Hasan . . . During his reign of four years and four months, the sultan attended to nothing but drinking, listening to music, debauchery, and pleasure, scattering gifts, and gratifying his lusts. . . Ultimately the degraded creature was killed by his minion, Khusru Khan. . . \textsuperscript{380}

K.S. Lal gives more of the sordid details of Qutb-ud-din's feelings about his male slave named Khusrau Khan.

Qutbuddin was blinded by the infatuation he had for Khusrau Khan, and unable to bear his separation any longer sent for him from the Deccan. Khusrau Khan was taken in a palanquin\textsuperscript{381} post-haste from Devagiri to Delhi where he arrived in a week's time. One day Khusrau engaged the king in his intimate company and got him killed.\textsuperscript{382}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{378} http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Malik_Kafur (accessed Aug. 12, 2009)
\item \textsuperscript{379} Vincent Smith, p. 247
\item \textsuperscript{380} Ibid. pp. 247-248.
\item \textsuperscript{382} http://voiceofdharma.org/books/mssmi/ (accessed Aug. 12, 2009)
\end{itemize}
Qutb-ud-din was murdered like his father, by his homosexual slave Khusrau Khan."

After a few months, the usurper was defeated and beheaded. Romans 1:26-27 describes Alauddin and Qutb-ud-din. The Apostle Paul wrote,

... God gave them over to shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones. In the same way the men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed indecent acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their perversion.

**Tughlaq Dynasty (1320-1413)**

The nobles, having their fill of the Khilji dynasty, looked for a replacement. They decided upon Ghiyath al-Din Tughluq. His father, a Turk, had been a slave of Balban and his mother was an Indian woman. Muslims are often encouraged to marry women of other religions and force their children to be raised Muslim. Muslim doctrine teaches that all children are naturally born Muslim, especially those born to a Muslim father. From a Muslim perspective, this would be true for President Obama, whose father was a Muslim from Kenya. V. Smith says of Tughluq's rule,

His conduct justified the confidence bestowed on him by his colleagues. He restored a reasonable amount of order to the internal administration and took measures to guard against the ever-pressing danger from Mongol inroads.

Unfortunately, the son was not like the father and was more in line with the preceding dynasties. The story of how Juna, or Muhammad bin Tughlak, murders his father (Ghiyath al-Din Tughluq) and brother (Mahmud) to become the Sultan, is well known. The plot goes like this,

Muhammad, who had returned from the south, was then in charge of the capital.

---
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The sultan [his father] desired his son[ Muhammad] to build for him a temporary reception pavilion or pleasure-house on the bank of the Juman. Juna [Muhammad] Khan entrusted the work to Ahmad. . . who was head of the public works department and in his confidence. The prince [Juna/Muhammad] asked and obtained permission to parade the elephants fully accoutered [...with military clothes, equipment, etc.] by his father [Tughluq Shah], who took up his station in the new building for afternoon [Islamic] prayers. The confederates arranged that the elephants when passing should collide with the timber structure, which accordingly fell on the sultan and his favorite younger son, Mahmud, who accompanied him. Juna [Muhammad] made a pretence of sending for picks and shovels to dig out his father and brother, but purposely hindered action being taken until it was too late. The sultan was found bending over the boy's body, and if he still breathed, as some people asserted that he did, he was finished off (A.D. 1325). After nightfall his body was removed and interred in the massive sepulcher which he had prepared for himself in Tughluqabad, the mighty fortress which he had built near Delhi.  

Students of Islamic Indian history actually know quite a little bit about Sultan [Juna] Muhammad bin Tughlak,[1300-1351] , because of two contemporary sources: Ibn Batuta, who worked for Juna, and Zia-ud-din Barani, who was an African traveling historian of the time.  

Ibn Batuta. . . spent several years at the court and in the service of the sultan until April 1347, when he succeeded in retiring from his dangerous employment. His account of his Indian experiences. . . bears the stamp of truth on every page. . . Zia-ud-din . . . was also a contemporary official and wrote in the reign of Muhammad bin Tughluq's cousin and successor, Firuz Shah. . . his narrative is full of vivid detail.  

Because of the above sources, V. Smith writes of this sultan that, "Notwithstanding that Muhammad bin Tughluq was guilty of acts which the pen shrinks from recording, and that he wrought untold misery in the course of his long reign he was not wholly evil. He established hospitals.
and almshouses, and his generosity to learned Muslims was unprecedented.  

Durant describes this complex man.

Sultan [Juna] Muhammad bin Tughlak,[1300-1351] acquired the throne by murdering his father [and brother] became a great scholar and an elegant writer, dabbled in mathematics, physics and Greek philosophy, surpassed his predecessors in bloodshed and brutality, fed the flesh of a rebel nephew to the rebel's wife and children, ruined the country with reckless inflation, and laid waste with pillage and murder till the inhabitants fled to the jungle.  He killed so many Hindus that, in the words of a Moslem historian, "constantly in front of his royal pavilion and his Civil Court a mound of dead bodies and a heap of corpses, while the sweepers and executioners were wearied out by their work of dragging" the victims "and putting them to death in crowds." In order to found a new capital at Daulatabad he drove every inhabitant from Delhi and left it a desert and hearing that a blind man had stayed behind in Delhi, he ordered him to be dragged from the old to the new capital, so that only a leg remained of the wretch when his last journey was finished.  The Sultan complained that the people did not love him, or recognize his undeviating justice.  He ruled India for a quarter of a century, and died in bed.

"Thus 'the sultan was freed from his people, and the people from their sultan'. It is astonishing that such a monster should have retained power for twenty-six years, and then have died in his bed. The misery caused by his savage misrule is incalculable."

Now how can a Muslim be so cultured and still a mass murderer? The answer is that a person can be both cultured and a robbing murderer, if their worldview and theology tells them what they are doing is correct. In this case, both the Qur'an and the perfect
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exemplar, Muhammad, stated and modeled to the Sultan that the slaughtering of Hindus was a good thing. So there was no need to feel guilty for gruesome acts committed against infidels or rebellious subjects. Muhammad did not put up with criticism or rebellion and neither would he.

Moreover, the sultan... believed himself to be a just man, and was persuaded that all his atrocities were in accordance with the principles of justice and Muslim law. There is no reason to suppose that his conscience troubled him. On the contrary, he deliberately defended his conduct against criticism and avowed his resolve to continue his course to the end. "I punish", he said, "the most trifling act of contumacy" with death. This I will do until I die, or until the people act honestly, and give up rebellion and contumacy.

Firuz Shah Tughlaq [1351-1388] was in the camp where his cousin, Muhammad bin Tughlak, had died in his bed and he was reticent to claim for himself the title of sultan. This left the army leaderless. On March 23, 1351, after several days and much hardship, he was installed as the Sultan at age 42. "Firuz Shah was scarcely a suitable choice as successor... for he lacked the generalship necessary for re-establishment of the authority of Delhi over the lost provinces."  

Consequently, "Firuz's realm was... smaller... forced by rebellions to concede virtual independence to Bengal and other provinces..." But he conceded this only after he failed to defeat them in battle. As a motivator for his troops, he offered a bounty for every decapitated Hindu head from Bengal. He eventually paid for 180,000 of them, but still failed to conquer the province. This is very similar to Saddam Hussein's practice of giving a $25,000 to the surviving family members of Islamic homicide.

---
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bombers in Israel from Gaza. By 2002, Hussein had doled out $10,000,000 for these attacks on innocent people in buses and markets. 398 Firuz "was extremely devout, although he allowed himself the kingly privilege of drinking wine." 399 His devotion to Islam can be seen in the way he punished others for practicing their religion in public.

Firuz . . . could be fierce when his religious zeal was roused . . . The historian witnessed the burning alive of a Brahman who had practiced his rites in public. Those unquestionable facts prove that Firuz Shah carried on the tradition of the early invaders, and believed that he served God by treating as a capital crime the public practice of their religion by the vast majority of his subjects. 400

On occasion Firuz would also wage war directly on Hinduism. For example in 1360 he invaded Orissa. 401 There he destroyed the Hindu temple and the Hindu shrines. What is interesting is his justification as to why he did this. He wrote,

"Allah who is the only true God and has no other emanation, endowed the king of Islam with the strength to destroy this ancient shrine on the eastern sea-coast and to plunge it into the sea, and after its destruction he ordered the image of Jagannath to be perforated, and disgraced it by casting it down on the ground . . . and stretched them in front of the portals [i.e. doorways] of every mosque, so that the body and sides of the images might be trampled at the time of ascent and descent, entrance and exit, by the shoes on the feet of the Muslims." 402

After the destruction of the temple in Orissa, he went after the people who had fled.

Firuz Shah Tughlaq attacked an island on the sea-coast where "nearly 100,000 men of Jajnagar had taken refuge with their women, children, kinsmen and relations." The swordsmen of Islam turned "the island into a basin of blood by the massacre of the unbelievers." A worse fate overtook the Hindu women. Sirat-i-Firuz Shahs records: "Women with babies and pregnant ladies were halted, manacled, fettered and enchained, and pressed as slaves into service in the house of every soldier." 403
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Firuz used the carrot as well as the stick to attempt to convert Hindus to Islam. Firuz tried to bribe or buy their conversions by removing the jizya tax if they converted. He told the Hindus,

I encouraged my infidel subjects to embrace the religion of the prophet and I proclaimed that everyone who repeated the creed and became a Musalman should be exempt from the jizya or poll-tax. Information of this came to the ears of the people at large, and great numbers of Hindus presented themselves, and were admitted to the honour of Islam. Thus they came forward day by day from every quarter, and adopting the faith, were exonerated from the jizya, and were favoured with presents and honours.\(^{404}\)

V. Smith observes that this was the process for the conversion of many of the Muslims in India today. This bribery was kept on for generations. This bribery is still used as an inducement to join Islam today.

Firuz, after 32 years, dies at the age of 80. He is followed by "a series of puppet sultans, all equally wanting in personal merit, pass rapidly across the stage. The only exception is Mahmud Nasir al-Din (1394-1413) who essentially becomes the king of Delhi. The kingdom in fact ceased to exist, and the governor of every province assumed, practical independence."\(^{405}\) Mahmud Nasir al-Din (1394-1413) will tragically figure in again in our study of Timur and Delhi below.

**The Mongolian Invasion (1398-1399) and Amir Timur (Tamerlane) (1336-1405)**

Timur, referred to earlier in his conquest of Mongolia, now turns his attention to India. Timur was a Turk whose father was one of the earliest converts to Islam. He attained the throne in 1369 and began to set out on world conquest.

Timur launched his attack on India in 1398, claiming that the Muslim Delhi Sultanate was too lenient towards its Hindu subjects. In reality, Timur probably
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cared more about looting this wealthy Muslim region than about punishing its religiously tolerant Muslim leaders. At any rate, he sacked Delhi quickly, despite the efforts of the Sultan's army, which included 120 war elephants. As with most of Timur's empire, however, he did not stay in India to establish a Timurid administration. He left northern India in ruins and returned to Samarkand. . . .

According to Timur's alleged memoirs (i.e. his Tuzk-i-Timuri), he justified his raid by quoting the Quran "O Prophet, make war upon the infidels and unbelievers, and treat them severely." (Surah 8:65, 9:73, ) Then he gave this rational, "My great object in invading Hindustan had been to wage a religious war against the infidel Hindus...[so that] the army of Islam might gain something by plundering the wealth and valuables of the Hindus." At the fort of Kator, on the border of Kashmir, he ordered his soldiers "to kill all the men, to make prisoners of women and children, and to plunder and lay waste all their property." As has been alluded to before, with the exception of wasting the land, this is exactly what Muhammad did in 627. Next, he "directed towers to be built on the mountain of the skulls of those obstinate unbelievers." Like Muhammad did with the Meccans in 630, he could break his word when necessary. He laid siege to Bhatner and made a deal with the Hindu Rajputs who were defending it. After some fighting, they were allowed to surrender without peril of death. But Timur reconsidered. In his memoirs, it was recorded "In a short space of time all the people in the fort were put to the sword, and in the course of one hour the heads of 10,000 infidels were cut off."

The worst massacre of all occurred near Delhi. By this time Timur had collected 100,000
Hindu prisoners he intended to keep as slaves. But Mahmud Nasir al-Din (1394-1413), the only one of the remaining Tughlaq sultans to rule for any length of time, had gathered an army to challenge Timur and attempt to deliver the city of Delhi. The battle was fast approaching and his advisers came to Timur with this advice, "that on the great day of battle these 100,000 prisoners could not be left with the baggage, and that it would be entirely opposed to the rules of war to set these idolaters and enemies of Islam at liberty."

Therefore, "no other course remained but that of making them all food for the sword." 412

The memoirs state Timur ordered all the soldiers who collected prisoners to put them to death or they would suffer the same fate. "One hundred thousand infidels, impious idolaters, were on that day slain." 413 On the day of the battle, Timur's troops were victorious and his men went into the city where a "great number of Hindus with their wives and children, and goods and valuables, had come into the city from all the country round." 414 Timur's recollection is very descriptive, but horrible to imagine.

The Hindus set fire to their houses with their own hands, burned their wives and children in them and rushed into the fight and were killed...On that day, Thursday, and all the night of Friday, nearly 15,000 Turks were engaged in slaying, plundering and destroying. When morning broke on Friday, all my army...went off to the city and thought of nothing but killing, plundering and making prisoners....The following day, Saturday the 17th, all passed in the same way, and the spoil was so great that each man secured from fifty to a hundred prisoners, men, women, and children. There was no man who took less than twenty. The other booty was immense in rubies, diamonds, garnets, pearls, and other gems and jewels;...gold and silver of the celebrated Alai coinage: vessels of gold and silver; and brocades and silks of great value. Gold and silver ornaments of Hindu women were obtained in such quantities as to exceed all account. 415

After this theologically approved butchery and carnage, Timur stayed true to his
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pattern and returned home with his booty and new craftsmen slaves, robbing more cities on the way, with plans to beautify Samarkand.

The "So Called" Sayyid Dynasty\(^{416}\) (1414-51)

India was left in such a devastated state of turmoil after Timur's \textit{jihad}s that there was no sultanate government for the next fifteen years. Remember devastation was caused by Islam on Islamic people and Islam on Hindu people. After that length of time the "so called" Sayyid dynasty arose for only 37 years. They were "so call"\(^{417}\) because it was highly unlikely that they actually were truly "Sayyid." The title \textit{Sayyid} indicated that you were, "a supposed descendant of Muhammad through his grandson Hussein, the second son of his daughter Fatima."

\(^{418}\) Today, those claiming to be Sayyid usually wear a black or green turban rather than the white to indicate this special birthright.\(^{419}\)

V. Smith writes, "They pretended to be Sayyids, and consequently are described in the history textbooks as the Sayyid dynasty."

\(^{420}\) The four different Sayyid sultans were Khizr Khan 1414 - 1421, Mubarak Shah 1421 - 1434, Muhammad Shah 1434 - 1445 and Alam Shah 1445 - 1451. One source summarizes their activities as follows:

Khizr Khan marched on Delhi, defeated Daulat Khan Lodi, and founded the Sayyid dynasty in 1414. The capital recovered as he helped the poor resettle. Shortly before his death in 1421 Khizr Khan raided Mewat. He was succeeded by his son Mubarak Shah who turned back early Mughul incursions. The Delhi kingdom declined during the reigns of Muhammad Shah (1434-1445) and 'Ala-
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ud-din ' Alam Shah Most of Gujurat sultan Ahmad's reign (1411-1443) was spent fighting local Hindu kings and the Muslim rulers of Malwa and the Deccan.\textsuperscript{421}

### Lodhi Dynasty (1451-1526)

Like nearly all the changes in Sultanates before the Lodhi Dynasty, this one also arose when Bahlul Khan Lodi (1451-1481) seized it and declared himself sultan.

"Though many authors erroneously call all the sultans of Delhi from 1206 to 1450 Pathans [Pashtun] or Afghans, in reality Buhlul Lodi was the first Afghan sultan."\textsuperscript{422} The rest were Turkic. During Bahlul's sultanate, he regained some of the former territories of the Delhi sultanate. He battled the Hindu king of Jaunpur in the east and was expelled him, putting one of his sons, Barbak Shah, on the throne before his thirty year reign came to an end.

Sikandar Lodhi (1489-1517) was the chosen replacement, and the chief accomplishment of his reign was, "the expulsion of his brother Barbak Shaw from Jaunpur, and the definite annexation of that kingdom."\textsuperscript{423} He also got some minor acknowledgment from the other Afghan rulers in the area that the sultan of Delhi was superior. Durant writes,

Sikandar proved to be a capable ruler who was kind to his Muslim subjects, but was extremely harsh upon his Hindu subjects. . . Much has been written about his religious intolerance. Bodhan - a Hindu renunciate (sadhu), was burnt alive for saying the following: Islam and Hindu Dharma are both equally acceptable to God if followed with sincerity.

The History of the Delhi sultanate by M.M. Syed says the following about him: he frequently razed temples to the ground and erected mosques in their place, as evidenced by his behaviour at Mandrail, Utgir, and Narwar. At mathura he prevented Hindus from bathing in their sacred ghats or having themselves shaved. The stones of
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broken Hindu idols were given away to butchers to be used as weights. . . He died in 1517 and has an elaborate burial tomb that resides in Lodhi Gardens, Delhi. 424

The Sultanate suffered significantly from the sacking of Delhi in 1398 by Timur, but revived briefly under the Lodi Dynasty, the final dynasty of the Sultanate before it was conquered by Zahiruddin Babur in 1526, who subsequently founded the Mughal Dynasty that ruled from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries. 425

Ibrahim Lodi (1517-1526), the son of Sikandar, became sultan upon his father's death. He did not have the skills of his father and there were many rebellions during his short reign. Some of the rebellions he provoked, even though they might have been necessary. He replaced the senior commanding officers with younger ones who were loyal to him. "He was feared and loathed by his subjects. His Afghan nobility eventually invited Babur of Kabul to invade India. Ibrahim died in the Battle of Panipat, where Babur's superior fighters, and the desertion of many of Lodhi's soldiers, led to his downfall, despite superior troop numbers."426 Babur initiated the Mughal Dynasty that lasted from 1526–1858 or for 334 years. "The Mughal Emperors were descendants of the Timurids of Turkistan, and at the height of their power around 1700, they controlled most of the Indian Subcontinent."427 Their dynasty would coincide with much of the Ottoman empire, another Turkic empire. (1517-1924).

We have read about a lot of Islamic killing of Hindus and fellow Muslims. Could one argue accurately that Islam was a peaceful religion during these centuries? Obviously not. Not in the life of Muhammad, not during the four caliphs, not during the Umayyads, nor the Abbasids, and now not during the age of The Fragmentation of Islamic Lands. So
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how many actually died between 1206 and 1517? There are no exact statistics, but it is safe to say it is in the tens of millions. Durant said, that the "History of Islam's conquest of India is probably the bloodiest story in history." Hindu scholar K.S. Lal estimated the figure might be as high as 80 million. This figure is not without its critics but that is to be expected. Islamic Historian, Professor Emeritus, Irfan Habib at Aligarh Muslim University said of of K.S. Lal,

The author is known for his detailed studies of the Khalji dynasty and of the fifteenth-century Delhi Sultanate. He is well versed in the sources of medieval North Indian history. In the present study he has assembled almost all the conceivably relevant data and for this reason it will remain of value as a compendium of references. Yet the unknown variables are so great and the quality of the data yielded by our sources so poor that almost any detailed general estimates of population based upon them must appear willful, if not fantastic. 428

This is an amazing negation of the facts. Does it matter whether we have the exact number or not? To deny that the number must be enormous seems to be "willful, if not fantastic". The greater point is that Islamic raiders, from Muhammad until the fall of the Lodi Sultanate, had been murdering, ravaging, raping, and pillaging country after country from A.D. 624-1517, for nearly nine hundred years. This is not the behavior of a peaceful religion; rather, it is the mark of a pseudo-religion. How wise is it to ignore or attempt to paper over this reality?

One website offers this epilogue to the Islamic invasions of India, and how Indians resisted for seven hundred years (to this very day), in spite of incredible untold suffering.

Prithviraj Chauhan was the last Hindu King to rule in Delhi. After which started the saga of destruction of Hindu, Buddhist and Jain religion. Thousands of monks, priests, sadhus, common men & women were mercilessly killed. Thousands were converted to Islam, at the point of the sword. Non-Muslims had to pay extra taxes like Jazia, and pilgrimage tax. Statues of gods and sculptures were destructed.

About 60,000 Hindu temples were destroyed throughout the Islamic rule. Roughly 3,000 were converted into Masjids. . . . The Hindu temples were built in deep forests during this time (example Bhimashankar in Maharashtra), so that they were safe from Muslim attack.

After the Senas of Bengal were defeated (1250s) the Buddhist University of Nalanda was destroyed. 9 million scriptures in the University were burned. It is said that the university burned for months! The place where Astronomy, Physics, Medicine, Philosophy, Theology, Mathematics, Sanskrit and Grammar were taught, the place where students from all over Asia came to learn, all that remained were ruins. . . .

Within 200 years, Arabs had wiped out the original religions of North Africa, Western Europe and Central Asia. They came to India with the same intention. But even after 700 years of tyrannical rule, they did not succeed.429

Hindus should be praised for their tenacity, if nothing else.

As referred to at the beginning of the chapter, there are still three significant historic events that occurred during these years which must be mentioned: The Black Death and the siege of Caffa (1346-1350), the fall of Constantinople (1453) and the expulsion of Moors (Spanish Muslims) from Spain (1492).

**The Black Death and Caffa 1346-1350**

One of the most interesting articles you may ever read on the Black Death, the plague that hit Europe around 1347-1350, eventually killing one quarter to a third or more of Europe's population, was written by Mark Wheelis. Dr. Wheelis is the Senior Lecturer in Microbiology at the University of California and wrote this article for the Center of Disease Control in Atlanta, Georgia.430 The title of his article is *Biological Warfare at the 1346 Siege of Caffa*. Wheelis was trained as a bacterial physiologist and geneticist, but for more than 10 years, his research has focused on the history and control of

---


biological weapons. One of the earliest biological attacks ever made was by Mongol Muslims from the Golden Horde. One is tempted to quote the entire article, but in our day and age, you can go on-line and get your own copy. Nevertheless, the following is sufficient.

On the basis of a 14th-century account by the Genoese Gabriele de’ Mussi, the Black Death is widely believed to have reached Europe from the Crimea as the result of a biological warfare attack. This is not only of great historical interest but also relevant to current efforts to evaluate the threat of military or terrorist use of biological weapons. Based on published translations of the de’ Mussi manuscript, other 14th-century accounts of the Black Death, and secondary scholarly literature, I conclude that the claim that biological warfare was used at Caffa is plausible and provides the best explanation of the entry of plague into the city. This theory is consistent with the technology of the times and with contemporary notions of disease causation; however, the entry of plague into Europe from the Crimea likely occurred independent of this event. 431

The Narrative of Gabriele De’ Mussi. . . is presumed to have been written in 1348 or early 1349 . . .

The narrative begins,

“...In 1346, in the countries of the East, countless numbers of Tartars [peoples from the Gobi desert area of Mongolia, conquered by Genghis Khan and converted to Islam when the Golden Horde converted] and Saracens [Arabs or Muslims, those not from Sarah]432 were struck down by a mysterious illness which brought sudden death. . . The Christian merchants, who had been driven out by force, were so terrified of the power of the Tartars that, to save themselves and their belongings, they fled in an armed ship to Caffa, a settlement in the same part of the world which had been founded long ago by the Genoese.

“... See how the heathen Tartar races, pouring together from all sides, suddenly invested the city of Caffa and besieged the trapped Christians there for almost three years. There, hemmed in by an immense army, they could hardly draw breath, although food could be shipped in, which offered them some hope. But behold, the whole army was affected by a disease which overran the Tartars and killed thousands upon thousands every day. It was as though arrows were raining down from heaven to strike and crush the Tartars’ arrogance. All medical advice

---

432 "In Christian writing, the name meant "those empty of Sarah" or "not from Sarah," as Arabs were, in Biblical genealogies, descended from Hagar. . . " http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saracen (accessed Aug. 15, 2009).
and attention was useless; the Tartars died as soon as the signs of disease appeared on their bodies: swellings in the armpit or groin caused by coagulating humours, followed by a putrid fever.

“The dying Tartars, stunned and stupefied by the immensity of the disaster brought about by the disease, and realizing that they had no hope of escape, lost interest in the siege. But they ordered corpses to be placed in catapults and lobbed into the city in the hope that the intolerable stench would kill everyone inside. What seemed like mountains of dead were thrown into the city, and the Christians could not hide or flee or escape from them, although they dumped as many of the bodies as they could in the sea. And soon the rotting corpses tainted the air and poisoned the water supply, and the stench was so overwhelming that hardly one in several thousand was in a position to flee the remains of the Tartar army. Moreover one infected man could carry the poison to others, and infect people and places with the disease by look alone. No one knew, or could discover, a means of defense... .

“...As it happened, among those who escaped from Caffa by boat were a few sailors who had been infected with the poisonous disease. Some boats were bound for Genoa, others went to Venice and to other Christian areas. When the sailors reached these places and mixed with the people there, it was as if they had brought evil spirits with them: every city, every settlement, every place was poisoned by the contagious pestilence, and their inhabitants, both men and women, died suddenly. And when one person had contracted the illness, he poisoned his whole family even as he fell and died, so that those preparing to bury his body were seized by death in the same way. Thus death entered through the windows, and as cities and towns were depopulated their inhabitants mourned their dead neighbors.” . . .

**Biological Warfare at Caffa**

Tentatively accepting the attack took place as described, we can consider two principal hypotheses for the entry of plague into the city: it might, as de’ Mussi asserts, have been transmitted by the hurling of plague cadavers; or it might have entered by rodent to rodent transmission from the Mongol encampments into the city.

... Front-line location must have been approximately 250–300 m from the walls; trebuchets [i.e. a catapults] are known from modern reconstruction to be capable of hurling 100 kg more than 200 m and historical sources claim 300 m as the working range of large machines. Thus, the bulk of rodent nests associated with the besieging armies would have been located a kilometer or more away from the cities, and none would have likely been closer than 250 m. Rats are quite sedentary and rarely venture more than a few tens of meters from their nest. It is
thus unlikely that there was any contact between the rat populations within and outside the walls.

Given the many uncertainties, any conclusion must remain tentative. However, the considerations above suggest that the hurling of plague cadavers might well have occurred as de’ Mussi claimed, and if so, that this biological attack was probably responsible for the transmission of the disease from the besiegers to the besieged. Thus, this early act of biological warfare, if such it were, appears to have been spectacularly successful in producing casualties, although of no strategic importance (the city remained in Italian hands, and the Mongols abandoned the siege).  

Wheelis concludes that only the hurling of plague cadavers is consistent with the facts. Wheelis does not want to blame the Black Death's arrival in Europe exclusively on the Islamic biological warfare carried out against Christians at Caffa. He even suggests the disease would surely have been carried to Europe by other ships and land travelers as well. That may or may not be the case, but without question Caffa was a source of the spread of the disease to Europe. Regardless, the attempt was made to use biological warfare against Christians, and based on other information about Islam; we should see it as more than just a minor footnote in history. Wheelis notes that, "The siege of Caffa is a powerful reminder of the horrific consequences when disease is successfully used as a weapon..." The use of chemical warfare was a major concern when the invasion of Iraq occurred, because Saddam Hussein had used it to kill so many of his own Kurdish people. In mid-March, 1988, Saddam ordered the city of Halabja attacked. Colin Powell stated,

The planes flew low enough for the petrified Kurds to take note of the markings, which were those of the Iraqi air force. Many families tumbled into primitive air-raid shelters they had built outside their homes. When the gasses seeped through the cracks, they poured out into the streets in a panic. There they found friends and family frozen in time like a modern version of Pompeii: slumped a few yards

behind a baby carriage, caught permanently holding the hand of a loved one or
shielding a child from the poisoned air, or calmly collapsed behind a car steering
wheel.

Powell also noted that while this attack was one of the most famous, it was just one of
some forty chemical assaults staged by Iraq against the Kurdish people. The United
States people would be deluding themselves if they think there are not Muslims in
fundamentalist nations who would not like to repeat the attack on Caffa, or Halabja, or
New York City or Washington D.C. given the opportunity. Allowing for more Islamic
immigration only increases the number of potential sympathizers with such an attack.
The rejoicing that took place in the Gaza strip over the 9/11 attacks reveals this.
Appeasing Islam will not work, for Islam does not call for peaceful relations with other
religions, but for conquest of other religions and governments until Islam rules supreme.
"Make war on them until idolatry shall cease and God's religion shall reign supreme."
(Surah 8:36) Ask Israel if a nation can make peace with fundamentalist Islam.

Netanyahu is correctly concerned about Israel's future. He felt that the Palestinians
were not merely demanding a state next to Israel, but a state instead of Israel. He had
long ago cautioned that it is very easy to make peace agreements. "A new agreement
could be made every five minutes. Unfortunately, they don't last longer than the
photo-op."  

**Fall of Constantinople 1453**

Federer, in his book, *What Every American Needs to know about the Quran*, has
included this vivid description of what the fall was like from a 1453 diary.  

---

436 http://www.netanyahu.org/netnexcomkid.html
Barbaro, in his *Diary of the Siege of Constantinople 1453*, translated by Professor John Melville-Jones (New York, 1969), related the horror of the sack of the city, scenes which were repeated all over central and southern Europe:

On 29 May 1453, the Turks entered Constantinople at daybreak. . . The confusion of those Turks and of the Christians was so great that they met face to face, and so many died that the dead bodies would have filled twenty carts. . . The Turks put the city to sword as they came and everyone they found in their way they slashed with their scimitars . . . women and men, old and young, of every condition, and this slaughter continued from dawn until midday. Those Italian merchants who escaped hid in caves under the ground, but they were found by the Turks, and were all taken captive and sold as slaves. When those of the Turkish fleet saw with their own eyes that the Christians had lost Constantinople, that the flag of Sultan Mehmet II had been hoisted over the highest tower in the city, and that the emperor's flags had been cut down and lowered, then all those in the seventy galleys went ashore. . . They sought out the convents and all the nuns were taken to the ships and abused and dishonored by the Turks, and they were all sold at auction as slaves to be taken to Turkey, and similarly the young women were all dishonored and sold at auction; some preferred to throw themselves into wells and drown. These Turks loaded their ships with people and a great treasure. They had this custom: when they entered a house they would at once raise a flag with their own device, and when other Turks saw such a flag raised, no other Turk would for the world enter that house but would go looking for a house that had no flag; it was the same with all the convents and churches. As I understand it, it seems there were some two hundred thousand of these flags on the houses of Constantinople. . . these flags flew about the houses for the whole of that day, and for all of that day the Turks made a great slaughter of Christians in the city. Blood flowed on the ground as through it were raining. . .

A Greek scholar recited the last minutes of the last Roman Emperor, Constantine XI, as he charged to fight the Muslim who had come in through an unlocked gate:

Although he clearly saw with his own eyes the danger that threatened the city, and had the opportunity to save himself- as well as many people encouraging him to do so- he refused, preferring to die with his country and his subjects. Indeed, he chose to die first, so that he might avoid the sight of the city being taken and of its inhabitants being either savagely slaughtered or shamefully led away into slavery.

After his 53 day siege, Mehmet [Turkish for Muhammad] II conquered Constantinople and marched directly to the Christians' Hagia Sophia cathedral and turned it into a mosque. . . . The cathedral's . . . were covered with whitewash and walls were covered with verses from the *Qur'an*. The uniquely shaped dome
was copied by Islamic architects and incorporated into the style for mosques around the world.  

**Expulsions of Islamic Moors from Andalusia Spain and Columbus 1492**

The capture of Constantinople by Sultan Mehmet II in 1453, effectively cut off the land trade routes from Western Europe to India and China - trade routes that had been used since before Marco Polo. Western Europe now sought alternative routes to India and China. In 1479, Spain's Kingdoms of Aragon and Castile were united by the marriage of Ferdinand and Isabella. Together, in 1492, they recaptured the last Muslim stronghold of Granada, forcing the Moorish King Abu'abd Allah Muhammad XII to surrender. Jihad Results in Columbus' Voyage

The jihad which conquered the Byzantine Empire and brought about the fall of Constantinople eventually led the Spanish monarchs to support Christopher Columbus on his voyage to reach India and China by sailing west.

Columbus thought the islands he discovered were around India, so he named the inhabitants "Indians." He thought Haiti was Japan and Cuba was the tip of China. Though it was not till his fourth voyage that he admitted he had not found the Far East, the fact is underscored that Columbus would have never set sail had it not been for Islamic jihad closing off European trade routes to the East.

In 1492, Columbus wrote to the King and Queen of Spain in his *Journal of the First Voyage* . . .

In the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ . . . [to ] King and Queen of the Spains . . . in this present year 1492, after Your Highnesses had made an end to the war with the Moors [Muslims] who ruled in Europe, and had concluded the war in the very great City of Granada,. . . I saw the Royal Standards of your Highnesses placed by force of arms on the towers of the Alhambra . . . And I saw the Moorish King come forth to the gates of the city and kiss the Royal Hands of Your Highnesses and . . . soon in that same month, through information that I had given to your Highnesses concerning the lands of India, and of a prince who is called Gran Can.

---

438 Federer, William J. *What Every American Needs to Know About the Qur'an* (St. Louis MO, Amerisearch, Inc. 2008) p. 119-121.
[Khan], how many times he and his predecessors had sent to Rome to seek doctors in our Holy Faith to instruct him therein, and that never had the Holy Father provided them. . . And your Highnesses, as Catholic Christians . . . devoted to the Holy Christian Faith and the propagators thereof, and enemies of the sect of Mahomet and of all idolatries and heresies, resolved to send me, Christopher Columbus, to the said regions of India, to see the said princes and peoples and lands. . . in which may be undertaken their conversion to our Holy Faith, And ordained that I should not go by land (the usual way) to the Orient, but by the route of the Occident [i.e. West], by which no one to this day knows for sure that anyone has gone. . .”

Discussion Questions:

1. What are the names of the six regions that became Islamic regions in this chapter?

2. Was the Mongolian culture compatible to the Islamic culture? Explain.

3. Summarize what the Qur’an has to say about jihad based on the passages sited in this chapter.

4. What did the Mongolians learn about blood ties or religion? Which is more powerful? Examples?

5. How did ego factor into the destruction of Baghdad in 1258?

6. How did immigration speed up the conversion of the Mongolians to Islam? What lessons are there for those who cherish the Judeo-Christian culture?

7. Who was Timur and how did his Islamic faith impact his relation with Muslims in Mongolia and in New Delhi?

8. What was different between the Arab Muslims treatment of Christian Pilgrims to the Holy Lands and the Seljuks treatment of Pilgrims? Consequences?

9. Describe the Ghulam, Mamluk and Janissaries systems of recruitment into the Islamic army? What do these systems tell you about Islam?

10. What two opposite perversions came out of the above systems?

11. According to Vincent A. Smith how pleasant is it to read about the Islamic rule of India during the Delhi Sultanate (1206-1506)?

12. K.S. Lal suggests that the Hindu population decreased by what number between 1,000 to 1525? This has prompted Will Durant to make what statement?

439 Ibid. p.121-123.
13. Why was India vulnerable to Islamic invasion? What did Jesus say in Luke 11:17 that we should take to heart? What did Benjamin Franklin do to press this point home during the American Revolution?

14. In general what could you say is true about the character of the Islamic rulers we studied? Did they appear to suffer from great bouts of guilt? Why?

15. In general, what was the treatment by Muslims of the religion of the Indians and their temples? Would this be different or the same for Christians?

16. How did the Sultans of Delhi and Saddam Hussein use similar methods in keeping their populations in under control?

17. How did the Muslims of Caffa and Saddam use similar methods in war? Did the Christians of Caffa spread the Black Death to Europe? Would some of the more radical Muslims like to use similar methods today?

18. What happened with Constantinople fell in May 29, 1453? Who failed to come to their aid? Consequences to the present?

19. What two factors led to the funding of Columbus' trip to the new world in 1492? According to Columbus journal what did he hope he could do for the Grand Khan of India and the people of India?

20. Vincent Smith gives us some other ideas to ponder about the Islamic conquest of northern India that have applications for the United States today. He writes, Islam in Indian Life. The permanent establishment of Muslims at Delhi and many other cities, combined with the steady growth of a settled resident Muslim population forming a ruling class in the midst of a vastly more numerous Hindu population, necessarily produced changes in India. The Muslim element increased continually in three ways, namely, by immigration from beyond the north-western frontier, by conversions, whether forcible or purchased, and by birth. We do not possess any statistics concerning the growth of the Muslim population in any of the three ways mentioned, but we know that it occurred in all the ways. It was impossible that the presence of a strange element so large should not bring about important modifications of Indian life. (emphasis mine)


b. From a Biblical perspective, is the probable change going to be in the right direction?

---

440 Vincent Smith p. 265.
c. Are there any truly free and warm hearted Islamic and Christian relationships being experience among the masses anywhere in the world today where there is a numerical equality?

d. In what way(s) is Islam growing in the United States? What is the fastest means of growth?

e. Were the important modifications of Indian life, under Islamic rule, positive or negative for India?

21. Smith also writes of the Strength of Muslim Religion in India, or, put another way, of Islam's ability to convert Hindus and resist assimilation into Hinduism. Remember he is writing this in 1958 about what transpired in India. Read it carefully and ask what are the lessons for the United States.

The Muslims were not absorbed into the Indian caste system of Hinduism as their foreign predecessors, the Sakas, Huns, and others, had been absorbed in the course of a generation or two. The definiteness of the religion of Islam, founded on a written revelation of known date, preserved its votaries from the fate which befell the adherents of Shamanism and the other vague religions in central Asia. . . they merged in the Hindu caste system with extraordinary rapidity, chiefly because they possess no religion sufficiently definite to protect them against the power of the Brahmans [i.e. Hindu religion]. The Muslim with his Quran and his Prophet was in a different position. He believed in his intelligible religion with all his heart, maintained against all comers the noble doctrine of the unity of God, and heartily despised the worshippers of many gods, with their idols and ceremonies. The Muslim settlers consequently regarded themselves, whether rich or poor, as a superior race, and ordinarily kept apart so far as possible from social contact with the idolaters. 441 (emphasis mine)

a. Why were the peoples from central Asia so rapidly assimilated into the Hindu religion?

b. Why did the Muslims not assimilate into the Hindu religion in a generation or two.

c. What was the attitude Muslims had toward the Hindus?

d. Are Muslims rapidly assimilating into the Christian religion?

e. What is the state of religion in the United States and the possible consequences of becoming a secular society?

441 Ibid. p. 266.
CHAPTER 9 THE OTTOMAN CALIPHATE (1517-1924)

The 1517-1924 dates for the Ottoman empire are a little artificial; it actually began much earlier with Osman I [Othman] (1281-1326), from whom the empire takes its name. As the Mongols, under Genghis Khan, began their invasion of Central Asia, several hundred families fled ahead of the Mongols to modern day Turkey. Osman [Othman] was only a child at the time; his father was pagan, but upon adulthood Osman [Othman] converted to Islam. Islam was suffering defeat elsewhere in the world. In Spain, Islam was being defeated at the hands of the Christian King, Saint Fernando III (1199-1252) who was leading the reconquering (i.e. the Reconquista) of Spain. Likewise, the Abbasid caliphate of Baghdad, Iraq, was being massacred by the Mongol, Hulegu, in 1258. Osman [Othman] was committed to using jihad to expand Islam.

442 "Ottoman historians often dwell on the prophetic significance of his name, which means "bone-breaker", signifying the powerful energy with which he and his followers appeared to show in the following centuries of conquest. . . . On the other hand, the name Osman is the Turkish variation of the Muslim name Othman, or Uthman. " Wikipedia, September 7, 2009, "Osman I, Origins Of Empire," http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Osman_I/ (accessed September 12).
Fregosi writes, "the star-and-crescent banners of the Jihad had nearly everywhere been furled; but in Turkey, Othman was to unfurl them again and launch a new and ever vaster expansion of Muslim imperialism through the Jihad." Halil Inalcik, Professor of Turkish History at the University of Ankara, wrote,

"Continuous Holy War was the fundamental principle of the[Ottoman] state… the ideal of gaza, [a Turkish term for] Holy War, was an important factor in the foundation and development of the Ottoman state … Gaza [Holy War] was a religious duty, inspiring every kind of enterprise and sacrifice."

This 1683 map marks the greatest extent of the Ottoman empire and demonstrates how effective the Ottoman jihad had been.

---

444 Ibid. p. 210-211.
Antony Bridge wrote, “The fact that endless wars waged against their various neighbors had been vastly enriching was regarded as proof of God’s approval, for plainly he would not have rewarded his servants so lavishly if he had not been pleased with their martial efforts on his behalf.”

Fergosi writes, "Within a century, Holy War was to penetrate and overwhelm most of southeastern Europe and transform it for centuries into the Land of Islam, the Dar-al-Islam [i.e. House of Islam].”

Walter Martin writes,

Eventually under the Ottoman Turks... Muslims went far into Europe, conquering Serbia (1459), Greece (1461), Bosnia (1463), Herzegovina, (1453), Montenegro (1499), parts of Hungary (1526-1547) and Poland (1676). Although there were wars with European countries in the interim, many countries did not regain their independence until the 1800s, Montenegro did not win independence until 1799, Serbia in 1817, Greece in 1821, and Bulgaria in 1878. Many middle Eastern areas held by the Turks were lost under Napoleon Bonaparte, and later held by the British

---

and French. Moreover, many modern Middle Eastern countries did not come into existence as we know them until [after WWI when the Ottoman empire was broken up c. 1924] the early twentieth century. Iraq became independent in 1921, Egypt in 1937, Lebanon in 1945, Syria in 1946, Jordan in 1946, [Israel in 1948] and Kuwait in 1961.449

Before leaving the question of continuous war waged by the Ottomans, the following list is interesting to reflect upon. The Ottomans waged 14 different wars with Russia as the list demonstrates. One wonders how the Ottomans had time or energy to fight any of the other wars mentioned above. It certainly speaks to the Turk's tenacity to wage war on behalf of Islam and the Ottoman Empire.

- Russo-Turkish War (1568–1570)
- Russo-Crimean War (1571)
- Russo-Turkish War (1676–1681)
- Russo-Turkish War (1686–1700)
- Russo-Turkish War (1710–1711)
- Russo-Turkish War (1735–1739)
- Russo-Turkish War (1768–1774)
- Russo-Turkish War (1787–1792)
- Russo-Turkish War (1806–1812)
- Russo-Turkish War (1828–1829)
- Russo-Turkish War (1853–1856) (Crimean War)
- Russo-Turkish War (1877–1878)
- Russo-Turkish War (1914–1918) (World War I)
- Turkish intervention (1918) (Russian Civil War)450

The Ottoman Caliphate of Islam was clearly not a peaceful religion over these four centuries. As a high school student, be mindful of this, for this reality is often glossed over. The New World Encyclopedia writes of the Ottomans and gives this overview of the different perspectives presented about the Ottoman Empire throughout its history.

449 Martin, p. 616.
The Ottoman Empire represents one of the largest imperial projects in human history, ruling vast territories in North Africa, the Balkans, and the Middle East over a period of some five centuries. During its history, it did much to sustain Islamic civilization. Outsiders and insiders have had different perceptions of the Ottoman Empire. Outsiders often viewed it as a threat; for insiders, including for much of the time non-Muslims, it represented stability and security. Towards the end of its existence outsiders saw it as decadent and corrupt. Even though it had embarked on a process of democratization that process had been sabotaged by the Young Turks.451

How can Europeans, or anyone else not committed to Islamic world conquest, hold any other perspective than to see the Ottoman Empire as a threat to Western Civilization? Europe survived this life and death struggle only at great personal cost. The preservation of Islamic culture is not the highest good. The oppression and deaths of literally hundreds of thousands of non-Muslims at the bloody hands of fundamentalist jihadist should not be glossed over. The end does not justify the means.

As Europe fought to defend itself against the Ottoman aggressions, the Protestant reformers rightly viewed the Ottoman Turks as a military threat. “Luther [1483-1546] saw the Turks (as they were then called) as God’s rods of chastisement, whose god was equal to the devil and whose so-called holy book was both foul and shameful. “452 John Calvin (1509-1564) “…for his part, likened the Turks to his more immediate enemies the Papists, attributing to both the evils of gross deception.”453 Christians in the Middle Ages also had a very low opinion of Muhammad. John Esposito writes disapprovingly of comments like these. Note that Esposito is the head of Georgetown University's Center For Muslim-Christian Understanding and the recipient of a $20,000,000 gift from the

452 Esposito. p. 323-324
453 Ibid. p. 324.
Saudis. He writes,

Muhammad was almost universally thought of among Christians as a man of depravity, dishonor, falsehood, and illicit power. In addition, he was seen as a sexual libertine, demonstrated most specifically by the well-known facts of his own multiple marriages and the details of his (that is, the Quran's) description of the pleasures of the gardens of paradise, which was seen by the West as both material and carnal. Such rewards promised to the faithful were convincing proof to the Christians that Islam was a religion utterly devoid of spirituality. . . . They saw him as having presented throughout his life a prime example of sensuality, violence and immorality, an example that guaranteed that his followers would demonstrate those same unfortunate qualities. Christians' opinions about the Prophet and his religion had as their starting point the conviction of the depravity of Muhammad, but this never stopped them from analyzing whatever elements of the faith were familiar to them and pronouncing them to be further proof of the absolute inadequacy of Islam as a religion. In western eyes, the other primary offense of the Prophet Muhammad and his followers was the advocacy of force and violence. This moved from the realm of simple analysis of the life and teachings of the founder of Islam to the actual experiences that Christians had . . . Muslims invading their lands and profaning their churches. Such violence was seen as a natural outgrowth of the Saracen terror that was associated with Arab lands as a legacy for the warring tribes of the Old Testament. It was at once projected upon Islam and expected of it, fostered in the awareness that Muslims understood the world to be divided into what they termed "the abode of Islam" and which is not Muslim, namely "the abode of war."

What is curious is that Esposito does not seem to share the concern of the Reformers nor appreciate the actual threat Islam was to the West, both then and now? Nevertheless, as a student of Islam you must prepare yourself for positively responding to those who share Esposito's perspective. Attempting to awaken their concern without seeming to be hateful and intolerant can be challenging.

William J. Federer, in his book *What Every American Needs to Know about the Qur'an: A History of Islam & the United States*, has listed a number of historic encounters between Islam and Western Civilization during the Ottoman Empire. The ability to give examples of four hundred years of violence can be a means to demonstrate

\[454\] Ibid.
Islam was not a peaceful religion over these centuries. Each one of these conflicts can only be touched upon and deserve further study.

In 1521, the capital of Hungary, Belgrade, one of the most important cities in Europe, was captured by the Muslim Ottoman army of Suleiman the Magnificent. Much of the city was destroyed. Muslims burned churches and desecrated Christian shrines. Thousands of Christians had to flee their homes to escape death and dhimmitude.\(^455\)

In 1529, Vienna experienced its first siege, being surrounded by Ottoman troops. Had Vienna fallen, Muslims would have flooded into Western Europe. Suleiman the Magnificent used methods that seem familiar to what is going on today.

Suleiman... with an army of 120,000 laid siege to Vienna, Austria. [Providentially] Torrential rains caused 10,000 supply camels to slip in the mud and break their legs. Unsuccessful in sending suicide bombers at the gates and tunneling under the walls, Suleiman beheaded 4,000 Christian hostages and left.\(^456\)

The 1571 Battle of Lepanto should be included among the most important battles ever fought against Islam. The Battle of Lepanto,\(^457\) was fought in close proximity to the ancient city of Corinth.

The Ottoman Muslim fleet had over 30,000 sailors,

\(^{455}\) Federer p. 150
\(^{456}\) Ibid. p. 134.
including 2,500 Janissaries,\textsuperscript{458} in 230 galleys and 56 galliots. It was led by Ali Pasha, who served under Sultan Selim the Drunkard (1524-1574), the son of Suleiman the Magnificent who was notorious for his debauchery.\textsuperscript{459} (p. 135)

Federer describes the battle as follows,

The five-hour battle, which was the last major sea battle in world history solely between rowing vessels, cost the Holy League 12 galleys and 13,000 men, but freed about 15,000 Christian galley-slaves from the Muslim ships. The Ottomans lost 25,000 soldiers and 200 ships. In fact, the Ottomans lost all but 30 of their ships. With Ali Pasha killed, it was a crushing defeat for the Muslims, who had not lost a major naval battle since the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{460}

Had the battle ended in the Muslim's favor, there would have been no Christian navy to prevent Muslim ships from raiding all up and down the Mediterranean coast. The victory at Lepanto was a decisive battle, demonstrating the vulnerability of Islam.

In 1566-1603, Mehmed III became the Ottoman Sultan. As other rulers had done before him, he ordered that his sixteen brothers be strangled. This is interesting in its own right but it demonstrates the complete ruthlessness of this Islamic Ottoman ruler in achieving his goals.

He [Mehmed III] raised an army of 60,000 and in 1596 conquered the Hungarian city of Erlau. Mehmed III defeated the Austrian Habsburg and Transylvanian forces at the Battle of Mezokeresztes.\textsuperscript{461}

In 1601, a 21 year old named John Smith, the same John Smith who made his mark in 1607 in Jamestown, Virginia, joined the Austrian army to fight in the "Long War" against the Muslim Ottomans in Hungary. Smith distinguished himself as a man of military skill and courage. He is credited with devising makeshift catapult bombs in earthen pots filled with gunpowder, musket shot and covered with pitch. These catapult bombs proved
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effective in dispersing the attacking Muslims. After Smith had been fighting the Muslims for two years, Federer conveys a heroic incident in Smith's military career.

Muslims had captured the city of Regall, located in a pass between Hungary and Transylvania, "the Turks having ornamented the walls with Christian heads when they captured the fortress." . . . During a lull in the fighting, the bashaw (officer) of the Turks put out a challenge for a "David and Goliath" style contest. The 23-year-old John Smith was chosen to fight. He defeated the bashaw, cutting off his head. To avenge the bashaw's death, another soldier challenged Smith and also lost his head. This happened a third time . . . Prince Sigismund Bathory conferred on John Smith a shield-of-arms with "three Turks' heads."  

In 1602, Smith was defending Wallachia against an invading Ottoman Army. The Westerners lost the battle. Smith was wounded and left for dead on the battlefield. As pillagers were going through the pockets of the unconscious Smith, it was discovered he was not dead. He would have been immediately finished off but for his attire which reflected wealth. Consequently, Smith was nursed back to health to be ransomed at some future date. In the mean time, Smith was sold into slavery and dhimmitude. Smith was chained by the neck with nineteen others and marched to Constantinople to be sold in the market. His new master Tymor Bashaw,
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stripped Smith naked, shaved him bald, riveted an iron ring around his neck, clothed him in goat skins and as slave of slaves, was given only goat entrails to eat. Following a beating while he was thrashing in a field, Smith seized the opportunity and killed his master. He hid his body in the straw, put on his master's clothes took a bag of grain and rode off toward Russia. After 16 days he reached a Muscovite garrison on the River Don, where the iron ring was removed from his neck.\footnote{Ibid. p. 143.}

Smith also fought Muslim Barbary pirates in the Mediterranean Sea until 1605 when he returned to England. In 1606, Captain John Smith set sail to help found Jamestown Virginia, the first permanent English colony in North America.\footnote{Ibid. p. 144.} In 1620 Pilgrims heading for Virginia were blown off course and settled in Plymouth, Massachusetts.

In 1625, five years after the Pilgrims had landed at Plymouth Rock, they were finally in a position to begin repaying the investors who made their trip to America possible. The Pilgrims loaded a small ship with corfish and some 800 pounds of beaver and other furs which were then towed across the Atlantic. In the English Channel, the small ship was allowed to finish the journey to England on its own, believing it was out of danger. "But even there she was unhappily taken by a Turkish man-of-war and carried off to Saller [Morocco], where the captain and crew were made slaves and many of the beaver skins were sold for 4d. a piece."\footnote{Ibid.}

The Pilgrims' experience, at the hands of Muslims, was not unusual. Barbary Muslim pirates of North Africa were routinely sailing up the English Channel seeking targets of opportunity. Federer writes, "By 1640, hundreds of English ships and over 3,000 British subjects were enslaved in Algiers and 1,500 in Tunis. In three centuries, over a million Europeans were enslaved by Muslim Barbary Pirates."\footnote{Ibid. p. 146.}
This problem of Islamic piracy, which has been apparently ignored in modern times, recently garnered national attention when on April 8-13, 2009 the Maersk tanker was captured by Muslim Somalia pirates from Mogadishu. The ship was captained and crewed by Americans. The captain bravely gave himself as a hostage and remained in the pirate's hands until military snipers dispatched the kidnappers in a precision strike. It was surprising to learn that there were actually 293 Islamic pirate attacks in 2008 and between 40 -150 million dollars paid to ransom the ships, cargos and crews.\textsuperscript{468} Since 9/11/01 all attacks should be made public knowledge so Americans are informed about the danger of Islamic piracy. Americans need to be informed in order to make sensible policies.

As we move back to the historic encounters with Islam, we learn in 1683, the Ottomans
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commenced the Second Siege of Vienna.

In 1683, Mustafa led 138,000 Muslim Ottoman Turks to surround Vienna, Austria, defended by only 11,000 Hapsburg soldiers. Sultan Mehmed IV sent a message to Austrian King Leopold I: "Await us in your residence...so we can decapitate you." For two months, the attackers starved Vienna's defenders. The Polish King, Jan Sobieski, left his country undefended and led a coalition of 81,000 Polish-Austrian-German forces to Vienna's rescue on September 11, 1683. In a surprise move at five o'clock in the afternoon, September 12, Jan Sobieski charged directly into the Muslim army. . . The Turkish battle line suddenly broke and Turks scattered in confusion. [Amazingly] Approximately thirty minutes after the battle began, Sobieski as the "Savior of Western European civilization" and a statue of Jan Sobieski stands in Gdansk, Poland. This battle was the last major effort of the Muslims to conquer Western Europe, ending the continuous 300-year invasion. 470

As we continue examining Islamic aggression, we return to conflict with the United States. We read of Islamic piracy against the West. Piracy is often overlooked by history books and in modern times by the news media. The United States had to deal with this threat early in their history.

For centuries, Muslim Ottoman pirates of Tripoli, Tunis, Morocco and Algiers—countries along the North African Barbary Coast, attacked and enslaved thousands of Europeans . . . England and France . . . arranged to pay the Muslim Barbary Pirates an annual tribute, equivalent to millions of dollars, to bribe Muslims to leave their countries' ships alone. American vessels were considered protected by British tribute until the conclusion of the Revolutionary War in 1783. . . Finally, the Muslim Barbary Pirates insisted the United States pay its own tribute. In 1784 Jefferson and Adams . . . were directed by Congress to negotiate a tribute of $80,000 borrowed from Dutch bankers. In 1785, Muslims of Algiers captured two American ships and held their crews as prisoners, demanding $60,000 in ransom. Muslims ransoms varied from $300 for seaman to $1,000 for a captain. 471
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Adams and Jefferson asked an ambassador from Tripoli, "On what grounds these outrageous acts of unbridled savagery could be justified?"\textsuperscript{473} The ambassador gave an answer as old as Muhammad. We would do well to reflect upon it. Nothing has changed in the minds of many Muslims.

The ambassador answered . . . that it was founded on the laws of the prophet, that it was written in their Qur'an, that all nations who should not have acknowledged their [Islam's] authority were sinners, that it was their right and duty to make war upon them wherever they could be found, and to make slaves of all they could take as prisoners.\textsuperscript{474}

But there was a change in policy coming,

When Thomas Jefferson became US President in 1801, he had had interactions with rulers of the Barbary States of North Africa for at least fifteen years, first as Ambassador to France and then as Secretary of State to President George Washington. He and Congress were fed up with what they considered outrageous blackmail. The slogan of the day became: “Millions for defense, not a penny for tribute.”\textsuperscript{475}
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Jefferson's position was different than Adam's. "This was a change in tenor from President John Adams who declared in 1787: "We ought not to fight them at all, unless we determine to fight them forever."\textsuperscript{476} John Adams was correct. We will have to fight, or at least be on guard against the growth of Islam forever. Islam is only willing to make peace when it is to their tactical advantage. Unfortunately, many mistakenly feel today that Islam is a peaceful religion only taken over by radicals. But Islam, in its core teachings, will always generate radical fundamentalists because of the clear teachings of the Qur'an and radical Imams that challenge them to do so.

Jefferson also gave John Paul Jones, (Father of the American Navy) permission to fight against the Ottoman navy on behalf of Russia's Catherine the Great in 1787-1792 during the 2nd Russo-Turkish War.\textsuperscript{477} The 1796-1797 Treaty of Tripoli, Article 11, is often cited by those who seek to deny the United States' Christian heritage. On the web site named after the agnostic Stephen J. Gould, one can read of the "Treaty Of Peace And Friendship Between The United States And The Bey And The Subjects Of Tripoli And Barbary,"

\textbf{Art. 11.} As the Government of the United States of America is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion[; punctuation added by Gould site] as it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion, or tranquillity, of Mussulmen; and, as the said [United] States never entered into any war, or act of hostility against any Mahometan nation, it is declared by the parties, that no pretext arising from religious opinions, shall ever produce an interruption of the harmony existing between the two countries.\textsuperscript{478}

Superficially, this sounds like a repudiation of Christianity, but nothing could be
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further from the truth. David Barton of Wallbuilders has given a more thorough response than can be given here. But a brief comment should suffice. This quote is usually credited to George Washington (1789-1797). Washington never saw this treaty nor signed the treaty. It did not arrive until months after Washington left office. It was signed by John Adams (1797-1801) who sought to avoid conflict with the Muslims, recognizing that war with Islam once begun would never truly cease. Barton writes,

Recall that while the Founders themselves openly described America as a Christian nation . . . they did include a [1st Amendment] constitutional prohibition against a federal establishment [of religion]; religion was a matter left solely to the individual States [9 of 13 states had official supported Christian churches]. Therefore, if the article is read as a declaration that the federal government of the United States was not in any sense founded on the Christian religion, such a statement is not a repudiation of the fact that America was considered a Christian nation.

Remember also that this treaty, signed by Adams, was an attempt to appease the Islamic Barbary pirates of North Africa. These Islamic terrorists were hijacking boats and holding the crew and passengers for ransom. The United States did not have a navy at this time and was forced to appease these pirates to protect its ships and people. This policy based upon appeasement did not work then or now.

The First Amendment was the very first inducement to get these thirteen independent colonies or states to submit to a Federal government. In this first amendment the people of the thirteen colonies were promised freedom of religion from the Federal government. The First Amendment reads in part, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof . . .” Similes suggested for the word religion were words like denomination or religious sect. Nine of the original


thirteen colonies\textsuperscript{481} had state supported denominations and religious sects that they insisted on protecting.\textsuperscript{482} The new federal government was not to be allowed to establish and require obedience to a particular denomination or religion, like done in Islamic countries or Catholic countries. This was the original intent of the first amendment. Regrettably, in recent years, it has turned out that secular, left leaning courts have been the branch of government which has attempted to establish a humanistic or multiculturalist religion in place of the historic Judeo-Christian religion. John Adams would not have agreed with this idea. The second President of the United States, while seeking to avoid conflict with Islam, conveyed his view of religion in a personal letter to Jefferson.

The general principles on which the fathers achieved independence were. . . . the general principles of Christianity. . . . I will avow that I then believed, and now believe, that those general principles of Christianity are as eternal and immutable as the existence and attributes of God; and that those principles of liberty are as unalterable as human nature.\textsuperscript{483}

On July 1, 1798 Napoleon invaded Ottoman Egypt, breaking the French treaty with the Ottomans. Napoleon sought to manipulate the Muslims with deception.\textsuperscript{484}

In a letter to a sheikh in August 1798, Napoleon wrote, "I hope...I shall be able to unite all the wise and educated men of all the countries and establish a uniform regime based on the principles of the Quran which alone are true and which alone can lead men to happiness." However, Bonaparte's secretary Bourienne wrote that his employer had no serious interest in Islam or any other religion beyond their
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political value.\textsuperscript{485}

The very first wars the United States were involved in, after becoming a nation, were wars with Muslims in North African. Muslims attacked American ships, took hostages, and demanded tribute. When the United States refused to pay, they declared war. The wars are called, the First Barbary War, 1801-1805, and the Second Barbary War, 1812-1826.

In 1801, the year Jefferson became President, the Muslim Barbary Pirates demanded $225,000 plus an annual tribute of $25,000. When Jefferson refused, the Pasha (Lord) of Tripoli declared war. This was the first war the United States was in after becoming a nation. . . Eventually, President Jefferson sent the Marines to capture Tripoli in 1803. This forced the Muslim Pasha to stop his terrorist attacks, giving rise to the Marine Anthem: \textit{From the Halls of Montezuma [Mexico] to the shores of Tripoli [i.e. North Africa]}. . \textsuperscript{486}

The Muslims signed a treaty, but soon broke it (just as Muhammad had done with the city of Mecca in 630), thus necessitating a second Barbary war.

In 1830, the fifth President of the United States, John Quincy Adams (1825-1829), son of John Adams, published his \textit{Essays on the Turks}. J.Q. Adams's \textit{Essays on the Turks} are no longer in print but they are apparently accessible in some libraries. Andrew G. Bostom acquired a copy, and quoting a number of scholars, who also read the Essays, wrote an article entitled, \textit{John Quincy Adams Knew Jihad}. Bostom's analysis and Adam's observations are right on.

John Quincy Adams possessed a remarkably clear, uncompromised understanding of the permanent Islamic institutions of \textit{jihad} war and \textit{dhimmitude}. Regarding \textit{jihad}, Adams states in his essay series,

\textquotedblleft...he [Muhammad] declared undistinguishing and exterminating war, as a part of his religion, against all the rest of mankind...The precept of the Koran is, perpetual
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war against all who deny, that Mahomet is the prophet of God.” . . . And Adams captured the essential condition imposed upon the non-Muslim *dhimmi* “tributaries” subjugated by *jihad*, with this laconic statement,

“The vanquished may purchase their lives, by the payment of tribute.” . . .

*Adams on Jesus Christ and Christianity, Relative to Muhammad and Islam*

"And he [Jesus] declared . . . His whole law was resolvable into the precept of love; peace on earth – good will toward man…The first conquest of the religion of Jesus, was over the unsocial passions of his disciples. . . . [pp. 267-268]

[In Contrast J.Q. Adams writes of Muhammad]

“In the seventh century of the Christian era, a wandering Arab of the lineage of Hagar [i.e., Muhammad], the Egyptian, combining the powers of transcendent genius, with the preternatural energy of a fanatic, and the fraudulent spirit of an impostor, proclaimed himself as a messenger from Heaven, and spread desolation and delusion over an extensive portion of the earth. Adopting from the sublime conception of the Mosaic Law, the doctrine of one omnipotent God; he connected indissolubly with it, the audacious falsehood, that he was himself his prophet and apostle. Adopting from the new Revelation of Jesus, the faith and hope of immortal life, and of future retribution, he humbled it to the dust by adapting all the rewards and sanctions of his religion to the gratification of the sexual passion. He poisoned the sources of human felicity at the fountain, by degrading the condition of the female sex, and the allowance of polygamy; and he declared undistinguishing and exterminating war, as a part of his religion, against all the rest of mankind. THE ESSENCE OF HIS DOCTRINE WAS VIOLENCE AND LUST: TO EXALT THE BRUTAL OVER THE SPIRITUAL PART OF HUMAN NATURE (Adam's capital letters)….Between these two religions, thus contrasted in their characters, a war of twelve hundred years has already raged. The war is yet flagrant…While the merciless and dissolute dogmas of the false prophet shall furnish motives to human action, there can never be peace upon earth, and good will towards men.” 487

Unfortunately, the last days of the Ottoman Empire tragically illustrate J.Q. Adams sentiments. The Ottomans did not go out with a whimper, but with a multitude of shrieks.

The last three-quarters of the 19th century were littered with brutal sporadic local massacres of Jews and Christians culminating in the Armenian Genocide of Christians (1915-1917). Bat Ye'or quotes multitudes of authors and officials all across the Islamic

---

world demonstrating Islam's arrogance and cruelty towards Jews and Christians during these years. Ye'or quotes C. Wilson from 1836 who writes,

The Mussulmans [of Syria-Palestine] whatever may be said of the diminution of their fanaticism, deeply deplored the loss of that sort of superiority which they all and individually exercised over and against the other sects. Pride, selfishness, and ignorance, may be said to be the characteristics of a Mussulman; and from the bottom of his heart he believes and maintains that a Christian, and still more so a Jew, is an inferior being to himself.  

The Ottomans were pressured to grant some tolerance to Jews and Christians and did so on paper in edicts called the Hatti Shereef of Gulhaneh on November 3, 1839 and the Hatt-i-Humayoon [Humayun] on February 18, 1856. The Ottomans only did this under extreme pressure from European powers. The Islamic peoples generally ignored such declarations. James Finn, Consul of Jerusalem (1845-1862), had this to say about such declarations of tolerance,

A few words must be said on the subject of religious equality before the law in Turkey. . . the Koran code with its commentaries . . . are deeply engraved in the hearts and customs of their adherents, are undoubtedly adverse in principle to such notions of equality, and cannot be made to fall into harmony with them. How can unbelievers be put on an equality with believers in theory or in practice? Consequently, the Hatti Shereef of Gulhaneh, in . . . 1839. . ., and that charter were only accepted by the bigoted part of the Moslem population as temporary regulations of the Turks, in their mistaken system dictated by the exacting Europeans. The same of course with the still greater document, the [February 18,] Hatt-i-Humayoon [Humayun] of 1856.

Christians in Nablus, a city thirty-nine miles north of Jerusalem, were persecuted by an Islamic population that was enraged by the 1856 decree of tolerance. Protestants wrote to the Ottoman Caliph and ask for his intervention.

The humble petition of the Protestants of Nablous. . . Since the issue of the Hatt-i Humayun, [Feb. 1856] declaring religious liberty, the Mohammedans of Nablous
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have been filled with rage against the Christians, insulting his Majesty the Sultan, and crying "No obedience to a creature, who causes disobedience to the Creator [i.e. Allah] . . . Allah Akbar! God is great! Oh religion of Mohammed, attack the Christians. . ."  

The Ottoman loss of the Russo-Turkish War 1877-78 made Muslims even more angry.

The success of Imperial Russia in the Russo-Turkish War, 1877-78, and the ensuing Treaty of San Stefano meant that the Ottoman government had to give away a large part of territory (including the cities of Kars and Batumi) to the Russians. The Russian government claimed they were the supporters of the beleaguered Christian communities within the Ottoman Empire and clearly, the Russians could now beat the Ottomans.

According to British historian A. J. P. Taylor, "If the treaty of San Stefano had been maintained, both the Ottoman Empire and Austria-Hungary might have survived to the present day." Both of these empires brought about their own downfall by their oppressive and aggressive policies, and by joining with the Germans in WWI (1914-1918). Both empires were broken up shortly after the conclusion of that bloody war.

The Treaty of Berlin (June 13-July 13, 1878), on paper, promised hope of some protection for Jews and Christians, but that is where it remained, on paper. The Treaty of Berlin stated that the Ottoman government had to give legal protection to the Christian Armenians, but in the real world, the treaty's protections were not implemented.

Six years after the treaty, the Sultan of Morocco, North Africa, in September of 1884, felt like he had to make an edict forbidding the persecution of the Jews at Damnat, Morocco. The prohibitions told of the treatment Jews were receiving during this Ottoman period. Muslims were asked to stop:

1. Forcing them [Jews] to work on the days that their religion requires them to rest.
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2. Employing them in the cleaning of latrines;
3. Compelling them to carry heavy loads;
4. Forcing them to work without wages;
5. Forcing their wives to work without their husbands' consent;
6. Forcing them to sell their merchandise at half its value; ... 494

The list has seventeen prohibitions in total but these few illustrate the nature of the abuses well.

Twelve years after the treaty, in 1890, the Shah of Persia [i.e. Iran] had a long list of oppressive policies to which Jews were forced to submit. These policies could have their ideological roots traced back to the Pact of Umar (634-644) and the cradle of Islamic civilization. As has been alluded to in earlier chapters, Ye'or documents laws like this have been part of a number Islamic cultures throughout its history. This list of policies is both ridiculous and shameful but what might be expected to come to Europe if they permit Sharia law to be instituted in their nations.

1. The Jews are forbidden to leave their houses when it rains or snows [to prevent the impurity of the Jews being transmitted to the Shiite Muslims].
2. Jewish women are obliged to expose their faces in public [like prostitutes].
4. The men must not wear fine clothes.
5. They [i.e. Jewish men] are forbidden to wear matching shoes.
6. Every Jew is obliged to wear a piece of red cloth on his chest.
7. A Jew must never overtake a Muslim on a public street.
8. He is forbidden to talk loudly to a Muslim.
9. A Jewish creditor of a Muslim must claim his debt in a quavering and respectful manner.
10. If a Muslim insults a Jew, the latter must drop his head and remain silent.
11. A Jew who buys meat must wrap and conceal it carefully from Muslims.
12. It is forbidden [for Jews] to build fine edifices.
13. It is forbidden for him to have a house higher than that of his Muslim neighbor.
14. Neither must he [i.e. a Jew] use plaster for white-washing.
15. The entrance of his [i.e. a Jew's] must be low.
16. The Jew cannot put on his coat; he must be satisfied to carry it rolled under his
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arm.
17. It is forbidden for him [i.e. a Jew] to cut his beard, or even to trim it slightly with scissors.
18. It is forbidden for Jews to leave the town or enjoy the fresh air of the countryside.
19. It is forbidden for Jewish doctors to ride on horseback [this right was generally forbidden to all non-Muslims, except doctors].
20. A Jew suspected of drinking spirits must not appear in the street; if he does, he should be put to death immediately.
21. [Jewish] Weddings must be celebrated in the greatest secrecy.
22. Jews must not consume good fruit (1:377).

Europeans, like the Italians, tried to protect the Jews but the Muslim authorities viewed this contemptuously. One Jew in Marrakesh, Morocco wrote of his experience there in 1894.

The Caid [i.e. in North Africa a judge or senior official] mounted their tent today. . . and had summoned the Jews in order to collect from them the poll tax (jizya), which they are obliged to pay the sultan. They had me summoned also. I first inquired whether those who were European-protected subjects had to pay this tax. Having learned that a great many of them had already paid it, I wished to do likewise. After having remitted the amount of the tax to the two officials, I received from the cadi's guard two blows in the back of the neck. Addressing the . . . cadi, I said: "Know that I am an Italian protected subject."

whereupon the cadi said to his guard:
"Remove the kerchief covering his head and strike him strongly he can then go and complain wherever he wants." The guard hastily obeyed and struck me once again more violently. These public mistreatments of an European-protected subject demonstrate to all the Arabs that they can, without punishment, mistreat the [European-protected] Jews. 497
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Bat Ye’or documents hundreds of examples of abuse from around the Islamic world placed upon the dhimmi population. Certainly, the dhimmi would not say that Islam is a religion of peace. Neither would the Armenian Christians who suffered terribly at the hands of the Ottomans. They suffered acutely at the hands of the Bloody Sultan Abdul Hamid II\(^\text{498}\) in 1894-96 and again in 1909. Worse still the Armenian Christians suffered at the genocide commenced against them by the Young Turks in 1915-17. Amadinejad of Iran has been in the news much recently for denying the Jewish Holocaust. This Armenian Genocide, until perhaps recently, is hardly even mentioned and still continues to be denied by Turkey. Most United States students are not even aware that it occurred. Armenians, along with the rest of Europe and the world, suffered most severely in WWI, 1914-1918. Abdul Hamid II was the Ottoman Sultan who made this choice to join with the Central Powers, Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Bulgaria against the West.

Hamid II was “the 34th sultan of the Ottoman Empire. He oversaw a period of decline in the power and extent of the [Ottoman] Empire, ruling from 31 August 1876 until he was deposed on 27 April 1909.”\(^\text{499}\) The Young Turk Revolution of 1908 reversed the suspension of the Ottoman parliament by Sultan Abdul Hamid II, marking the onset of the Second Constitutional Era.\(^\text{500}\)

The combination of Russian military success, clear weakening of Ottoman power, and hope that one day all of the Armenian territory might be ruled by Russia led to a new restiveness on the part of the Armenians still living inside the Ottoman Empire. Added to this was the fact that the Ottomans never applied justice evenly in disputes between Christians and Muslims . . . Starting around 1890 the Armenians began clamoring to obtain the protections promised them at Berlin [i.e. in The Treaty of


Sultan Abdul Hamid’s and the Ottoman’s reaction to these righteous desires was exactly the opposite of what the Armenians desired. But his response was in line with the strict understanding of the Qur’an, the Hadith and Islamic tradition. What followed were,

The Turkish massacres of Armenians in 1894, 1895, 1896, and 1909... In the following months, systematic pogroms swept over every district of Turkish Armenia. The slaughter of between 100,000 and 200,000 Armenians, forced conversion of scores of villages, the looting and burning of hundreds of settlements, and the coerced flight into exile of thousands of Armenians became Abdul-Hamid’s actual response to European meddling.”

In some descriptions, the numbers are even higher and give more details.

The Hamidian massacres, . . . of 1894-1896, refers to the massacring of Armenians . . . with estimates of the dead ranging from 80,000 to 300,000, and at least 50,000 orphans as a result. The massacres are named for Abdul Hamid II, whose efforts to reinforce the territorial integrity of the embattled Ottoman Empire reasserted Pan-Islamism [i.e. unity of all Islam under one Caliph] as a state ideology. Abdul Hamid [saw himself as a victim and] believed that the woes of the Ottoman Empire stemmed from "the endless persecutions and hostilities of the Christian world." He perceived the Ottoman Armenians to be an extension of foreign hostility, a means by which Europe could "get at our most vital places and tear out our very guts.”

Hamid and the Ottomans did not report the truth as to the nature of these massacres.

After George Hepworth, a preeminent journalist of the late 19th century, traveled through Ottoman Armenia in 1897, he wrote Through Armenia on Horseback, which discusses the causes and effects of the recent massacres. In one chapter Hepworth describes the disparity between the reality of the Massacre in Bitlis and the official reports that were sent to the Porte [i.e. Ottoman Government or the gate of Foreign Ministry]. After retelling the Turkish version of events, which places the blame solely on the Armenians of Bitlis, Hepworth writes:

"... It is a most remarkable story, and the discrepancies are as thick as leaves in
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Valambrosa. On the face of it, it cannot be true, and before a jury it would hardly have any weight as evidence. It is extremely important, however, because it is probably a fair representation of the occurrences of the last few years. That it is a misrepresentation, so much so that it can fairly be called fabrication, becomes clear when you look at it a second time... and yet it is from an official document which the future historian will read when he wishes to compile the facts concerning those massacres.\(^{504}\)

Nevertheless, the truth got out about the massacres. One author wrote, "However, this occurred in the 1890s, at a time when the telegraph could spread news around the world and when the European powers were vastly more powerful than the weakening Ottoman state."\(^{505}\)

Consequently, President Grover Cleveland was asked to weigh in on the Hamidian Armenian Massacres. On December 11, 1894 the "Senate [requests] the President communicate information of alleged cruelties committed upon Armenians in Turkey, and especially whether any such cruelties have been committed . . . upon persons because of their being Christians."\(^{506}\) On December 7, 1896, two years later, Cleveland was still referencing this act of brutality in his Eighth Annual Message,

It would afford me satisfaction if I could assure the Congress that the disturbed condition in Asiatic Turkey had during the past year assumed a less hideous and bloody aspect and that, either as a consequence of the awakening of the Turkish Government to the demands of humane civilization or as the result of decisive action on the part of the great nations having the right by treaty to interfere for the protection of those exposed to the rage of mad bigotry and cruel fanaticism, . . . had been mitigated. Instead, . . . we have been afflicted by continued and not infrequent reports of the wanton destruction of homes and the bloody butchery of men, women, and children, made martyrs to their profession of Christian faith. . . . A number of Armenian refugees having arrived at our ports. . . It is hoped that hereafter no obstacle will . . . prevent the escape of all those who seek to avoid the perils which threaten them in Turkish dominions. . . . I do not believe that the present somber prospect in Turkey will be long permitted to offend the sight of Christendom. . . . It so mars the humane and enlightened civilization . . . it seems hardly possible that the

---
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earnest demand of good people throughout the Christian world for its corrective treatment will remain unanswered.\(^{507}\)

Hamid II was overthrown by the *Young Turks* in 1908. The Armenian Christians hoped that circumstances for them would now improve. Unfortunately, the Hamidian massacre was only the warm up act to the *Armenian Holocaust* or *Genocide* of 1915-1917 at the hands of the Muslims of Turkey.

The Armenian Genocide—also known as the Armenian Holocaust . . . refers to the forced mass evacuation and related deaths of . . . over a million Armenians, during the government of the Young Turks from 1915 to 1917 in the Ottoman Empire. . . . the Turkish government and several international historians deny that it was genocide, claiming that the deaths among the Armenians were the result of inter-ethnic strife and turmoil during World War I and not of a state-sponsored plan of mass extermination. Turkish law has criminalized describing the event as genocide, while French law criminalizes not stating that it was a genocide. Most Armenians, Russians, and West Europeans believe that the massacres were a case of genocide. Western commentators point to the sheer scale of the death toll. The event is also said to be the second-most studied case of genocide, and often draws comparison with the Holocaust. To date about 21 countries, . . . have officially described it as genocide.\(^{508}\)

Federer provides insight into the Young Turk Revolution. The revolution was lead by Mehmed Talat Pasha, Ismail Enver, and Ahmed Dmemal. He writes,

There was an initial joy by the Armenians thinking that the terrors of Sultan Abdul Hamid were over, but the greatest horrors were just beginning. . . . The Three Pashas. . . began promoting the idea of a homogeneous Turkish state of one race and one belief. They decided to expel or exterminate non-Muslim, non-Turkish ethnic groups, specifically the Greek and Armenian Christians. This set an example followed thirty years later by Adolph Hitler's Nazi military who decided to expel or exterminate non-Aryan ethnic groups, specifically the Jews. . . . The new "constitutional" government of the Young Turks became immensely more abusive and brutal than the Sultan's. The Young Turks organized systematic genocidal massacres of hundreds of thousands of Greek and Armenian Christians.\(^{509}\)

Everyone owes it to themselves to go on line and view the documentary *Genocide of* 

\(^{507}\) Ibid.  
\(^{508}\) http://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Armenian_Genocide (accessed Sept. 9, 2009)  
\(^{509}\) Federer p. 176-177.
When I purchased a copy from the Oregon Public Broadcasting company, they directed me not to show this to high school students. One can understand, due to the brutality described in this program, this would and should be disturbing to youth. The Armenians had lived in this land for more than 2,000 years and were nearly wiped off the face of the earth. Their story needs to be told for their sake and for ours. One wonders if a documentary on the Jewish Holocaust at the hands of the Nazis would be discouraged from being viewed. Perhaps not, for Nazis are not currently threats. But the reason this program needs to be viewed is that the threat of fundamentalist Islam is real, continuing even to this present day. The same Islamic theology that permitted and promoted the Armenian genocide at the beginning of this past century is the same theology promoting an anti-Christian jihad theology in our day.

Additionally, Israel is currently facing threats by Iran's Amadinejad threatening the same type of Holocaust against them. Your generation will need to make a number of difficult decisions and you need to be given all the information necessary to make the best decision possible. This generation will have to be aware of how violent Islam can be.

---
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Federer continues to describe the genocide,

The Armenians were the first targeted for genocide because they had no international state which would rush to their aid, as the Greeks in Turkey had the country of Greece. Armenian men, women and children were marched into the desert without water until they dropped and died. Armenians were thrown off cliffs, drowned or burned alive. . . During this period, over 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children were killed, as were another 1 million Greeks and members of other ethnic groups, such as Albanians. 511

Henry Morgenthau, American Ambassador at Constantinople from 1913-1916 wrote, "I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this."512 Certainly one has to go back to the killing fields of India to match this type of slaughter from jihadist Islam. President Woodrow Wilson sought to come to the aid of the Armenians in a number of ways. He wanted to make them a protectorate like Puerto Rico, Guam, and Virgin Islands. President Wilson, a scholar with an earned Ph.D., and himself a Christian, makes his appeal to the Congress on Christian grounds.

I am conscious that I am urging upon the Congress a very critical choice, but I make the suggestion in the confidence that I am speaking in the spirit and in accordance with the wishes of the greatest of the Christian peoples. The sympathy for Armenia among our people has sprung from untainted consciences, pure Christian faith, and an earnest desire to see Christian people succored [i.e. to help or relieve]513 in their time of suffering, and lifted from their abject subjection and distress and enable to stand upon their feet and take their place among the free nations of the world. 514

Unfortunately, the Republican Congress was in an isolationist mood after WWI; Congress did not come to the aid of the Armenians. 515 This did not sit well with Teddy Roosevelt. On November 24, 1915, President Teddy Roosevelt writes a letter expressing his outrage at this decision.

________________________
511 Federer. p. 178.
512 Ibid.
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I trust that all Americans worthy of the name feel their deepest indignation and keenest sympathy aroused by the dreadful Armenian atrocities. I trust that they feel . . . and realize that a peace obtained without . . . righting the wrongs of the Armenians would be worse than any war. I trust they realize that unless America prepares to defend itself she can perform no duty to others and under such circumstances she earns only derision if she prattle about forming a league for world peace. . . . Let us realize that the words of the weakling and the coward, of the pacifist and the poltroon [i.e. dastardly, spiritless, lazy, couch bed, coward] are worthless to stop wrongdoing. Wrongdoing will only be stopped by men who are brave as well as just, who put honor above safety, who are true to a lofty ideal or duty, who prepare in advance to make their strength effective, and who shrink from no hazard, not even the final hazard of war, if necessary in order to serve the great cause of righteousness. When our people take this stand, we shall also be able effectively to take a stand in international matters which shall prevent such cataclysms of wrong as have been witnessed in . . . Armenia.

Roosevelt added a year later in his book,

Armenians, have been subjected to wrongs far greater than any that have been committed since the close of the Napoleonic Wars . . . Genghis Khan and Tamerlane in Asia. Yet this government has not raised its hand to do anything to help the people who were wronged or to antagonize the oppressors. . . . Individuals and nations who preach the doctrine of milk and water invariably have in them a softness of fiber which means that they fear to antagonize those who preach and practice the doctrine of blood and iron. . . . These professional pacifists, through President Wilson have force this country into a path of shame and dishonor during the past eighteen months. Thanks to President Wilson, the most powerful of democratic nations has refused to recognize the binding moral force of international public law. Our country has shirked its clear duty.

Roosevelt had an accurate historical perspective of the threat Islam had posed to Western Civilization in the past. He also understood that the freedom of Western Civilization has in the past hung or turned on a single battle. Roosevelt also described what happened to cultures that do not remain vigilant. His observations are as true today as they were when he first made them.

515 Federer p. 179.
518 Ibid. p.112-114.
The civilization of Europe, America, and Australia exists today at all only because of the victories of civilized man over the enemies of civilization, because of victories stretching through the centuries from . . . Charles Martel in the eighth century and those of John Sobieski in the seventeenth century. During the thousand years that included the careers of the Frankish soldier and the Polish king, the Christians of Asia and Africa proved unable to wage successful war with the Moslem conquerors and in consequence Christianity practically vanished from the two continents. . . (No intelligent man desires war. But neither can any intelligent man who is willing to think fail to realize that we live in a great and free country only because our forefathers were willing to wage war rather than accept the peace that spells destruction.) No nation can permanently retain any "social values" worth having unless it develops the warlike strength necessary for its own defense. 519

Will Christians speak out today as Roosevelt did in his day?

519 Ibid. p.70-71, 75.
This brings us to World War I and the years 1914-1918. The Central Powers of Germany, Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire joined forces and sought to defeat the Allied Powers of Britain, France, the United States and others. Estimates vary, but somewhere around 37 million soldiers and civilians died in this War to End all Wars. The point is that the Ottomans, when given a choice, joined the enemies of Western Civilization. This would have been very natural for them, for the Ottomans had been in one state of jihad or struggle against the West ever since their inception. The most significant consequence that came out of the Ottoman defeat in WWI was the breakup of their empire into separate nations under the guidance of European powers.

http://www3.eou.edu/hist06/WorldWarImap.html (accessed September 20, 2009)
The Partitioning of the Ottoman Empire was a political event that occurred after World War I. The huge conglomeration of territories and peoples formerly ruled by the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire was divided into several new nations.

The partitioning was planned from the early days of the war. . . After the occupation of Istanbul by British and French troops in November, 1918, the Ottoman government collapsed completely and signed the Treaty of Sèvres in 1920.

In spite of Roosevelt's criticism, President Wilson had not given up upon his attempt to help the Armenians. Wilson thought that the Treaty of Sevres would protect the Armenians and strongly promoted it. Unfortunately, Wilson was wrong.

After Congress rejected the League of Nation's "Mandate for Armenia" President Wilson continued trying to help the Armenians by negotiating the Treaty of Sevres in which the international community of nations was to pressure Turkey to stop the killings, disarm and recognize the right of Armenia to exist. . . The last major
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endeavor before he died, President Woodrow Wilson's *Treaty of Sevres*, August 10, 1920, was intended to provide protection for Armenians without United States involvement. It was to be the crowning effort toward his goal of world peace. The defiant Muslim leader Ataturk realized that the western powers no longer had the political resolve to intervene in what appeared to the west to be a civil war. Ataturk simply ignored the Treaty of Sevres.\textsuperscript{523}

On July 24, 1923, Ataturk signed the Treaty of Lausanne. The treaty gave him control of Anatolia and East Thrace, and the Republic of Turkey gained international recognition as the successor state of the defunct Ottoman Empire.\textsuperscript{525} Unfortunately, it appears there are some today who no longer have the political resolve to stand up against radical Islam and are seeking to appease them, forgetting the lessons of history. Some Americans grasp at straws hoping for better things which will never materialize.

The Ottoman Empire was dissolved after World War I. It had been allied with Germany and had been defeated. By the Treaty of Sevres (1920), all non-Turkish
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possessions of the empire were surrendered, and parts of Turkish homeland itself (in Thrace and Anatolia were ceded to Greece. The break-up of the empire and the harsh provisions of the treaty rallied the people to a nationalist movement led by Mustafa Kemal, a Turkish army commander. In 1920 he called for the election of a new National Assembly. Elections were held; Sultan Mohammed VI was declared deposed; and a provisional government was formed, with Kemal as president. The assembly conferred on him the surname Ataturk, "Father of the Turks." 

Because of Ataturk's repulsion with fundamentalist Islam, some in the West were optimistic of what lay ahead. Andrew Mango gives an example of this false optimism when he wrote a biography about Ataturk. Daniel Pipes reviewed his book and commends this comment by Mango.

Atatürk's message is that East and West can meet on the ground of universal secular values and mutual respect, that nationalism is compatible with peace, that human reason is the only true guide in life. It is an optimistic message and its validity will always be in doubt. But it is an ideal that commands respect.

Based on these words, it is easy to understand why many Westerners might well have looked favorably upon the rise of Ataturk. Ataturk sounds almost reasonable here.

Turkey is now looked upon as one of the more moderate nations as a result of his reforms. As has been noted earlier, Ataturk, even though he was raised Muslim, voiced his unqualified contempt of Muhammad. He also reversed a number of oppressive Islamic sharia laws.

The Republic of Turkey was proclaimed in 1923, with Kemal Ataturk as its first president. Far-reaching political, social, and economic reforms were put into effect. Ataturk abolished the sultanate and later exiled all Ottoman heirs. He did away with old traditions associated with the empire-men could no longer wear the fez (a hat), nor women the veil. Women were given political and civil rights equal to those of men. Church [i.e. mosque] and state were separated, and the property of the mosques nationalized. Universal education and a new law code were introduced.

---
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When many of these changes were not accepted by the people, Ataturk assumed unlimited dictatorial powers.\(^{529}\)

Ataturk did away with the Islamic Caliphate, something that has earned for the Turks great enmity to this day among fundamentalist Muslims who seek to have it restored in the hopes of unifying Islam and potentially enacting a worldwide jihad. Ergun Caner conveys the gist of a graphic phone message he received after returning from one of his numerous speaking engagements regarding Islam. The call reflects this anger. "You dirty Turks are not even real Muslims. You are an embarrassment to us and will fill hell."\(^ {530}\) Caner refutes these charges with the following.

Were the accusations valid? Some Muslims hold bitter resentment against Turkish Muslims. Turkey enraged world Muslims after World War I when Mustafa Kemal Ataturk (1881-1938) abolished the caliphate. Muslims saw the once monolithic voice of Islam silenced by a man they considered a renegade. Many Muslims believe they have a valid grudge against Turkey.

This is not to say that Turkey has been a peaceful state. Our proud people must live with the shame that we slaughtered millions of Armenian Christians, Kurds, and Cossacks. However, we dispute the charge that the Turkish people somehow are inferior in their Islamic faith. Turkey has tens of millions of faithful Muslims, who attend the mosque devoutly. Until we accepted Christ as Savior, we were among them.\(^ {531}\)

Ataturk progressively removed the authority of Islam from the necks of the Turkish people and in, "1928 - Turkey is declared a secular state on 10 April. Islam is dropped as the state's official religion."\(^ {532}\) From an Islamic fundamentalists' perspective Ataturk additionally added these sins.

In 1928 the government decreed that the Arabic script be replaced by a modified Latin alphabet, which was easier to learn and teach and made publishing much easier. All citizens from six to 40 years of age were made to attend school and learn

\(^{530}\) Ergun Caner, More than a Prophet, p. 260.  
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the new alphabet. The Turkish language was "purified" by the removal of many Arabic and Persian words and their replacement by new Turkish ones.

Visual representation of human forms was banned during Ottoman times following the Islamic faith. Kemal opened new schools to teach art to boys and girls. Atatürk also lifted the Islamic ban on alcohol: he had a great appreciation for the national liquor, raki, and consumed vast quantities of it. In 1934 he required all Turks to adopt western style surnames.

Atatürk was still generally popular with the mass of the Turkish people when he died in 1938 of complications due to cirrhosis of the liver, a consequence of his heavy drinking and tiring studies over many years.533

In spite of all these anti-fundamentalist Islamic reforms, Atatürk was not favorably disposed towards Jews or Christians; he was truly a militant secularist. This is a lesson or warning Westerners should take to heart about the rise of secular humanism in the West.

While Atatürk's policies initially seemed to be an improvement over radical Islam in many ways, his policies were nevertheless brutal against the Christians in Smyrna, Asia Minor beginning on September 13, 1922. George Horton wrote of this four day Armenian massacre in Smyrna:

Many Armenians and Greeks were killed when the Turkish army reoccupied Smyrna. . . Dobkin's . . . cites the estimate of the U.S. Consul at Smyrna that up to 100,000 people may have perished. Falih Rifki Atay, who was also a close confidant of Atatürk, was more direct when he wrote: "Why were we burning Izmir? Were we afraid that we would not be delivering ourselves from the (sway) of the minorities [i.e. Armenian Christians] in case the mansions, hotels, and cafes were left to remain? Driven by the same fear we put to the torch all the inhabitable quarters and neighborhoods of the Anatolian cities and towns during the World War I Armenian deportations."

U.S. consul-general, George Horton, was an eyewitness to this massacre. He took many pictures of the burning city and wrote his account of it in his book, *The Blight of Asia.*

According to James L. Marketos, Horton wanted his book to make four main points. **First,** he wanted to illustrate that the catastrophic events in Smyrna were merely “the closing act in a consistent program of exterminating Christianity throughout the length and breadth of the old Byzantine Empire.” **Second,** he wanted to establish that the Smyrna fire was started by regular Turkish army troops with, as he put it “fixed purpose, with system, and with painstaking minute details.” **Third,** he wanted to emphasize that the Allied Powers shamefully elevated their selfish political and economic interests over the plight of the beleaguered Christian populations of Asia Minor, thereby allowing the Smyrna catastrophe to unfold without any effective resistance and, as he said, “without even a word of protest by any civilized government.” And **fourth,** he wanted to illustrate that pious western Christians were deluded in thinking they were making missionary headway in the Muslim world. 535

The dissolution of the Ottoman empire by the West and the secularization of Turkey brings us to the conclusion of this chapter. But an analysis of this material shows that Islam again has demonstrated a consistent propensity for bloody conflict with non-Muslims. This, as in the past, was not committed by a small group of radicals but was part of the very essence of Islamic theology. Islamic growth is not based on the power of ideas but the power of the sword. **Jihadic** growth of Islam began with Muhammad himself and continues to the present. This is not **hate speech** but merely a reflection of what is found in history.

As our study enters *Islam in the 20th Century,* it is apparent that the pattern continues to the present day. All the false, misdirected accusations as to who is to blame for the current tensions, once seen


in historic context, clearly demonstrates that Islam itself is to blame. The blame and attacks on the nation of Israel have nothing to do with Israel being a unique target. Israel is merely a current target. Since 1948 Israel has literally experienced thousands of attacks\(^{536}\) and yet many in the European and United States' media do not seem to take notice. The existence of Israel helps Islamicists shift the blame and responsibility from themselves to others for their aggression. The media is too often a willing accomplice in this.

The same is true for the animosity of some Muslims toward the United States. If Israel and the United States did not exist, fundamentalists would have their eyes on any nation that was not yet subdued or in submission to Islam. Islam plans to rule the world as the placards clearly demonstrate.\(^{537}\) What we see today is the way Islam has always been and parts of Islam always will be. Again, this does not mean Christians should be in pitched battles with Islamic peoples seeking to exterminate them. Rather, our goal at this point should be twofold. First, we should restore, conserve and preserve America's and other nations' Christian foundation which is under attack by both secularists and multiculturalists. Second, Christians should seek to press and express our love for the Muslim people by
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seeking to introduce them to the real God who so loved the world. This is the best way to
rid the world of terrorists. Christians need to be willing to put forth a concerted effort to
equip the Christian Community to evangelize Muslims. At the very least, Christians need
to alert the West to the threat of radical Islam. Naiveté, ignorance, and glossing over the
genuine threat Islam poses to the West will not be good for us nor for them regarding
their eternal state. Profound differences in theology, history and culture exist. Islam can
be forced to tolerate other religions, when they are in a weakened or vulnerable state or, if
more liberal Islamic theologians can water down the intended meanings of the passages
in the Qur'an that call for jihad. But history shows this is merely a temporary state of
coexistence. As the saying goes, "Oil and water do not truly mix no matter how fast you
stir." This may sound a bit pessimistic, but it is also true. If Western civilization desires
peace, at least internally, (which we should) we should be careful to discourage the
growth, especially by immigration, and encourage the assimilation of the Islamic
population. In the immediate future, neither of these two considerations seems to be
likely. Even proposing such an idea makes one suspect of being a racist or a religious
 bigot. Currently, Islamic population in the United States is estimated to be within
3,000,000 to 11,000,000.

Even now there have been a number of Islamic attacks since 9/11 that had limited
death tolls or been foiled. The most recent attack was at Fort Hood Army Base in Texas.
A Muslim-American psychiatrist killed 13 people. It was well documented what his
intent was in his action. But because of our "politically correct" climate, he had not been
removed from the army where this tragedy occurred. As efforts continue to be made to
encourage the press, schools and politicians to accept the Islamization of the United
States, youth, including yourself, need to be prepared to emotionally and intellectually resist such pressure. This issue of dealing with radical Islam is one that we will take a closer look at in the next chapter.

Discussion Questions:

1. How was the Ottoman empire able to grow from a small speck of land in the 1300's to the enormous empire it became?

2. What did Turkish history professor Halil Inalcik say about the Ottomans?

3. Antony Bridge described the Ottoman perspective about these wars. What was it?

4. What did Walter Martin list for us? Significance?

5. How did the Ottomans get along with Russia and why is this a wonder?

6. *The New World Encyclopedia* described two perceptions of the Ottoman Empire. Which view do you hold? Why?

7. What was Martin Luther's (1483-1546) and John Calvin's (1509-1564) view of Islam?

8. In general, what are most Christian's view of Muhammad and Islam? Who disapproved of this view and why may his objectivity be questioned?

9. Describe what happened on each of these dates: 1521, 1529, and 1571.

10. Summarize the exploits of John Smith and describe his shield-of-arms.


12. What happened in 1683 and what role did Jan Sobieski play? How did coffee and the crescent-shaped pastry enter into this event?

13. Why is the Parthenon missing its roof?

14. How did the Muslims view the Europeans sailing in the Mediterranean Sea and what was the Islamic ambassadors justification for this action?

15. What does the Treaty of Tripoli 1796-97 not show?

16. Compare and contrast John Adam's and Thomas Jefferson's views on dealing with North Africa and Islam?
17. What was the original intent of the 1st Amendment and how has this changed?

18. Who was America's first war against in 1801-1805 and how does this war make its way into an anthem?

19. What was President John Quincy Adam's (1825-1829) assessment of Islam. Be specific.

20. The Ottomans were pressured by the Europeans to give the Christian Armenians fairer treatment. They signed two edicts stating they would. What are the names of the edicts and the dates they were issued. How effective were the edicts?


22. In contrast to the above what did the Shah of Persia require from the Jews in 1890?

23. In 1894 how did a Jew get treated in Morocco after he let it be known that he was under the protection of the Italians?

24. Who was the Sultan Abdul Hamid II and what was his policy toward the Armenian Christians in 1894, 1895, 1896, 1909? What was popularly reported about this?

25. What was President Grover Cleveland asked to do by the Senate on December 11, 1894?

26. How did the Young Turk Revolution of 1908 affect the policy toward the Armenian Christians?

27. What does every Christian owe it to themselves to watch? Why?

28. What do modern Muslims in Turkey and Iran teach about the Armenian Genocide and the Jewish Holocaust?

29. What was the President's desire for Armenia? What was the Republican Congress's attitude? What was President Teddy Roosevelt's attitude?

30. What was Teddy Roosevelt's observations about Western civilizations and why they still exist today? Who does he credit for this?

31. When given the chance what side did the Ottomans take in W.W. I.? Why do you think they made the choice they did?

32. How effective was Wilson and the Treaty of Sevres in protecting the Armenians?
33. What did Ataturk realize about the Western Powers in his day? Are Islamic leaders realizing the same think today? Explain or illustrate.

34. Was the coming to power of a true secularist like Ataturk good for the Christian Armenians? Will American Christians benefit from a true secularist President, Courts and Congress?

35. What four main points did Horton want to make in his book and what are their applications for us in the United States and Western Civilization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horton's Main Point?</th>
<th>Possible Applications for today?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1. Are tensions today with Islam a closing act or an opening act? Explain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2. Are the attacks being made truly being done by a fringe group of Muslims who have highjacked a peaceful religion? Defend your opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3. Did the Allied powers of Europe and the United States show courage when given the chance to come to the aid of the Armenian Christians? Explain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4. Many in the West think that appeasement will bring about peace with Islam. Are we, in your opinion, truly making headway with the moderates and radicals of Islam?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. What do the placards say about the attitudes of some Muslims?

37. Is the existence of Israel and the United State's support of them the real issue driving the tension with the Islamic world today? How does the media feed this perception?

38. Is there a sensible position for Christians to hold between the extremes of gullible naivété and hate speech?
39. What should Christians seek to conserve and preserve in America?

40. What is the best way to get rid of a Muslim terrorist?
CHAPTER 10 ISLAM IN THE 20TH CENTURY (1924-2000)

The 20th Century opens up with Islam suffering a political setback, but it ends with the reemergence of Islamic fundamentalism being felt worldwide. The defeat of the Ottomans brought about several problems for Islam. First, the office of the Caliph, the theoretical leader of the entire Islamic world who had a similar role as the pope for Catholics, was dissolved by the secular Ataturk of Turkey. Since that time, radical Muslims have desired to have this office restored. If a caliph ever did arise and unify the entire billion plus Muslim population to war against the West, this would lead to a war unlike the world has ever seen.

Second, the defeat of the Ottoman Empire, and the subsequent break up, gave the Islamic world a major defeat in prestige and power from which they are just now fully recovering. In fact they are on the verge of becoming bellicose again. In the 1920’s, after the break-up at the hands of the European powers, Islam was fragmented into new nation
states. Europeans took on the challenge of attempting to build up these former Turkish
countries. European nations had become protectorates for former Islamic countries. The
goal of the European countries was to encourage these lands to become independent
nations similar to those in Europe and move these former Turkish lands into the modern
age. For example, England had become the protector of Israel and in 1917 had issued the
_Balfour Declaration_. France was the protector of Lebanon and it is often said the French
made "Beirut the Paris of the Middle East." Beirut stayed that way until after a sufficient
number of Muslims had immigrated to Lebanon. Then there was a call by Muslims for a
_jihad_ in Lebanon. A bloody civil war ensued between Muslims seeking to take control of
Lebanon and the Maronite Christians who resisted.

Third, as the world was approaching WWII, Europe and England were encouraged by
the words of comfort from the Prime Minister of England. In 1938, Neville Chamberlain
returned from a visit with Herr Hitler and assured Europe that there would be "peace in
our time." History shows these words were completely false. Likewise, we often hear
that Islam is a religion of peace. The Qur'an, the Hadith and history proves this to be
completely false. Perhaps, because of the Ottoman defeat in WWI, Islam could not
necessarily play a major role in WWII. Nevertheless, Muslims in Jerusalem, like Nazis
in Germany, continued to be bitter enemies with the Jewish people. The Mufti of
Jerusalem and Hitler developed a friendship and they both conspired to kill Jews.
Fundamentalist Muslims, like Amadinjad of Iran, have continued to be enemies of Israel
to the present day. Most do not know that the Mufti of Jerusalem had his own Nazi-like
storm troopers modeled after Hitler’s.

The Islamic Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin al-Husseini, was the notorious Nazi who
mixed Nazi propaganda and Islam. He was wanted for war crimes in Bosnia and
Yugoslavia. His mix of militant propagandizing Islam was an inspiration for both Yasser Arafat and Saddam Hussein: He was also a close relative of Yasser Arafat and grandfather of the current Temple Mount Mufti. The picture shows the Islamic Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin al-Husseini, comfortably talking about the “final solution” with Hitler.

After WWII, the British followed through on their professed goal, expressed in their 1917 Balfour Declaration, of aiding Israel in becoming an independent, democratic and free nation. This declaration affirmed British support for the idea that Israel should be permitted to return to their ancient ancestral homeland and become an independent nation again. Jews had always lived in Israel but they had been an occupied people, out of power politically, for two millennium. Nearly two-thousand years earlier, Romans had grown intolerant of the Jews. Rome’s oppressive policies toward Jews led to a series of three Jewish wars, the first Jewish War, A.D. 66-73, led to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 and Masada in A.D. 73. The second war was the Kitos War (115–117) in North Africa and the last Jewish-Roman war was in A.D. 132-136 called the Bar Kochba Revolt. Consequently, in A.D. 135, Emperor Hadrian arbitrarily decided to disband Israel, disperse the Jews (i.e. Diaspora) and changed Israel’s name to Palestine.

time in history the people living in the land we know as Israel were called *Palestinians*.

The *Balfour Declaration* was a declaration of the intended reversal of the extinction of the nation of Israel. This declaration gave the Jewish residents of Israel and around the world great hope and excitement. The letter and decree reads as follows.

"Foreign Office,
November 2nd, 1917

Dear Lord Rothschild,

I have much pleasure in conveying to you, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations which has been submitted to, and approved by, the Cabinet

'His Majesty's government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.'

Isaiah the prophet, writing around 700 B.C., had asked, "Can a nation be born in a day (66:8)?" The answer to the question was given in the affirmative when on May 14, 1948, the United Nations, sympathetic with the survivors of the Jewish Holocaust at the hands of the Nazis, voted to give back to the historic Israeli people some of their ancient homeland. This brought great joy to Jews and Christians but great grief to Muslims. Israel was attacked by Jordon, Lebanon, Iraq, Egypt, and Syria the very next day.

Iran's hard-line President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said that if Germany and Austria feel responsible for massacring Jews during World War II, a state of Israel should be established on their soil. Ahmadinejad, who sparked an international outcry in October when he said Israel "must be wiped off the map," also repeated his view.

Thursday that the Jewish state was a "tumour."541

Since May 15, 1948 to the present, Israel continued to survive naked Islamic aggression against, what would appear to be, overwhelming odds. Nevertheless, Israel miraculously survived two more major Islamic invasions, on June 5-10, 1967, *The Six Day War*, and again on October 16-26, 1973, *The Yom Kippur War*. Today, Israel still lives with the threat of rocket attacks across the wall from the Islamic Gaza Strip. Because of the vast numbers of suicide bombers sneaking across the borders and attacking Israel's soft targets (buses, markets, etc.), Israel has been forced to extraordinary security measures to keep their people safe. One measure is the extended interview process for anyone desiring to fly to Israel. Another is the wall Israel has built, forcing all visitors to walk through a bomb detection device. The fence is not an attempt to keep people in but to keep uninvited people out. Such measures has greatly curtailed the number of attacks on Israeli busses. The United States has considered such a policy on the southern border, but the political will is not currently present.

These attacks on Israel are in spite of the fact that the Palestinians could be absorbed in the fifty-six Islamic nations. If nothing else, the unwillingness to make peace with Israel proves the intolerance of Islam. The Islamic world's begrudging refusal to permit this tiny bit of rocky ground to this persecuted people demonstrates the degree and depth of intolerance the Islamic world has to others. We in the West ignore this lesson, to our own peril.

Fourth, the protectorate system brought Western culture into the archaic Islamic

---

world exposing the primitive culture of modern Islam with the amazing technology of the West. Muslim fundamentalists felt challenged by this, while other Muslims, like the Shah of Iran, embraced it. In 1979 the Shah was removed by Fundamentalists.

As was the original intended plan, the European nations have all granted independence to the Muslim nations. But the Fundamentalist Muslims have sought to wipe out many cultural advances of tolerance made by the Europeans. Eventually, due to the instigation of radical Islam, Europe found it was too expensive to stay in the Islamic world. This seems to be a giant step backward into the Middle Ages. John L. Esposito sees this differently.

Esposito, the editor of a massive reference book with many different pro-Islamic contributors, wrote chapter fifteen and entitled it, *Contemporary Islam: Reformation or Revolution?* Esposito evidently presumes fundamentalist Islam can be reformed, but he never really describes what reformed Islam will look like. Esposito optimistically begins his article by stating,

The twentieth century has been one of the most dynamic, explosive, and innovative in Islamic history. Within a span of a few centuries Muslim societies have …[become]…a global community not only of Muslim-majority communities in Africa, the Middle East, and Asia but also of significant Muslim-minority communities in Europe and the United States.  

Esposito seems to be happy about Islam overcoming the odds. He writes,

At every stage the predictable has proven unpredictable: mighty European colonial powers were overthrown, artificially drawn nation-states emerged and engaged in nation building, … the desert Gulf sheikhdoms discovered oil … secular presuppositions and expectations of modernization theory were swept aside by an Islamic tide that seemed to come out of nowhere and challenged much of the Muslim world, from North Africa to Southeast Asia to the West.  

\[542\] Ibid. p. 643.  
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Esposito continues speaking in glowing terms, “The history of contemporary Islam is a story of challenge and response, tension and conflict…creativity and renaissance, retreat and advancement…reformation and revolution.”544 Continuing his discussion of the twentieth century he writes,

It [the twentieth century] has been dominated by two major struggles: the first, the wars of independence at the turn of the twentieth century, when much of the Muslim world struggled to free itself from dominion by European powers; and the second, the latter half of the century, the internal battle over religion-cultural identity and integrity associated with contemporary Islamic revivalism and the reassertion of Islam into public life. 545

Another way of understanding this quote would be that Europe began to see just how deeply Islam was entrenched in its violent ways. They had hoped they could bring Muslims into the modern world, even though they were kicking and screaming all the way. Muslims, nevertheless, stubbornly refused to become civilized, at least from a Western or Christian perspective. The cost to the Europeans became too great and they shook the dust off their feet and have left them to their own devices. While Esposito may see this as a victory, this reviewer sees it as a global tragedy. One might suggest the United States is currently in a similar situation in Afghanistan and Iraq. The purpose in entering the land was to arrest Osama bin Laden, the master mind of the 9/11 attack. The brutal Taliban refused to surrender him to face his charges. After multiple warnings, the United States attacked. Next, the United States felt there was some unfinished business with the “Butcher of Baghdad.” Saddam had used chemical weapons of mass destruction on Kurdish villages. Many military strategists feared he might sell them or use them on Americans, or possibly he had in his possession some nuclear weapons. This did not
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apparently prove to be the case, but he refused to allow investigators to confirm that. During the 2009 presidential election campaign, Obama promised to begin pulling the troops out of Iraq within sixty-days of taking office. He argued that American troops should not be in Iraq, that the real war should be in Afghanistan. With major conflict in Iraq settled, conflict flared up in Afghanistan. As this is being written, President Obama is weighing the idea of accepting or refusing to commit forty-thousand more troops to Afghanistan as his generals have recommended. Some have described Obama's inaction as "dithering." Obama has since been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. As this paper has taken some time to comprise, Obama has decided to send thirty thousand troops for a surge in Afghanistan. A couple of my former students stopped by the house yesterday and one of them will be a part of that surge. Our young men and women need us to daily lift them up in prayer. They are doing a noble work. At the same time, Obama has set a time for beginning withdrawal from this conflict in the next eighteen months. Some commentator reported of this decision that if we had heard from Osama that in eighteen months they would pull out and stop the jihad, would we not regard this as great news. If in eighteen months we pull out as Obama has indicated, would the Muslims have won militarily or politically? Obviously, they would have only won a political victory. But this action would be felt all across the Muslim world. Jihadists would now argue that they had defeated the United States. We have done a lot of pulling out the last few decades. Karl Rove argued that to pull out would send a message to all the moderate Muslim regimes that America is not a reliable ally. The cost of conflict with Islamic radicals, for some, has become too high. What will be the cost for pulling out both to the United

States and to the people of Afghanistan and Iraq? What will jihadists really have won? They will have won the freedom to return to the brutality of their past. Esposito quite honestly must not believe in the God of the Bible or he could not write the way he does. How can anyone rejoice in the growth of an oppressive ideology? Only a liberal or a Muslim could see this as a victory. John 3:19 seems to apply here, “This is the verdict: Light has come into the world, but men loved darkness instead of light because their deeds were evil.”

Esposito spends a few pages listing his apparent heroes of the Islamic faith. For example, Jamal al-Din al-Afghani who believed, “Muslims could repel European colonialism not by ignoring or rejecting the sources of its strength—science and technology—but by reclaiming and reappropriating reason, science and technology.”

Esposito, believes the answer for Islam today is to read and interpret the Qur’an like Amad Khan does. “Amad Khan was quick to distinguish between literal and metaphorical or allegorical meanings of the Qur’an. He called for a critical reassessment of the hadith (prophetic traditions), challenging their historicity and authenticity.”

Likewise, Muhamd Iqbal (1877-1938) the poet-philosopher commented on the condition of the Islamic community from the 1500s-1900s.

“Iqbal…judged the condition as one of five centuries “dogmatic slumber” as a result of the blind following of tradition, and he called for the “reconstruction” of religious thought to revitalize the Muslim community….Iqbal believed that Muslims must once again reassert their right to reinterpret and reapply Islam to changing social conditions….Moreover, modernists were vulnerable to criticism that their reforms often resulted in a redefinition of Islam in light of western criteria and therefore amounted to a westernization or Europeanization of Islam. …Thus, Islamic modernists introduced and reinforced a change-oriented mind-set that rejected the blind following of tradition and accepted the necessity as well as the
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legitimacy of reinterpretation.  

Most words have regular meanings. When words are used unambiguously, taken in context, they determine their plain meaning. Esposito and Muslims cannot honestly reinterpret the central meaning of Muhammad’s Qur’an. Muhammad (allegedly Allah) said what he meant, over and over. Muhammad was a violent man in word and deed. This is why allegorizers will never be able to solve the Islamic problem, no matter how hard they work. The only honest solution is to expose the fact that Muhammad was not a prophet of God. This is why Islamic fundamentalists have the upper hand as they require their followers to memorize and meditate on the Qur’an. The more of the Qur’an impressionable minds memorize, the more support they have for jihad. John Walker Lindh is a perfect example of this. Lindh grew up in a nominal religious home. His mom had converted to Buddhism. Lindh, the American Taliban, told the FBI that at age 12 he first became interested in Islam after seeing the movie Malcom X. At age 16, in 1997, Lindh became a Muslim. In the years that followed he traveled to Yemen and Pakistan where he learned Arabic and memorized all 6, 151 verses of the Qur'an. He swore allegiance to jihad. When the Americans found him, he was fighting with the Taliban in Afghanistan. Since his capture, he has apparently had a change of heart being converted to the allegorical interpretation of the Qur'an.

He apologized for fighting alongside the Taliban, saying, "had I realized then what I know now ... I would never would have joined them." The 21-year-old said Osama bin Laden is against Islam and that he "never understood jihad to mean anti-American or terrorism."

In a plea agreement Lindh was sentenced to twenty years in prison. 
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Esposito speaks in perfectly glowing terms about two other young Islamic men, Hasan al-Banna in Egypt and Mawdudin in India. He writes, “Two remarkable individuals established major Islamic movements in the Middle East and South Asia during this period [i.e. 1930s-40s].” Al-Banna helped create the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood and Mawdudin created Jamaat—Islami. They shared these values in common.

Both the Muslim Brotherhood and the Jamaat shared a common ideological worldview: First, was the belief that Islam was a comprehensive way of life and that the union of religion and the state...was the God-ordained Islamic ideal. Second, the separation of religion and politics, a Western secular artifact adopted by Muslim societies, was the cause of Muslim decline. Third, restoration of the unity and autonomy of Muslim societies required a return to “true Islam” and thus implementation of the shariah, the blueprint for Islamic society. Finally, this Islamic revolution was the required struggle of all true Muslims.

It is safe to say that many Westerners do not feel these two men are remarkable. If these groups are not terrorist groups, they have ties to terrorist organizations. Some may not care that these men think what they think, but we are forced to care when these men seek to implement their view by carnage. Their own governments did not see them as remarkable and they took decisive action.

Al-Banna was assassinated by Muslims in Egypt in 1949. Muslim brotherhood leaders who...espoused a more militant revolutionary path were executed, imprisoned, or driven underground...[by]...Gamal Abdel Nasser (1918-70)…Abul Ala Mawdudi was condemned to death...

While fundamentalists were fighting with moderate Muslims in Egypt and India, it was in 1979, in Iran, where they initially had their greatest success. Muslim students
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overran an American embassy in Iran and held American hostages for 444 days. This occurred during Jimmy Carter’s administration. The Ayatollah called Carter, the “Great Satan.” Esposito uncritically describes what an inspiring effect Carter’s weak American administration had on the entire Islamic world and the fear it caused the West.

In many ways the Iranian revolution of 1978-80 was the defining moment that signaled and symbolized for many the contemporary resurgence of Islam…Led by the Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini (1900-89)…subsequent events reinforced fears of a militant radical Islamic resurgence, popularly referred to as “Islamic fundamentalism.”

Khomeini’s government wanted to export this revolution. In their constitution they wrote that their goal was, “to perpetuate the revolution both at home and abroad.” Islamic fundamentalists caused conflict elsewhere as well. Libya was taken over by Muammar Qaddafi and Sudan by Jafar Numayri in the late 1960s. Dr. Hasan Turabi continued his rule in Sudan and has been involved in the torture and execution of Christians in Darfur, Sudan.

Russia invaded Afghanistan in 1979, and with the fighting of the muhajadin and the financial and military support from the United States, the Soviets found the war too costly and eventually pulled out in 1989. Esposito writes,

After almost eighteen years of civil war in Afghanistan, a seemingly endless state of carnage and chaos was abruptly reversed. As if out of nowhere, a band of students (Taliban) from the madrasas (colleges whose primary purpose is the teaching of Islamic laws and related subjects) appeared in late 1994 and within two years swept across the country…Although initially hailed as liberators…The Taliban subscribed to a very conservative, puritanical interpretation of Islam. They segregated the sexes outside the home, closed girls’ schools, required that women be fully covered in public, and banned women from the workplace. They also banned television, music and cinema, ordered men to grow beards and pray five times a day, and introduced the hudud punishments punishments for certain crimes as prescribed by the Quran
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and hadith (such as amputation for theft, death for murder, stoning for adultery).\(^{554}\)

Unfortunately, Islamic communities are frequently places of violence (e.g. Shiite versus Sunni, warlord versus warlord, military versus radical imams). Eventually, the strongest force comes to rule and some type of brutal dictator or authoritarian government who can suppress the unauthorized violence restores some type of order (e.g. Saddam Hussein, Ayatollah Khomeini, Hasan Turabi in Sudan). Esposito concedes,

The majority of Muslim countries have been ruled by authoritarian governments buttressed by military and security forces. Few rulers have held elective office; most have been kings or military or ex-military officers. Where parliaments and political parties have existed, they have generally remained subordinate to the ruling government or party. While some Muslim countries, such as Pakistan and Turkey, have held elections, the military have also had significant influence on politics. …The attempt to generate Islamic forms of democracy is based on a reinterpretation of traditional concepts and institutions.\(^{555}\)

Throughout modern times leading Muslims have given their opinions on democracy.

In Iran during the constitutional Movement of 1905-11, Shaykh Fadlallah Muri, in debates over the formulation, argued that one key democratic idea--the equality of all citizens-- is “impossible” in Islam. He maintained that unavoidable and insurmountable inequalities exist, such as those between believers and unbelievers …husbands and wives…Islam does not have any shortcoming that require completion.\(^{556}\)

Esposito paraphrases Sayyid Qutb of Egypt. Qutb was a founder of the Muslim Brotherhood, executed by the Egyptian regime in 1966. Qutb was strongly anti-democracy, “any notion of popular sovereignty [is]… incompatible with God’s sovereignty….sharia is so complete as a legal and moral system that no further legislation is possible.”\(^{557}\)

Mawlana Abul Ala Mawdudi, 1909-1973, of India, founder of Jammat-i-Islami “held
that Islam constitutes its own form of democracy” and Islam is “the very antithesis of secular Western democracy.”

King Fahd of Saudi Arabia, 1921-Aug. 1, 2005, declared

[D]emocracy is a Western institution foreign to Islam…[T]he democratic system prevalent in the world is not appropriate in this region. The election system has no place in the Islamic creed, which calls for a government of advice and consultation and for the shepherd’s openness to his flock, and holds the ruler fully responsible before his people.”

The map to the left gives some idea as to the various African political systems and their current positions on democracy. The picture does not look overly optimistic for those countries with large Islamic populations.

There are clearly some Muslims in authority in the Islamic world who are not comfortable with people having freedom of choice. They want to control thoughts and actions of the masses. That is why Islam does not do well with democracy. But as this
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tearful Islamic woman proudly displays her purple finger, she demonstrates that many of the average Muslim people appreciated this taste of democracy. She voted at the risk of her life. She obviously did not think that democracy was incompatible with Islam.\textsuperscript{560}

Esposito is correct that democracy has potential as an instrument of positive change, but even democracy does not guarantee freedom as long as thought control exists; as long as the Islamic street, mosque and madrasas are ruled by Islamic radicals. As long as fundamentalist indoctrination continues, democracy does not stand a chance to bring about change. For example, Al-Jazeera is beginning the indoctrination of hate for pre-schoolers in children’s programs on television.

Consequently, all elections may accomplish is the election of radicals. Esposito observes this very scenario played out in the Algerian elections on December 26, 1991 and led to civil war. It was Algeria's first multiple party elections. Fifty-nine percent of eligible voters voted. The radical fundamentalists won 188 of the 231 parliamentary seats. On January 12, 1992, the Algerian military seized power to prevent the FIS from winning their democratic victory. The military explained, “The governments in power are worth preserving. For no matter what their shortcomings, ranging from political exclusion to severe human rights violations, they form the only barrier against fanatics who want to confront the West.”\textsuperscript{561} The text went on to say that the civil war which squashed the Islamic fanatics actually led to the deaths of seventy-five thousand fellow Algerians. This was a tremendous price to pay for freedom. The Algerian military
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actually stood up to this radical ideology. The cost not stand would have been more deaths through war with the West. Do the United States executive branch, congress, and American churches understand that democracy does not guarantee freedom of thought? Western Civilization and the Christian church must take a long view of its contest with Islam. Remember, the Christians in Nubia and Ethiopia were not conquered in a battle but were gradually infiltrated and worn down.

Esposito’s solution to fundamentalism does not ask Muslims to leave Islam but to simply adjust their thinking about what Islam is and how it is to be practiced. He asks them to modify their religion to a neomodernist view.

There are four discernible orientations toward change: [1] secular, [2] conservative (or traditionalist), [3] neorevivalist (or fundamentalist), and [4] neomodernist. Secularists advocate the separation of religion and politics. While their critics sometimes characterize or dismiss them as nonbelievers….The conservative (or traditionalist) …emphasize the following of past traditions or practices and are wary of any innovation that they regard as ‘deviation’ (bida), the Muslim equivalent to Christian heresy. “fundamentalists”…claim the right to go back to Islam’s original sources, to reinterpret and reapply them to contemporary society…[But] Islamic neomodernists do not reject the West in its entirety; rather, they choose to be selective in approach. They wish to appropriate the best of science, technology, …and intellectual thought but to resist acculturation or assimilation of Western culture and mores, from secularism and radical individualism to the family and sexual permissiveness. The goal is thus to learn from the West but not to westernize Muslim society…neomodernists are more creative, and wide-ranging in their reinterpretation of Islam and less tied to traditional interpretations of the ulama [community] . For this reason, they are often accused of ‘deviantism’ [i.e. bida, or heresy] by the ulama, who charge that neomodernists lack the necessary training and credentials to interpret Islam.662

Cleary, Esposito suggests Muslims should become neomodernists, as described above and practice the, “reinterpretation of Islam and [to make it] less tied to traditional interpretations.” Of course this is the classic struggle currently going on in all the religions: how should a particular religion be practiced? Should it be practiced as it was
originally given (i.e. orthodox or authentic), or after jettisoning the politically incorrect features, how the current members wish it was given (i.e. neo-orthodox)? Should the Muslims stick with the original “revelation(s)” as given in context or do they make them more acceptable by allegorizing the message? Fundamentalist Muslims insist on a literal application of the Qur’anic text while Esposito encourages Muslims to pick and choose and spiritualize the text.

Esposito concludes, “Muslims need some first-class minds who can interpret the old in terms of the new as regards substance and turn the new into the service of the old as regards ideals.”\textsuperscript{563} Again Esposito shows that the hope is the modification of the Islamic man. Orthodox biblical theologians recognize the God of the Bible, not Allah, is needed. Really good Muslims, in every sense of the word, would be much nicer to have as neighbors, but in the end they are still lost. Thus Esposito’s two suggestions for dealing with Islam, namely promoting some type of democracy and the reinterpretation of the Qur’an, are inadequate. The only genuine solution is conversion from this pseudo-religion to a relationship with the Jesus of the Bible. Esposito is absolutely wrong for ignoring that Islam is a threat both to any democratic society and a theological threat to every adherent of true religion. Esposito actually turns the tables on Christians who call attention to this fact in his book, \textit{The Islamic Threat: Myth or Reality}? In essence he wrote the real threat comes from those who are alarmed by the Islamic messengers and the message.

The demonization of a great religious tradition due to the perverted actions of a minority of dissident and distorted voices remains the real threat, a threat that not only impacts on relations between the Muslim world and the West but also upon
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growing Muslim populations in the West itself.\textsuperscript{564}

This is a common theme developed multiple times in multiple ways by many liberal
and Islamic scholars. The Evangelical Christian is to be demonized. The support of the
nation of Israel is not a wise policy. The populace is asked to be sensitive to the feelings
of Muslims as they are increasingly moving into Western civilizations, demanding more
concessions with the underlying threat that if society offends them, there might be
reprisals. Ridiculous! World leaders should not ignore a fourteen-hundred year pattern of
historical conflict. Calling attention to this pattern is the honorable thing for our nation's
leaders to do. Islam is a world dominating ideology and theology. Many Muslims argue
a culture is either in dar al-Islam or dar al-harb; the house of Islam or the house of war. It
becomes increasingly evident that Christian Western Civilization and authentic Islam
cannot ever truly be at peace. There will always been an ideological and theological
struggle between the two religions. The courts have made the United States reject its own
religious heritage in the name of multiculturalism and pluralism. The courts do not
apparently understand or appreciate the value of biblical Christianity to the culture or the
ethics of its citizens. Currently, teachers cannot even honestly tell the truth about Islam's
aggression and theology without fear of being sued by the Counsel for Arab Islamic
Relations (CAIR). Instead, Americans are being taught that America never did have a
biblical heritage. This is not the place to argue the ridiculousness of that denial, but it is
very regrettable.

America needs to be strong inwardly (spiritually) and outwardly (militarily). While
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not looking for conflict, Americans need to continue to make the price for *jihad* against it so great that this will discourage future attacks. Appeasing Islam is only a temporary fix, if even that. Strength diminishes the number of attacks externally; limiting the number of Islamic immigrants will diminish the number of potential jihadists internally. At the same time, offering genuine friendship based on biblical values to Islamic countries is the way any Christian nation should operate. For those who disagree with the above, one might just as well argue that Western civilization, with its Judeo-Christian roots, is compatible with atheistic Marxist communism. Of course, the two ideologies cannot be blended, yet the USA treats the Marxists in a honest way. Leaders need to draw reliable, long term conclusions and promote realistic policies. Presidents Bush and Obama are apparently seeking to include Islam into the house of orthodox faith. After reading Esposito's encyclopedic textbook, it is apparent this is merely wishful thinking. Presidents Bush and Obama would be well served to read the actual words of the Qur’an, with its unambiguous meaning without seeking to allegorize the text. Next, they and their advisers should read the historic data found on the pages of the *Oxford History of Islam*, while ignoring the underlying philosophy promoted by the secularists and Muslims, who are themselves blinded by their politically correct presuppositions. If this does not convince them of the folly of pandering to Islamic and liberal theology, modern history, unfortunately, eventually will. One example comes from Darfur, Sudan.

Darfur, Sudan has been in the news over the last few years. The reason is that this is another modern day example of attempted genocide against Christians and non-Arabs. In a panel discussion entitled, *Symposium: Darfur-Islam’s Killing Fields*, Thomas Haidon and Walid Phares (both Muslim), Jon Lewis, and moderator, Jamie Glaznov, discussed
the Islamic genocide going on in Southern Sudan. Glazov began with this question, “Why is it that -- yet again -- another Arab League member is massacring its minority populations? Why is the Western media reluctant to identify the religion and ethnicity of the mass murderers and rapists?”

Phares said, “Since the 1989 coup that brought the National Islamic Front (NIF) to power with General Omar Bashir and Hassan Turabi, the ‘Jihadists’ in Khartoum focused on the ethnic cleansing of the southern ‘Christians’ on the base of religious ideology.”

They all agreed on the horrible nature of the genocide taking place. Lewis affirmed the second part of Jamie’s question dealing with the media: “Jamie, you are completely correct in the double-standard applied to Christians and Jews. The liberal left desperately wants to believe Bin Laden and Hamas are motivated by political rather than theological means and have tried to downplay the Islamicist ideology.”

The only point in quoting Lewis is that it is important for Christians to at least be cognizant of the Islamic theology of war on the infidel clearly taught in the Qur’an whether the media or public institutions want to hear about it or not.

There are many smaller incidents that are not on a national scale, but still show the intolerance of Islam for Christians and “unbelievers.” Just a few examples: after the Afghanistan war broke out, two Christian ladies were in the news because they had been arrested on the charge of sharing Christian literature with Islamic women. In the Netherlands on November 2, 2004, Van Gogh was shot and stabbed for making a program about the plight of a young Islamic woman who was abused by her husband and
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raped by her uncle. \textsuperscript{569} The Danish cartoons by Jyllands-Posten\textsuperscript{570} were used as an excuse for riots worldwide. In one angry demonstration, which occurred outside the Danish embassy in London on February 3, 2006, Muslim protesters chanted, “Bomb, Bomb USA! Bomb, Bomb UK,” and "Europe you will pay, your annihilation is on its way." There were many more such chants.\textsuperscript{571} More riots and demonstrations occurred over some comments made by the Pope Benedict XVI on September 12, 2006.

The controversial comment originally appeared in the \textit{Dialogue Held With A Certain Persian, the Worthy Mouterizes, in Anakara of Galatia}, written in 1391 as an expression of the views of the Byzantine emperor Manuel II Palaiologos, one of the last Christian rulers before the Fall of Constantinople to the Muslim Ottoman Empire, on such issues as forced conversion, holy war, and the relationship between faith and reason. The passage, in the English translation published by the Vatican, is as follows:

Show me just what Muhammad brought that was new and there you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command to spread by the sword the faith he preached.\textsuperscript{572}

A 54 year old British elementary teacher, Gillian Gibbons, barely escaped a beating of forty lashes and or six months imprisonment in the Sudan in 2007, over allowing the
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Islamic seven year olds in her class to name a well loved teddy bear “Muhammad.”\(^\text{573}\)

These horrible events are often not given the attention they deserve in the media. They seem to be ignored, suppressed, or glossed over by the media, Muslims and various institutions because to bring out the cold hard facts sounds intolerant. Haiden, in the panel on the genocide taking place in Darfur, places the blame for such horrible behavior not simply on misinterpretations of the Qur’an and Sunnah. Amazingly enough, this converted Muslim, places a healthy amount of the blame where it belongs, on the “sources themselves” (i.e. on the Qur’an and the Sunnah). This is a rare admission.

I am certainly frustrated with the current state and disposition of Islam and Muslims. **The problems don't stem merely from misinterpretation in the Qur’an and Sunnah but from the sources themselves.** It is my personal belief that the violent and unsavoury elements in Islam must be highlighted by Muslims, admitted and repudiated. Yet I am still Muslim because I believe that Islam can be a secular and modern faith, consistent with democracy. But this will never occur until there is as Walid Shoebat mentioned recently, a "confession."\(^\text{574}\) (Emphasis mine)

As recently as Wednesday, October 7, 2009 one article ran entitled, *Christian Arrested for Distributing Religious Materials in Egypt*

An Egyptian Christian arrested in Cairo for handing out gospel leaflets and held in prison illegally for four days has been released, the freed Protestant Copt told Compass.

Abdel Kamel, 61, was arrested on Sept. 23 in downtown Cairo for handing out copies of a Christian leaflet. As they arrested him, police told Kamel it was "unlawful" to hand out religious information on public roads. When Kamel countered that Muslims commonly hand out Islamic literature, police told him it was "more unlawful" for Christians. Kamel also didn't have his identification card with him.

Nabil Ghobreyal, an attorney who worked to gain Kamel's release, said there is no law in Egypt forbidding the distribution of religious material. Police handcuffed Kamel, put him into a police car and seized his leaflets. Authorities then took him to a police station for interrogation. While in custody, Kamel said, he remained in handcuffs for hours, was thrown to the ground, spit upon and threatened with violence.
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Kamel said he wasn't tortured, but when asked to describe his treatment, he wept uncontrollably.

The lay preacher said he was proclaiming repentance and forgiveness in Christ because he views it as a service to others.

"I love my people," he said. "I love Egypt, and I feel my service is directed toward the people I love and the country I love." 575

Islamic educators need to be more honest and transparent, expressing the whole truth about Islam. A case in point of a small, but obvious, deception, or at the least unrealistic wishful thinking, comes from Varton Gregorian. In his book, Gregorian quotes Surah 5:48 because this verse sounds reconciliatory, seeking to give the impression Islam is a tolerant religion. “The time has come for the world to recognize that Jews, Christians and Muslims are the children of Abraham--and according to the Qur’an, that our different religious communities are part of God’s plan.”576 This sounds tolerant, but a careful reading of the passage demonstrates Muhammad had just the opposite intention in mind from that given by Gregorian. While 5:48 sounds conciliatory, Surah 5:49-51 makes it clear that was not the original intention.

So judge between them by that which Allah hath revealed, and follow not their [i.e. Jews and Christians] desires, but beware of them lest they seduce thee from some part of that which Allah hath revealed unto thee. And if they [i.e. Jews and Christians] turn away, then know that Allah's Will is to smite them for some sin of theirs. Lo! many of mankind are evil-livers…. O ye [Muslims] who believe! Take not the Jews and the Christians for friends. They are friends one to another. He among you who taketh them for friends is (one) of them. Lo! Allah guideth not wrongdoing folk.577

Gregorian’s approach can be appreciated and encouraged, but his interpretation is not a straight-forward reading of the Qur’an. In dealing with the Russian Cold War threat,

which is not unlike our relationship with multiple Islamic nations today, President Reagan is often quoted for repeating the Russian proverb, “Trust but verify.” This is a very rational policy that should be implemented with Islamic countries as well today, for many Islamic countries currently pose a threat to our national security.

Gregorian does not apparently see, or want to see, that a plain and simple reading of the Qur’an, when followed, creates an adversarial relationship with all “unbelievers.”

When I wrote this idea in a paper submitted to a great Bible honoring American Christian University, one of the professors unbelievably remarked in the margin,

Is it possible that Gregorian has read the Qur'an at least as carefully and as often as you have, but that he is treating the topic on the basis of the different ways that different Muslim groups read it? You seem to be saying that this "straight forward reading" is the way ALL Muslims read it and that Gregorian is ignorant of this fact. You have not proven your point, if it is the point you are trying to make. Why are you trying to make it appear as if your straightforward reading is the way every Muslim reads it, rather than the way some Muslims read it?

I am not suggesting Gregorian did not understand the original intent of the passage, but that he is quoting only part of the thought and the passage in context clearly has the opposite meaning. Certainly, this is the way many read the passage. It is the way I understand the passage. Rather than presume ignorance, it seems Gregorian is willfully twisting the original meaning of the text, taking it out of context, to make Islam seem compatible with Judaism and Christianity. The next verses appear to clearly make this obvious. Sticking one's head in the proverbial sand will not change this reality. Rather than commend me for discovering this twisting of the passage, for politically correct reasons, the professor attacks me for discovering a clear inconsistency. This is an ad hominem attack. Rather than concede that the very next passage reveals just the opposite

intention to how the passage was used, the scholar questions who has read the Qur’an more carefully. Based on that reasoning, I ought to become a Muslim. Major Premise: Gregorian has read the Qur’an more carefully than I and I should therefore trust him. Minor Premise: Gregorian is a Muslim. Conclusion: therefore I should blindly trust Gregorian and become a Muslim. I did not respond to this or many other ridiculous comments like this but, share it here to note that accepting Islam at face value and believing Muslims mean what they say and say what they mean will get you criticized from those who should be sounding the alarm as well.

Gregorian boasts of Islam being the fastest growing religion and having twenty percent of the world’s population. Even those nations like India where Islam is a minority, there are still more Muslims there than in England and France’s population combined. He writes, “If current trends continue, according to some estimates, it [Islam] will have more adherents by the year 2023 than any other faith.” Gregorian should recognize that this does not bring comfort to those who already feel threatened.

Gregorian cannot have it both ways. Either Islam is not a threat or they are a threat. History shows us Islamicists are indeed a threat. Perhaps this was predicted in Genesis 16:12. There we read of Ishmael that, “He will be a wild donkey of a man; his hand will be against everyone and everyone's hand against him, and he will live in hostility toward all his brothers.” It is hard to take a lot of comfort from the idea that historically Muslims have been so hostile toward each other that this will keep us free from future attacks.

The birthrate of the Islamic world is easily surpassing those of the non-Muslim births in Europe and in the United States. Now that the Islamic population has grown so large

---

578 Gregorian, p. 1.
in Europe many suggest Islam will defeat Western civilization simply by out reproducing them. A population must reproduce at a rate of 2.11 to sustain itself. A 1.3 population growth rate is impossible for a culture to reverse from. This is an unintended consequence of the pro-abortion movement and laws. The United States birth rate is 1.6, less than that which is required to sustain our population. With Latino immigration, the US birth rate rises to 2.11. The reality that Europe and the United States is failing to produce enough children to sustain itself and its Judeo-Christian culture is startling as a Youtube program demonstrates. The site states, "Islam will overwhelm Christendom unless Christians recognize the demographic realities, begin reproducing again, and share the gospel with Muslims."  

The following essay by Alan Shlemon corresponds with the Youtube program above and more importantly it seems to strike a

---

580 Youtube, March 30, 2009, “Muslim Demographics,” http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6-
very healthy balance between genuine evangelistic concern for Muslims and a concern for the very cultural survival of Western Civilization.

Dear Friend,

Muslims are the largest unreached people group in the world. Of the 1.5 billion Muslims in the world, 38,000 die every day and enter eternity without Jesus. Any Christian concerned with the Great Commission should therefore care about Islam. It’s the belief system that’s holding one in every five people on earth captive. But it’s not only the death of Muslims that’s a concern. It’s also their births. Islam’s rapid growth is largely due to their higher fertility rate. Cultures that maintain a fertility rate of 2.11 children per family can sustain their population, but Europeans have an average rate of 1.38. Muslims in France, however, have 8.1 children per family and in the Netherlands 50% of all newborns are born to Muslim families. At this rate, the Netherlands’ population will be half Muslim in just over ten years. In Britain, the Muslim population has multiplied ten times faster than non-Muslims in that last four years. By contrast, the number of Christians fell by more than two million during the same period. The German government, recognizing a similar trend in their country, said, “The fall in the [German] population can no longer be stopped. Its downward spiral is no longer reversible…It will be a Muslim state by the year 2050.” It’s not surprising, then, that Libya’s leader, Gaddafi, said, “There are signs that Allah will grant victory to Islam in Europe without swords, without guns, without conquest…We don’t need terrorists, we don’t need homicide bombers. The 50+ million Muslims will turn it into a Muslim continent within a few decades.” Russia is facing a similar situation. Their fertility rate is only 1.28, which explains why their population is dropping at a rate of 700,000 a year. Muslims already account for 20% of their population and their fertility rate is 10 children per family. Russia estimates that its military will be more than 50% Muslim in just five years. Islam’s strategy is the same for North America. In the last three decades, the number of Muslims in the U.S. has climbed to nearly nine million. A coalition of American Islamic groups expects that number to climb to 50 million by 2040. They’re preparing for this rise in Muslims by building Mosques and Islamic schools. What are we doing to prepare? 581

It is frightenly clear that if the United States wants to remain a culture with any real Judeo-Christian influence, then it must restrict Islamic immigration in the near future or in a few short decades, it, too, will be in the same condition as Europe. Gregorian writes that in just the twenty-two Arab nations (not counting the other Islamic non-Arab

3X5hIFXYU&NR=1/ (accessed October 12, 2009).

countries where the Islamic population represents a profound minority), the Arab Islamic population, as of June 2003, is nearly as great as that of the United States. Gregorian writes, “Currently, the twenty-two Arab states have a total population of 280 million; that is projected to grow to between 410 million to 459 million by 2020. Today, 38 percent of Arabs are under fourteen years old.”582 Presently, the United States is only 300 million. The map583 on page 278 shows that Muslims represent a large majority in many nations.

These ideas about population growth and cultural takeovers create a lot of tension. There are many emotions on both sides. Westerners have seen or heard what is coming out of the Islamic world and they are justifiably concerned. Gregorian objectively observes,

As an example of Saudi intolerance, the organizations report that the governmental institute, which is a branch of Imam Muhammad bin Sa’ud in Riyadh, publishes books that promote intolerance. One, printed in Arabic, is entitled A Muslim’s Relations with Non-Muslims, Enmity or Friendship. The author, a certain Abdulla Al-Tarekee, states: ‘The unbelievers, idolaters, and others like them must be hated and despised….We must stay away from them and create barriers between us and them.’ He also [correctly, I might add] asserted that the Qur’an forbade taking Jews and Christians as friends, and that applies to every Jew and Christian, with no consideration as to whether they are at war with Islam or not. Saudi textbooks published by the Saudi Arabian Ministry Education, moreover promote intolerance, misinformation and enmity toward the West. One text, according to a recent American study states: ‘The West in particular is the source of the past and present misfortunes of the Muslim world, beginning with the Crusades, through modern Imperialism and ending in the establishment of the State of Israel. However, the West’s most dangerous effect on Muslim society nowadays is its cultural and intellectual influence in various fields such as: the spread of Western practices and habits—from Western democracy to…Christian missionary work, western humanitarian and medical aid,…”584

Even the 9/11 attack is spun in such a way as to blame the United States for this sneak attack on 3,000 innocent victims.

582 Gregorian, p. 56.
“In al-Jazeera the satellite news outlet that claims a global television audience of 35 million ... broadcast a serious debate about whether the United States had staged the September 11 disaster as part of a conspiracy against Islam...” The Islamic news service and website of Darul Uloom Deoband wrote, “a strong opinion is that the said horrible deed was hatched by the Israeli Secret service Mosad as informed by the various sources. As [many] as four thousand Jews [were] found absent in the Trade Center on that fateful day."

The promotion of these ideas seems incredibly ridiculous to many in the West. How are we to relate to such a group of gullible individuals who are so prone to violence?

There are also those in America, including two Presidents, who still insist that Islam is a religion of peace. The following is a partial list of known terror plots thwarted by the U.S. government since September 11, 2001.

• December 2001, Richard Reid: British citizen attempted to ignite shoe bomb on flight from Paris to Miami.


• September 2002, Lackawanna Six: American citizens of Yemeni origin convicted of supporting Al Qaeda after attending jihadist camp in Pakistan. Five of six were from Lackawanna, N.Y.

• May 2003, Iyman Faris: American citizen charged with plotting to use blowtorches to collapse the Brooklyn Bridge. 585

The full list of thwarted attacks can be found in Appendix 1. Most recently, another September 11, 2009 attack was foiled.

"The evidence suggests a chilling, disturbing sequence of events showing the defendant was intent on making a bomb and being in New York on 9/11, for purposes of perhaps using such items," Neff declared in arguing for Zazi’s transfer to New York. . . The charge against Zazi carries a possible life sentence upon conviction. Zazi, a 24-year-old Afghan-born coffee cart owner in New York and Denver airport shuttle driver, sat expressionless during the Denver court hearing.

584 Ibid. p. 119-120.
Zazi has publicly denied being a terrorist since he was arrested on Sept. 19 . . .

TIMELINE

A government motion seeking to deny bail laid out a chronology of the alleged scheme, which prosecutors said had been in the works for more than a year.

_August 2008_

Najibullah Zazi began plotting as early as August 2008 to "use one or more weapons of mass destruction," and received explosives training in Pakistan, prosecutors said.

_Early 2009_

In the Denver suburb of Aurora, he used a computer to research homemade bomb ingredients, according to prosecutors. A law enforcement official said associates of Zazi visited Colorado to help him buy the chemicals, using stolen credit cards. Security video and receipts show that some of the purchases were made near a Colorado hotel, according to court papers.

_Sept. 6 and 7_

On Sept. 6 and 7, Zazi checked into a suite at the hotel and tried to contact an unidentified associate "seeking to correct mixtures of ingredients to make explosives."

_Sept. 8_

A two-day trip to the city triggered a series of searches in Denver and New York City over the past two weeks, and netted backpacks, cell phones and a scale at a Queens home where Zazi spent the night.

One web site is faithfully recording attacks worldwide since 9/11. They note that there have been more than 14,218 since that time. They include detailed examples.

November 5, 2009, Nadal Malik Hasan opened fire on fellow soldiers at Fort Hood, killing 13 and wounding 30 others. He did this as he yelled, "Allahu Akbar," _Allah is great_. Obama's immediate response from the Rose Garden was to state, “We don’t

---


know all the answers yet. And I would caution against jumping to conclusions until we have all the facts. . .” Later details describe a man who should have been flagged by the military and removed from his position of authority. But such actions would not have been politically correct.

At about 1:30 Central Time, Army Major Malik Nadal Hasan walked into a processing center at Fort Hood Texas where soldiers were waiting for medical checkups with a pair of hand guns and started shooting without discrimination.

In less than five minutes, the toll was thirteen dead and thirty wounded, as of this writing. The carnage would have been even greater had a female civilian police officer not shot Malik Nadal Hasan four times. As of this writing, Malik Nadal Hasan is described as being in stable condition, on a respirator, and unconscious. Malik Nadal Hasan, who ironically was an Army psychiatrist specializing in treating post traumatic stress, seemed to show classic symptoms of a man who contemplating doing something terrible. He had suffered a bad performance review, which in the normal course of events would seriously affect his Army career. A lifelong Muslim, Malik Nadal Hasan had started to express sympathy for suicide bombers and Muslim terrorists in Iraq and Afghanistan. He had suggested to relatives that he had felt traumatized by hearing stories of combat in the Middle East. Scheduled to be deployed in Iraq himself, Malik Nadal Hasan was fighting vociferously against it, even hiring lawyers to try to get himself separated from the military early to avoid oversees service. Malik Nadal Hasan had given away his possessions, including copies of the Koran, a classic warning sign of a man who expected not to be alive for much longer.

Obvious questions arise after Malik Nadal Hasan massacre of his fellow soldiers. Why did Malik Nadal Hasan not receive some kind of intervention, some sort of counseling, during the months leading up to the Fort Hood massacre when he was displaying this bizarre and appalling behavior?

Was it political correctness, as some analysts are already charging? Imagine in 1943 a soldier expressing Nazi ideology before being deployed to Europe? Or was it simply that Malik Nadal Hasan simply fell through the Army bureaucratic cracks. 

When the 20th century opened, Islam was back on its heels. It seems to be in full

---

stride at the beginning of the 21st century. Today Christendom seems to be under attack at home and abroad, internally and externally. Perhaps we now get a glimpse of how the prophets of the Old Testament felt or why John the Baptist was described as, "a voice of one calling in the desert. (Mark 1:3)" Lest we get too melancholy, let us remember that Jesus changed the world with just twelve disciples. There are many more true disciples than this worldwide. We can take encouragement from the research and words of Joel Rosenberg. In his book Inside the Revolution, he writes, "You rarely hear about it in the churches...But the big untold story is that more Muslims are coming to faith in Jesus Christ today than at any other time in history." Indeed that is what we need. The Caner brothers report similar happenings in their book, Out of the Crescent Shadows. "More that 20,000 Muslims adopt Christianity as their faith each year in the United States."

We must always keep in mind God's promise, "If my people, who are called by my name, will humble themselves and pray and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from heaven and will forgive their sin and will heal their land. (2 Chronicles 7:14)" These are serious times and we must do all we can to bring about that healing by humbling, praying, seeking, turning and thus freeing God to heal our land. You can become an active part of our nation's ministry to Muslims and our nation's national repentance. May God richly bless you in this ministry.

Unfortunately, the idea that our nation needs to experience a national repentance will not go unchallenged. Opposition will come from the lost and confused within the Christian church and from our secular culture outside the church. The next two chapters

November 26, 2009).

initiate you to some of the debates presently going on over this very issue.

Discussion Questions:

1. Compare and Contrast the strength of the Islamic world at the beginning of the 20th Century to the end of the 20th century.

2. What was the idealistic goal of the European powers for the smaller nations at the breakup of the Ottoman empire?

3. What mistake did Neville Chamberlain make that some think our current political leaders may be making?

4. What relationship did Hitler have with the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem?

5. People talk of the land of Israel today as Palestine. What are the circumstances surrounding the birth of the land of Palestine? Significance?


7. What was the significance of Isaiah's question in 66:8?

8. What is Ahmadinejad of Iran's, stated intentions for Israel?


10. What two event empowered the Islamic world in 1979?

11. Esposito holds what view of the Islamic world in the 20th Century? Summarize his key points. What is a contrary view to that of Esposito's?

12. Why did the United States go to war with Afghanistan?

13. The United States had signed a peace treaty with Saddam Hussein of Iraq that he was breaking repeatedly. What was Saddam's nickname?

14. What was President Obama's posture to the Islamic world? What did this garner for him? Why does President Obama's words trouble some traditionalists and Judeo-Christians?

15. What is Karl Rove's concern with the Obama policy?

16. Esposito Questions:

   a. Does it appear that Esposito has a traditional orthodox view of the Bible and

Christianity? Explain.

b. Does it appear that Esposito has a traditional orthodox view of the Quran and Islam? Explain.

c. How was John Walker Lindh converted to two types of Islam?

d. What did Esposito think of Hasan al-Banna of Egypt and Mawdudin of India? What did the Egyptian and India government think of them? Who correctly assessed their views?

e. What did Esposito think of Sayyid Qutb and what was Qutb's view of democracy?

17. What was King Fahd's view of democracy in 2005?

18. Analyze the African political map on p. 266. Draw some conclusions about the political situation of Africa. Significance?

19. Does democracy guarantee good decisions? What happened in Algeria at what price?

20. Esposito identifies four different perspectives held by Muslims. Identify each perspective and identify which view he is promoting. Do you think this view will win out? Why or why not?

21. According to the Bible, and the Christian gospel, what is the only hope for Muslims, or any of us, in attaining salvation?

22. Who does Esposito think the real threat to world peace? What do you think of that view?

23. If a teacher in public or private schools teach this curriculum what are their potential risks? By whom?

24. Are some in the media recognizing the true source of inspiration for this violence? Example(s)?

25. There are a number of examples of individual jihad attacks made on Western Civilization around the world. Name some.

26. List any recent attacks that have occurred since the writing of this text. For example, as this question is being typed a newsbreak comes across the television on Christmas Eve December 25, 2009. The story tells of a Nigerian man, claiming to be sympathetic or associated with al-Qaeda, who was foiled in his attempt to ignite a bomb and blow up a flight to Detroit, Michigan. Initial reports are that the device was sophisticated. Unfortunately, more are to follow.
27. Should the short film about the plight of Islamic women, the cartoons, the words of the Pope, and the naming of the teddy bear, and the passing out Christian material in the streets of Egypt justify emotional and violent responses from the Islamic world? If these offense cause this response is there any chance that Western Civilization will be able to avoid offending some in the Muslims world in the future?

28. Are Muslim's and even Christians always accurate in giving the West the whole picture about the statements and desires of Islam? If not where can we get a better, more complete picture of Islam? Whatever view you hold on Islam someone will always what?

29. How does the birthrate of Europe, the United States and the Islamic world relate to our discussion of Islamic growth? What did the Libyan leader Gaddafi say in this regard? Since we have no desire to control birthrate what might we consider doing or controlling?

30. What posture does the Saudi school K-12 curriculum take regarding non-Muslims? What is the significance for this for the future?

31. What is unfortunately the position of the media in the Arab world, like al-Jazeera, on the United States and Israel?

32. Since 9/11 have the hostilities an attacks ceased? What should we be mindful of?

33. According to Joel Rosenberg what do we rarely hear about in our churches? What number did the Caners attach to this?

34. What did God promise in 2 Chronicles 7:14 that brings us hope for the future?
CHAPTER 11 ISLAM AND MULTICULTURALISM IN EUROPE

There are two critically important questions western civilization (i.e. Europe and the United States) must ask itself before it goes any further down the road to a rejection of its Judeo-Christian heritage. First, should we in western civilization move toward embracing Islam as a co-equal part of our culture as many Muslims and multiculturalists hope we will do? Secondly, multiculturalism comes at what price? The study of Islam is a very controversial subject in western civilization because so many of our academics, liberal theologians, politicians, and judges are busy promoting multiculturalism. Many in England have been promoting multiculturalism for years, and, are suffering more of the consequences of losing their historic identity as a former Christian nation. Melanie Phillips in her book, Londonistan, defines multiculturalism as follows:

Put at its simplest, it holds that Britain is now made up of many cultures that are all equal and therefore have to be treated in an identical fashion, and that any attempt to impose the majority culture over those of minorities is by definition racist. . . Until about forty years ago, British society had been relatively homogeneous. . . British national identity centered upon a set of traditions, laws and customs arising out of its Christian heritage. . . From the late 1960s onwards. . . Britain started to take in many more immigrants. . . foreign to the Judeo-Christian Western heritage. 592

Phillips goes on to describe the current multiculturalists' values, or lack of values taught to high school students in England.

Nowhere has this attack on the nation been more pronounced, and with more devastating consequences, than in the schools. The British education system simply ceased transmitting either the values or the story of the nation to successive generations, delivering instead the message that truth was an illusion and that the

nation and its values were whatever anyone wanted them to be.\(^593\)

Phillips describes what is at the heart of this ideological shift.

At the heart of this unpicking of national identity lies a repudiation of Christianity, the founding faith of the nation and the fundamental source of its values. . . . Britain is now a 'post-Christian' society. . . . local authorities and government bodies are systematically bullying Christianity out of existence.\(^594\)

The Kings and Queens of England have held the title *Defender of the Faith* since Pope Leo X awarded it to Henry the VIII on October 17, 1521. Today, Phillips points out that, "Prince Charles has floated the idea that when he becomes King he will no longer be *Defender of the Faith* but 'Defender of Faith'."\(^595\) She goes on to record that

For the Prince of Wales, Islam is a religion of peace, and so extremism and violence are foreign to its nature. In a major address in 1993 given in Oxford, where he is patron of the Centre for Islamic Studies, he said: "Our judgment of Islam has been grossly distorted by taking the extremes to the norm. . . . For example, people in this country frequently argue that the Sharia law of the Islamic world is cruel, barbaric and unjust. Our newspapers, above all, love to peddle those unthinking prejudices. The truth is, of course, different and always more complex. My own understanding is that extremes, like cutting off of hands are rarely practiced. The guiding principle and spirit of the Koran, should be those of equity and compassion."\(^596\)

One thing is quite apparent. Prince Charles appears to have spent little or no time actually reading the Qur'an or accurately reflecting upon Islamic history or even questioning the inspiration for current world events. In contrast, Mark A. Gabriel takes a contrary position to that of Prince Charles. Gabriel is no novice on Islamic studies. He memorized the Qur'an at an early age and as a Muslim earned a number of Islamic degrees culminating in a Ph.D. in Islamic studies. Gabriel has also taught Islamic history to fellow Muslims at the prestigious Islamic university, Al-Azhar, in Cairo, Egypt. After many years of study, Gabriel began questioning the foundational precepts of Islam,

---

\(^{593}\) Ibid. p. 62-63.
\(^{594}\) Ibid. p. 64.
earning for himself dismissal, persecution, and torture.

His understanding of the difference between Islam and Christian theology is nearly unparalleled. He tells us about some of his early steps that led to his amazing transformation. Beginning as an Islamic adult graduate student, Gabriel began to read and think for himself, which led him to the following conclusion.

Without exaggerating in any way, I can say that Islamic history is a story of violence and bloodshed from the time of Muhammad to this present day. When I looked at the teachings of the Quran and Muhammad, I could see why Islamic history developed this way. I thought, *What God would condone such destruction of human life?* But I kept this kind of question to myself.\(^{597}\)

Later in life, after his conversion to Christianity, Gabriel was involved in a debate with the president of the department of Islamic study at Rau University in Johannesburg, South Africa.

When this professor asked me why I left Islam, I told him, "I studied the history of Islam in a very deep way, and it is simply an ocean of blood. When Muslims stopped killing non-Muslims, they turned and started to kill each other.' Then I gave him examples: the War of Conversion that claimed the lives of almost ninety thousand people who tried to stop paying the *zakat*, or charity tax, after Muhammad's death; the War of Sufyan, where ten thousand Muslims died fighting over who would be in charge of the Islamic state after Muhammad's death; [jumps to modern times] the Iran/Iraq War, in which one million people were killed and two million disable in the course of nine years; civil war in Algeria, where 150,000 people have been killed in the past seven years.\(^{598}\)

Utopian humanists apparently feel they can tame both Christianity and Islam to establish a truly secular society. Humanists do not realize that by diminishing Christianity they are removing their protectors. Humanism may currently be the predominate worldview in the courts, the media, in at least half of the political parties, ________________________

\(^{595}\) Ibid. p. 66.

\(^{596}\) Ibid. p. 67


\(^{598}\) Ibid. p. 140.
and the public schools, but it is not powerful enough to suppress radical Islam any more than moderate Muslim nations are able to do so. Chesterton observed, "When men stop believing in God they don't believe in nothing; they believe in anything." By attacking Christianity, humanists are sowing the seeds of their own destruction. Richardson describes this very idea in his mongoose parable. A farmer had a mongoose, chickens and goats. The chickens gave him eggs and the goats milk, but he did not appreciate the mongoose. Occasionally, the mongoose would even eat an egg, depriving the farmer of it. He decided to rid himself of the mongoose. Later, he discovered he was not only missing eggs but also chickens and, later, even goats. At last the farmer discovered the problem. A python had come to the area and had eventually grown large enough to not just consume eggs, but chickens, and goats as well. At this point, the farmer bemoaned the fact he had removed the mongoose, which protected all else he valued. Richardson’s parable stops here, but he could have continued it because pythons grow to twenty feet, and the farmer himself was in danger of being killed and if not the farmer, surely his children. Richardson concludes with these sentiments:

The point: Secular humanists, agnostics and atheists have always assumed that if they could rid the world of this nuisance called Christianity, no other religion would rush in to take its place. Wrong assumption! Mankind as a species comes with an instinct for religion. Secular humanists, agnostics and atheists may manage to anesthetize their inbuilt religious instinct, but a majority of mankind still chooses religion. If people cannot have one religion, a majority will eventually turn to another. . . I have good advice for secularists who claim they are allergic to Christianity: Better to tolerate a religion that resembles an occasional irritating mongoose than to kill the mongoose and by so doing unwittingly welcome the python; i.e., an extremist religion that will avidly crush your freedom to be a secular humanist, an agnostic or an atheist!  

By turning our attentions to Europe one can see some of what our future holds if we continue down the course we are currently on.

Some Muslim Imams are predicting a number of [European] nations will be overtaken by Islam by the year 2050. The Brussels Journal wrote an article referring primarily to Islamic immigrants entitled, “Immigrants Comprise One Third of Dutch Population in 2050.”

Dennis Prager gloomily writes, "It is difficult to imagine any other future scenario for Western Europe than its becoming Islamicized or having a civil war."

"... The Muslim population of Europe has more than doubled since 1980, and according to some estimates, there are some 25 million Muslims living on the continent today. Demographers predict that this figure may double by 2015, and that the number of Muslims could outnumber non-Muslims in all of Western Europe by mid-century. This prompted Princeton University's Bernard Lewis to tell the German newspaper Die Welt that 'Europe will be Islamic by the end of the century.'

...  

A European Crisis of Spirit

Some analysts believe that what ails Europe is not primarily a crisis of demography, but rather a crisis of spirit. Michael Novak of the Washington-based American Enterprise Institute (AEI) says that in their blind pursuit of reason, secularism and materialism,

European elites have done their withering best to empty Europe of its Christian spirit. They have swept Europe clean just in time for the rapid rise of a rival faith [Islam] prolific with children, vitality, passion and confidence in long-term victory."

But by removing Judaism and Christianity from European cultural, intellectual and public life, secular Europeans are largely responsible for the lack of confidence ordinary Europeans have in the future. Indeed, the lack of faith not only in tomorrow—but also in God—begets hopelessness. And without hope for the future, one is less likely to want to bring children into the world.\textsuperscript{603}


\footnote{Soeren Kern, "Why Europe Won't Be Running The 21st Century," American Thinker,}
Discussion Questions:

1. What are two critically important questions Western Civilization should ask themselves? What are the consequences? How will Biblical Christians answer the questions in contrast to Multiculturalists and Muslims?

2. How does Melanie Phillips define Multiculturalism?

3. How did public schools in Britain promote Multiculturalism and what has been the consequence? Are we on that same cultural road? Evidence?

4. Phillips argues that at the heart of multiculturalism is a repudiation of what?

5. How does England's Prince Charles support multiculturalism? What is his view of Islam in general? What does this reveal?

6. Who is Mark A. Gabriel? What are his credentials to speak on Islam? After a lifetime of study what has he concluded about Islam? How does he support his contention in debate? Is this hate speech?

7. Humanists apparently believe they can do what with Islam? Do you agree with their apparent view? Explain.

8. Chesterton wrote, "When men stop believing in God they don't believe in nothing; they believe in what? As Europe and America have moved away from Biblical Theology has this been observably true? Support your answer.

9. Don Richardson has an interesting parable. Summarize his parable and whether or not you agree with his analysis.

10. What did Bernard Lewis and others realize about Europe in the next few decades? Are there real consequences to us in the United States? Explain some of those consequences.

11. What two alternatives does Denis Prager think cannot be avoided in Europe?

12. How does taking God out of European culture merely compound the problem of Islamic growth in Europe?

CHAPTER 12 ISLAM AND MULTICULTURALISM IN AMERICA (2000-PRESENT)

The presence of a growing significant number of Muslims in America is a fairly new concern.\textsuperscript{604} The first Muslims undoubtedly came to America against their will on slave ships. They were captured by Muslim slavers and sold to sea captains to be resold in America. “In 1717, names such as Omar ibn Said, Job Ben Solomon, Prince Omar and Ben Ali appeared on manifests of some slave ships arriving on the Atlantic coastline.”\textsuperscript{605} They were purchased by cultural “Christians” and given Christian names. The 1977 popular television mini-series, \textit{Roots}, by Alex Haley, has a memorable scene in which Kunta Kinte unsuccessfully attempts to refuse his new name, \textit{Toby}. Nevertheless, within a generation (or at the most, two) Christianity was the only religion practiced by these slaves. Likewise, for many Americans their first contact with Muslims was when they were attacked by Islamic pirates. The Pilgrims of 1620 were sending pelts of beaver and other furs from Massachusetts back to England to help repay their loan for the expense of the journey. Their boat, "... was ... taken by a Turkish man-of-war and carried off to ... [Morocco], where captain and crew were made slaves. ... "\textsuperscript{606} “In 1795, Muslim Barbary Pirates of Algiers captured 115 American sailors. The United States was forced to pay nearly a million dollars in ransom... . The Muslims broke their treaty with the United

\textsuperscript{604} 1811 \textit{People v. Ruggles} blasphemy case Judge Kent declared America to be a “Christian people” and Muslims “impostors”
\textsuperscript{605} Larry A. Poston, Carl F. Ellis, Jr, \textit{The Changing Face of Islam in America} (Camp Hill, PA: Horizon Books, 2000), 14
\textsuperscript{606} Federer, pp. 144-145.
States . . . In 1815, the Second Barbary War began."607

Both Jane I. Smith,608 in her book, *Islam in America*, and Larry A. Poston and Carl F. Ellis, in their book, *The Changing Face of Islam in America*,609 describe the voluntary migrations from the Middle East using ocean imagery. They write of five waves of Middle East immigration into America. They agree on the general time periods of the waves. Wave one (1875-1912) was comprised mostly of Christian immigrants from Syria, Jordan, Palestine and Lebanon. Wave two (1918-1922) came at the conclusion of WWI and the systematic breakup of the Ottoman Empire. Congress was concerned enough about the nature of these new immigrants that it passed immigration laws in 1924610 that placed quotas restricting immigration based on ethnic origin and nationality, favoring immigration from Western Europe over Eastern Europe, the Middle East, and Asia. Wave three (1930-1938) was when Congress opened the borders to relatives of people who were already living in America. While they came from the Middle East, many of these immigrants would have also been Christians. In wave four (1947-1960), “The Nationality Act of 195[2]3”611 gave each country an annual quota of immigrants.

609 Op cit. Poston,.Ellis, 14-17
611 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Immigration_and_Nationality_Act_of_1952, Wikipedia, The Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) of 1952 (also known as the McCarran-Walter Act) restricted immigration into the U.S. (accessed July 5, 2009. "Racial restrictions which previously existed were abolished in the INA, but a quota system was retained and the policy of restricting the numbers of immigrants from certain countries was continued. Eventually, the INA established a preference system which selected which ethnic groups were desirable immigrants and placed great importance on labor qualifications. The INA defined three types of immigrants: 1. immigrants with special skills or relatives of US citizens who were exempt from quotas and who were to be admitted without restrictions; 2. average immigrants whose numbers were not supposed to exceed 270,000 per year; 3. refugees."
Most of the immigrants allowed to enter the country were from Europe. "Still, a trickle of Muslims continued." Europeans, with their Judeo-Christian heritage, had an easier time assimilating into the United States’ culture. We are currently in the midst of wave five which was brought on by the passage of President Lyndon B. Johnson and Senator Ted Kennedy's *Immigration and Nationality Act* (1965 to present). This last wave demonstrates a profound change in immigration policy with potentially irreversible consequences.

It is hard to overestimate how important this change of policy may turn out to be to American culture, but the consequences of similar immigration policies, from a Christian perspective, have been devastating in other nations eventually taken over by Islam. Before turning our attention to the Johnson-Kennedy 1965 immigration bill, let us take a look at Europe.

Multiple authors write of this 1965 immigration policy change, but surprisingly, enough most of those who do, do so in either a neutral or supportive manner. Jane Smith writes,

> The last and final wave was related both to decisions internal to the United States and to events taking place in several parts of the Islamic world. In 1965, President Lyndon Johnson signed an immigration act repealing the quotas based on national diversity within the United States. For the first time since the early part of the century, one’s right to enter the country was not specifically dependent on his or her national or ethnic origin. Immigration from Europe thus declined, while that from the Middle East and Asia increased dramatically, more than half of the newcomers Muslim.  

Poston and Ellis described this fifth wave in similar terms, but gave a rationale as to
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612 Op. Cit. Poston, Ellis, p. 51
613 Ibid. p. 52
why the new Muslims did not need to assimilate as earlier Muslims had, and they estimated the actual number of Muslims that enter the U.S. annually:

…earlier Muslim immigrants had been more or less forced to assimilate into American culture in order to survive financially and socially. But the new arrivals, having economic resources of their own, were able to retain their traditional values and practices. The fifth and most recent wave of newcomers began in 1967 as a part of President Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society. Quotas had favored Europeans. Now they were relaxed considerably, and immigrants from Africa and Asia began to enter the United States in droves. This trend continues today. Estimates indicate that about 35,000 men and women from the Middle East and North Africa now enter the United States annually.  

Haddad describes the emotional motivation of the 1965 removal of quotas. She describes America as being in the midst of an identity crisis. This is apparently true.

Most of the Muslims who immigrated to the USA came after the repeal of the Asia exclusion Act in the 1960s. They entered an America that had passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights of 1965 and the Immigration Act of 1965. It was an America going through an identity crisis, one that was uncomfortable with its racist past, one that had begun to tolerate hyphenated identities. They [i.e. the new Muslim immigrants] found the accommodation [i.e. assimilation] made by earlier American Muslims citizens to be unacceptable. . . they [i.e. non-assimilating Muslims] sought equal representation hoping for a day when the USA would define itself as Christian-Jewish-Muslim.

Peter Brinelow, in his book Alien Nation, describes how 1965 marked a major turning point in immigration policy and has shifted the numbers and the source of immigrants dramatically in the last 50 years, no longer will the immigrants come from Western Europe but primarily from Eastern Europe, the Middle East and Asia. Most of the new immigrants are Islamic.

Teddy Roosevelt or Teddy Kennedy?

President Teddy Roosevelt (1901-1909) was concerned about the direction of the United States regarding foreign and domestic policies as it was approaching World War I

614 Ibid. p. 14-16.
(1914-1918). Roosevelt in his chapter entitled, "Peace Insurance by Preparedness Against War" begins by quoting the prophet Ezekiel (33: 1-6).

The word of the LORD came to me: "Son of man, speak to your countrymen and say to them: 'When I bring the sword against a land, and the people of the land choose one of their men and make him their watchman, and he sees the sword coming against the land and blows the trumpet to warn the people, then if anyone hears the trumpet but does not take warning and the sword comes and takes his life, his blood will be on his own head. Since he heard the sound of the trumpet but did not take warning, his blood will be on his own head. If he had taken warning, he would have saved himself. But if the watchman sees the sword coming and does not blow the trumpet to warn the people and the sword comes and takes the life of one of them, that man will be taken away because of his sin, but I will hold the watchman accountable for his blood.

Roosevelt is obviously concerned and senses a moral responsibility to warn his nation of war clouds he sees ahead. Roosevelt solemnly exhorts the readers with these words, "I very heartily commend these verses to the prayerful consideration of all those in high political office, whether Presidents, Secretaries of State or leaders of the Senate and the House at Washington. . . ."

Democratic President Woodrow Wilson appointed William Jennings Bryan to be the Secretary of State.

In 1912 Theodore Roosevelt stood as the Progressive Party candidate against William H. Taft. This split the traditional Republican vote and enabled Woodrow Wilson, the Democratic candidate, to be elected. Wilson appointed Bryan as secretary of state. A passionate pacifist, Bryan convinced 31 nations to agree in principle to his proposal to accept a year's cooling-off period during political conflicts, allowing the dispute to be studied by an international commission.

Both Wilson and Bryan are outstanding men and wise in many ways, but Roosevelt felt they were naive or too idealistic regarding world affairs. Picking up his comments in

615 Geaves p. 98.
616 Roosevelt. p. 166.
Now let these congressmen and editors face facts and be frank and truthful. . . . do they mean that they wish, if the Japanese take Magdalena Bay or the Germans St. Thomas, to discuss the matter through a commission for a year without taking any action? Do they?\footnote{Roosevelt. p. 177.} Roosevelt was also concerned about immigration.

Again, there are Pacific slope editors and public men who have excitedly applauded that phase of the peace-at-any-price propaganda. . . Now, do these public men and editors who champion this form of peace movement in California, Oregon and Washington mean that we shall in good faith submit to outsiders for arbitration the question whether or not there shall be an unlimited immigration of Asiatics to our shores? Do they mean that a court containing judges [lists several foreign countries] . . . shall say whether or not we have a right to decide what immigrants shall come to our shores and here establish citizenship? The Californian who does not believe in arbitrating the question whether there shall be such unlimited immigration of Asiatics to California is guilty of the grossest bad faith when he champions or fails to condemn such proposals, when he votes for or approves of the thirty-odd peace-commission treaties recently passed by the present administration and the all-inclusive arbitration treaties proposed by the preceding Administration. I hold that to arbitrate the question whether we should or should not allow the unlimited immigration of Asiatics to our shores would be a dreadful wrong. . . Let us not live in a realm of childish make-believe . . . Now, the fact that these male and female professional peace enthusiasts who have screamed so busily for peace during the past year have been afraid to make any concrete protest against wrong is doubtless due primarily to sheer fear on their part.\footnote{Ibid. p. 178-181.}

Roosevelt wanted loyal Americans, not what he called "Hyphenated Americans." He declared this was "Not Desirable." He wrote,

We welcome the German or the Irishman who becomes an American. We have no use for the German or Irishman who remains such. We do not wish German-Americans and Irish-Americans who figure as such in our social and political life; we want only Americans, and, provided they are such, we do not care whether they are of native or of Irish or of German ancestry. We have no room in any healthy American community for a German-American vote or an Irish-American vote, and it is contemptible demagogy to put planks into any party platform with the purpose of catching such a vote. We have no room for any people who do not act and vote

\addcontentsline{toc}{section}{Notes}
simply as Americans and as nothing else."\textsuperscript{620}

The Caners came to America and made America better from their scholarship. In a very positive manner, they emphasize the importance of integration in their book, \textit{More Than a Prophet}, a message critically important that should be heeded by the multiculturalists. This chapter is being written on the eighth anniversary of the September 11 weekend. It was still an emotional experience for many as was evidenced by the choked up comments of various individuals and from the programming that honored our fallen. The Caners sense this concern as they travel across the country. In a section they entitle, "Will the West Survive This Ordeal?" they write,

Since the United States felt a major terrorist attack firsthand, we have encountered fearful people in our speaking engagements who anxiously ask whether we are heading toward a great disaster. Usually at the end of a "question-and-answer" session, someone will tentatively rise and ask if the East-West difficulties can be overcome. Yes, we believe that the free world will survive, under one condition—we must return to our "tapestry" ideal. We are immigrant U.S. citizens. Like millions before us, our family came to fit into the American landscape. One of the shining distinctives of the United States has been its melting pot tendency, a weaving of mingling colors and threads of varying tensile strength, brought together as a beautiful fabric. . . Of late, however, the United States has shown less of a tapestry mentality than the mind-set of a patchwork quilt, a loose menagerie of independent patches with connecting threads that stretch and break easily. No one quilt patch relates to the others. We now seemingly prefer to be a confederacy of subgroups, agendas, and special interests. If the distinctive North American culture is to survive as a world influence, it must return to its tapestry ideal. We must desire to be amalgamated into this large swirling culture of freedom. To this end, we immigrants to the United States and Canada make a plea: Stop hyphenating us. We are immigrants and we are Americans. . . So we are not Turkish-Americans, Middle Eastern-Americans, Christian-Americans, or immigrant-Americans. We are Americans Period. No country will retain its historic freedoms if we accept a patchwork mentality. We pray that our readers will stop distinguishing themselves as African-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, or Asiatic-Americans. . . The only way we can withstand the onslaught of a bitter enemy is if we stand together, drawing on one another's strength and resolve in community.\textsuperscript{621}

\textsuperscript{620} Ibid. p. 411.
\textsuperscript{621} Ergun Mehmet Caner, Emir Fethi Caner, \textit{More Than a Prophet} (Grand Rapids, Michigan:}
Gabriel has this dedication in his book, *Jesus and Muhammad*:

Dedicated to the United States of America and the American people who opened their country to me and received me with love. May this book lead you to a clear understanding of the lives and teachings of Jesus and Muhammad. Your servant Mark A. Gabriel.

In contrast to the wonderful examples above, Islamic writer Haddad approvingly writes that America in the 1960s, "had begun to tolerate hyphenated identities." She sees this as a positive change as evidence of America moving away from a racist past. She also writes that past Islamic immigrants are even being criticized by recent Islamic immigrants for assimilating into the Western culture. Many mosques are directly discouraging assimilation in Friday sermons in Europe and the United States.

Balkanization of people groups naturally create racial and religious tensions. Radical Muslims encourage this sense of isolation and victimization. This assimilation into American culture will never be possible as long as Islam has individuals and groups seeking to force submission to Islam and waging war on infidels. As the non-assimilating Islamic population grows, the threat for conflict also grows.

The shift away from biblical Christianity in recent decades came from influences from inside (legislatively and by legal decisions) and outside (by immigration of those with different religions into) the United States. Former President Lyndon B. Johnson and Ted Kennedy directly influenced this process by appointing liberal Supreme Court judges and passing an *Immigration Act* that removed the quotas on Islamic immigration. These two actions, along with the indoctrinating of multiculturalism carried out by the public
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Mark A. Gabriel, *Jesus and Muhammad: Profound Differences and Surprising Similarities*
school system, directly contributed to this process of diminishing America's Judeo-Christian heritage among American youth. Johnson and Kennedy's participation of this was either done intentionally or unintentionally, but the effects were the same. In the 1960s the Supreme court made a number of legal decisions that prohibiting religious practices in school. These religious practices had been being encouraged in schools since the founding of Harvard in 1636 and now they are illegal. These decisions changed a three hundred year practice in the schools of America, prohibiting warm hearted study of the Bible, prayer and the passive display of the Ten Commandments.

This paradigm shift in American education has made a profound effect on the educational content, culture and behavior of American youth. This has diminished the influence of biblical Christianity and increased the belief in secular humanism, naturalism, acceptance of macro evolution as opposed to special creation, etc. The consequences of the Supreme Court's decision has had the effect of diminishing Christianity's influence in the school and even putting the school at an adversarial relationship with the Christian child in the school. This internal ideological shift, in itself, would have gradually diminished the number of believers in the United States because the malleable students were receiving only a naturalistic, atheistic education by people of influence within the public schools. But what has really tilted the political balance in just fifty years was the repeal of immigration quotas from predominately "Christian" Western Europe and the opening up of immigration from Eastern Europe and the Middle East. These immigrants arrived with a fully developed contrary worldview and religion from Judeo-Christianity. This immigration policy helped justify the

__________________________

(Lake Mary, Florida: Charisma House, 2004), iv.
multiculturalism being advocated and began the dilution of the homogenous nature of Christianity in America. Allowing family members of these non-Christians to immigrate also opened the floodgates to non-Western citizens and religions.

It is not a coincidence that this repealing of immigration quotas occurred during the Johnson administration. The 60's were a time of rebellion in many parts of the country and the mood of some had shifted away from our nation’s Christian heritage. Since the 5-4 decision in 1947, called Everson v. Board of Education, the first amendment had been reinterpreted to mean that the courts needed to protect the state from religion. The Judeo-Christian God became outlawed in the public arena.

A New Jersey law authorized payment by local school boards of the costs of transportation to and from private schools. As some of these schools were parochial Catholic schools…[Anti-Catholic Justice Black wrote,] No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect 'a wall of separation between Church and State.' 330 U.S. 1, 15-16.623

On June 25, 1962 in the Engel v. Vitale case, the state of New York outlawed a twenty-two word prayer. “Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon thee and we beg thy blessing upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country.” In this, Johnson made two appointments to the Supreme Court during his presidency. In 1965, Johnson appointed Abe Fortas to the Supreme Court. “Fortas was the architect and author of the broader landmark majority opinion that emerged banning religiously based

623 Wikipedia, "Everson V. Board Of Education," Everson v. Board of Education, 330 U.S. 1 (1947)[1] was the seminal United States Supreme Court case in Establishment Clause law in the United States. In addition to incorporating the Establishment Clause (applying it to the States through the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment), Everson was the beginning of a powerful separationist drive by the Court, during which many programs and practices given government sanction were found to have religious purposes or effects and thus invalidated.
creation narratives from public school science curriculums." The 1969 Epperson v. Arkansas case invalidated a Arkansas statute that prohibited the teaching of evolution in public schools. Johnson's second appointment in 1967 was Thurgood Marshall, the first African-American appointed to the Supreme Court. Johnson and others were apparently seeking to break the historic monopoly of Judeo-Christianity influence in America as Marshal was a pluralist and multiculturalist. The consequences have been profound in many areas, with the exception of fairer and more biblical treatment of the races, most of the changes were very negative.

Peter Brimelow, in his book *Alien Nation*, refers to the immigration policy and asks, "How did it happen?" Brimelow's chapter begins with a quote from England's 1830 British Prime minister Lord Melbourne. His comment regarding a different reform seems appropriate. "What all the wise men promised has not happened, and what all the damned fools said would happen has come to pass." President L.B. Johnson and Senator Ted Kennedy are the alleged "wise men" who proposed this legislation. The opponents of the measure, were the American Legion and the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies. They were portrayed as the "damned fools" that were right in what would happen. In 1965, Ted Kennedy promised on the Senate floor,
First, our cities will not be flooded with a million immigrants annually. Under the proposed bill, the present level of immigration remains substantially the same....

Secondly, the ethnic mix of this country will not be upset.... Contrary to the charges in some quarters, [the bill] will not inundate America with immigrants from any one country or area, or the most populated and deprived nations of Africa and Asia.... In the final analysis, the ethnic pattern of immigration under the proposed measure is not expected to change as sharply as the critics seem to think.... The bill will not flood our cities with immigrants. It will not upset the ethnic mix of our society. It will not relax the standards of admission. It will not cause American workers to lose their jobs." The act's supporters not only claimed the law would not change America's ethnic makeup, but that such a change was not desirable....Brimelow contended that every one of these assurances has proven false. 626

Many, if not most, do not realize that a change in immigration policy has occurred.

How did it happen? Even now, many Americans still simply do not realize what is causing this ethnic revolution that is transforming their country. They tend to assume that some kind of natural phenomenon is at work. . . in fact, [Americans are ] regularly told a natural phenomenon is indeed at work. Thus Time magazine proclaimed happily in its April 9, 1990 cover story "What Will the U.S. Be Like When Whites are No Longer the Majority?" that the "browning of America" will alter everything in society, from politics and education to industry, values and culture. . . and that, of course, "it is irreversibly the America to come" . . . Buried in eight pages of text was this one weasel phrase: "If current trends in immigration and birthrates persist. . . ",. . . No natural phenomenon is at work. And the point cannot be emphasized too strongly. . . It was a change in public policy that opened U.S. scuttles [i.e. the valve] to the Third World inflow after 1965. A further change in public policy could shut them. . . Public policy could even . . . reopen the scuttles [i.e. the valve] on the European side and start to shift the ethnic balance back." 627

Brimelow’s solution to preserve America’s Western Civilization culture does not go unchallenged or uncriticized. Hiroshi Motomura writes,

There is no doubt that the racial and ethnic composition of immigrants has shifted dramatically in the past forty years. From 1951 through 1960, fifty-three percent of our legal immigrants came from Europe.(21) In fiscal year 1993, only eighteen percent came from Europe, while over seventy-five percent came from Asia and

626 Peter Brimelow, Alien Nation: Common Sense About America’s Immigration Disaster (New York: Random House, 1995), 74.
627 Ibid. pp. 74-75.
Latin America. The European share of current immigration would fall further if we included undocumented immigration."

Suppose we were to do as Brimelow urges and undo the effects of the 1965 Act. We could, for example, restore the predominantly Northern and Western European character of immigration -- assuming sufficient numbers to shift the racial balance would want to come. Or we could allow in only "white" immigrants. Brimelow sees these as easy solutions. But immigration policy goes beyond mere statistics. It also reflects a society's most basic values. What values must we abandon before we can restore pro-European bias to immigration policy?

Multiculturalists are willing to diminish the influence of their heritage and culture not cherishing the positive influence of Christianity in order to embrace a hypothetical utopian pluralistic multiculturalist world culture.

To answer this question we must first understand the 1965 Act's place in broader historical trends in both American immigration law and public law generally. The 1965 Act marked the full adoption of a basic nondiscrimination principle in American immigration law. In so doing, it crystallized the sentiments that had already led to the repeal of the laws barring Asian immigration and naturalization.

The Caners do not write specifically of the fifth wave, but they do describe the consequences of LBJ’s policy change. It brings us to the growth of Islam in the United States since 1965. They write, “In 1960, mosques in the United States of America barely numbered more than 100. As of the year 2000, that figure surpassed 1,200 [by 2008 1,500 mosques].” From an orthodox Christian perspective, it is seen as tragic, for more Islamic mosques (i.e. “places of prostration” before Allah) means more citizens of America being enticed away from orthodox Christianity.
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629 Ibid
My concern about immigration has nothing to do with races or skin color, but my concern has everything to do with preserving our Judeo-Christian, western civilization cultural values and faith. I would encourage the United States to become a haven for persecuted Christians from all over the world.

One Imam predicts North America will become Islamicized by 2050. “As-Sabiqun, (i.e. The Vanguard) is an Islamic movement that believes in the Islamic State of North America no later than 2050. Those who engage in this great effort require a high level of commitment and determination. We are sending out a call to the believers: Join with us in this great struggle to change the world!”

Current immigration policy has already born fruit for multiculturalism. The Boston Globe headline On November 11, 2008 was: *Obama victory took root in Kennedy-inspired Immigration Act*. The article follows.

There is no question that Obama owes a debt to the Kennedys - but it may be far greater than he or they realize. Yes, Senator Edward M. Kennedy offered a crucial early endorsement, comparing the Obama of 2008 to the Jack Kennedy of 1960. And certainly Caroline and others in the Kennedy family worked hard on the campaign trail. But the greatest Kennedy legacy to Obama isn't Ted or Caroline or Bobby Jr., but rather the Immigration Act of 1965, which created the diverse country that is already being called Obama's America.

That act is rarely mentioned when recounting the high points of 1960s liberalism, but its impact arguably rivals the Voting Rights Act, the creation of Medicare, or other legislative landmarks of the era. It transformed a nation 85 percent white in 1965 into one that's one-third minority today, and on track for a nonwhite majority by 2042.

Before the act, immigration visas were apportioned based on the demographic breakdown that existed at the time of the 1920 Census - meaning that there were few if any limits on immigrants from Western and Northern Europe, but strict quotas on those from elsewhere.

The belief that the United States should remain a nation of European lineage was openly discussed when immigration laws were revisited in 1952. . . . But it also had the effect of maintaining the 1920s-era notion of the United States as a white nation. (Congress imposed the bill over President Truman's veto.)

A decade later, attitudes were changing, and President Kennedy proposed a new immigration structure that would no longer be based on national origins. After Kennedy's assassination, his brother Ted took up the fight, pushing the Johnson administration to go even further than it wanted in evening the playing field. Though Lyndon Johnson, in signing the bill, tried to reassure opponents that it wouldn't do much to change the balance of immigration, its impact was dramatic.

In the 1950s, 53 percent of all immigrants were Europeans and just 6 percent were Asians; by the 1990s, just 16 percent were Europeans and 31 percent were Asians. The percentages of Latino and African immigrants also jumped significantly.

Simon Rosenberg, president of the liberal think tank NDN, formerly the New Democrat Network, calls the Immigration Act of 1965 "the most important piece of legislation that no one's ever heard of," and said it "set America on a very different demographic course than the previous 300 years." 632

President Barak Hussein Obama appears to be on board with this change. On March 9, 2008 he said, "Whatever we once were, we are no longer a Christian nation – at least, not just. We are also a Jewish nation and a Muslim nation and a Buddhist nation and a Hindu nation and a nation of non-believers.”633 On April 6, 2009, in a speech in Turkey he remarked,

You know I have said before, one of the great strengths of the United States is although as I mentioned we have a very large Christian population, we do not consider ourselves a Christian nation or a Jewish nation or a Muslim nation. We consider ourselves a nation of citizens who are bound by ideals and a set of values. I think modern Turkey was founded with a similar set of principles... 634

Two months later, June 4, 2009, in Cairo, Egypt he identified who he feels is causing

634 Barak Obama, "Obama To Turkey: We Are Not A Christian Nation," Youtube, April 6,
the problem and suggests a cure between Islamic nations and the West.

Violent extremists have exploited these tensions in a small but potent minority of Muslims. The attacks of September 11, 2001 and the continued efforts of these extremists to engage in violence against civilians has led some in my country to view Islam as inevitably hostile not only to America and Western countries, but also to human rights. All this has bred more fear and more mistrust.

So long as our relationship is defined by our differences, we will empower those who sow hatred rather than peace, those who promote conflict rather than the cooperation that can help all of our people achieve justice and prosperity. And this cycle of suspicion and discord must end.

Richard Bolton, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, had this analysis of the President's speech before the United Nations in September 2009. Bolton observed it was,

a post-American speech by our first post-American president. . . . It was a very naïve, Wilsonian speech, and very revealing of Obama’s foreign policy. . . . the president put Israel on the chopping block in a variety of references, from calling Israeli settlements in the West Bank illegitimate to talking about ending ‘the occupation that began in 1967.’ That implies that he supports going back to 1967 borders.

Is it possible President Obama may adjust his thinking about Islam and the value of encouraging our Judeo-Christian heritage? Anything is possible, but this is unlikely. However, recently the news has reported that President Obama's Camp David Navy chaplain Carey Cash, the great-nephew of Johnny Cash, called Islam a violent faith. Cash said “from its very birth [Islam] has used the edge of the sword as a means to convert or conquer those with different religious convictions”. It is naive to believe

Islam will change its nature; attacks against infidels will continue. As attacks get closer and more frequent even the most stubborn will be challenged to accept the truth about the violent nature of Islamic theology.

Personally, I think the priority of United States immigration policy ought to be to have an open door for Christians around the world seeking to live in a Christian nation. The United States should be first a refuge for our fellow believers around the world; only secondarily for those who seek economic advantage. Encouraging the immigration of future citizens, from around the world, with the same Judeo-Christian worldview would truly strengthen our nation. Israel has found this to be a great advantage for their nation. However, some Muslims say this makes killing Jews easier and they would like to turn Israel into a great graveyard for the Jews. "The staunch pan-Arabist Awni Abdel Hadi... vowed to fight until Palestine is either placed under a free Arab government or becomes a graveyard for all the Jews in the country."638

Some judicial activist, secularists judges, in the United States, are making new interpretations of laws that ignore four hundred years of America's Christian heritage, dismissing the contribution Christianity has made to our culture and the blessing that has come from God because of this Judeo-Christian culture. The New York Times ran an article entitled Judges Ban Pledge of Allegiance from Schools. The Ninth district court a federal court of appeals said "the Pledge of Allegiance is unconstitutional because the phrase 'one nation under God' violates the separation of church and state."639

639 Evelyn Nieves, "Judges Ban Pledge Of Allegiance From Schools, Citing 'under God'," New
In a nation whose public schools are rampant with academic failure, drug abuse, unwanted pregnancy and violence, some have sought to wage war on anything that might have any association to Judeo-Christian culture, including Christmas. Others have sought to reintroduce the students to the historic Judeo-Christian culture and values once held by Western Civilization. This fall, September 2009, I was hired to teach ancient World History and United States history at Nampa Classical Academy in Idaho. The Academy opened with 550 students, ranging in grades from kindergarten through the freshman year of high school. The mascot for the school is the Minutemen. The charter called for the use of original ancient texts including readings from the Bible, the Qur'an, etc. The Founding Fathers quoted from the Bible more than any other ancient text. Donald S. Lutz, former professor of political science at the University of Houston wrote, . . . between 1760 and 1805. If we ask which book was most frequently cited in that literature, the answer is, the Bible. Table 1 shows that the biblical tradition accounted for roughly one-third of the citations in the sample.

As the school opened its doors, the local paper began to practice yellow journalism, portraying the academy as if they were involved in an illegal practice and attacking

---


the school with whatever means they thought might cause it harm.

One of the points of conflict, repeatedly referenced, was a perfectly legitimate assignment I had given to my 7th grade students. I asked them to “Compare the Code of Hammurabi with the Mosaic Law.” Both the seventh grade and freshman texts deal with these law codes. I had distributed a comparison of the two ancient texts from a web site. The assignment is perfectly valid. On November 24th, 2009 the front page lead story of the *The Idaho Press Tribune* (in bold print) stated, Charter Commission Reproves NCA. The article quoted,

Commission member Gayann DeMourdaunt . . . a seventh grade assignment to compare the Codex Hammurabi - a Babylonian system of Law-to Mosaic law as laid out in Jewish scripture and the Old Testament of the Bible. . . Deputy Attorney General Jennifer Swartz noted. . . You can't just go to a Web site and print out excerpts from the Bible and call it not a religious text. . .

DeMourdaunt and Swartz apparently do not understand that quoting from a religious text in a history and literature class is not illegal even if she decides to make it so. Nor does she apparently know that the Codex Hammurabi is a religious text. The Hammurabi religious text does not bother her, only the Judeo-Christian text. This reading was not forced upon the class, but is a natural part of the reading assignments from the state approved textbook. The following quote is from our freshmen textbook.

Seated on the throne is the sun-god Shamash, who was also the god of justice, because the rays of the sun expose the evil practices that cannot bear the light of day. He is recognizable as the sun-god by the rays at his shoulders. Hammurabi is standing in front of the throne. The text contains a prologue, laws and an epilogue. In the prologue Hammurabi introduces himself as the king whom the gods have

---


appointed to ensure the maintenance of justice . . . future kings who do not comply with these laws are threatened with the curse of the gods.\textsuperscript{643}

The 7th grade text has the following description of the Mosaic laws:

\textbf{God's laws}

This movement out of Egypt-the Exodus as it is called - was the most important event in Jewish history because Moses proved to be a great law-giver. . . On Mount Sinai, God gave him those Ten Commandments which have been an essential part of Jewish religion ever since.

Thou shalt have no other gods before me.
Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image [statue]. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them.
Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.
Remember they father and thy mother.
Thou shalt not kill . . . \textsuperscript{644}

Of course the point is, that if the Codex Hammurabi, a religious text, is not illegal, then neither should the Hebrew text be an illegal book. The textbooks themselves clearly demonstrate that referring and quoting from these religious texts should not be an illegal act. Consequently, comparing these two ancient religious law codes is a perfectly legitimate assignment. One, in fact, would be remiss for not making this comparison.

Europe and America's law codes have historically been built upon law codes like this. This is especially true of the United States laws and values.

On November 25, 2009, also on the top of the front page, our local paper wrote another article entitled, \textit{Attorney: We Won't Let NCA Shut Down}. That article included these comments,

The School and Charter Commission have clashed over the use of the Bible and other religious texts in the Academy's classrooms. Cortman, of the Alliance Defense Fund, represents the school in a federal lawsuit against the state asking a judge to allow the school to use religious texts in a cultural context. The Charter Commission issued a notice of defect this week asking the school to stop using religious texts.

\textsuperscript{643} L. DeBlois, R.J. Van Der Spek, \textit{An Introduction to the Ancient World} (London and New York: Routledge, ), 20.

\textsuperscript{644} Cootes and Snellgrove, \textit{Histories of the Ancient World}, p. 67.
But school officials say the school intends to use religious texts anyway. Cortman said it is the school's legal right to do so. He said Idaho Attorney General deputy attorneys have misinterpreted the Idaho Constitution regarding use of religious texts in schools. "The purpose of this is to keep the school open but also to protect its Constitutional rights," Cortman said of the lawsuit. But Charter Commission chairman Bill Goesling disagrees with Cortman. "It's my sense that if certain things do not change and change quickly, that school will probably receive a letter of revocation," . . . Cortman said the Alliance Defense Fund will ask the court to stop the Charter Commission from revoking the school's charter. "We'll ask for some (injunctive) relief in the upcoming weeks," Cortman said. Cortman said the language and the history of Idaho's Constitution indicates that its framers wanted to keep denomination biases out of schools, not the Bible. And he said Idaho schools have long used the Bible in its classrooms. He said the Charter Commission's decision not to allow Nampa Classical Academy to do so is a reversal of state tradition. . . . While Cortman said the Charter Commission should let the lawsuit play out before making a "rush to judgment" to shut down the school, Goesling said the lawsuit could go on for a year. That, he said, would allow the school to continue defying the state. "In the meantime taxpayers are using their money to support a religious school, or what appears to be a religious school," Goesling said.

I can assure you NCA not a religious school. There is no prayer, no attempt to convert. Presently, no religious sacred text has even been opened. My classes did begin with instruction of the various views of cosmology. This unit emphasized the humanistic evolutionary ideas presented in our textbooks but did not completely ignore various competitive views on origins. My students come from a wide variety of religions (orthodox and unorthodox) and political flavors. The school merely teaches an accurate history of the Ancient Near East and American history. NCA is not, however, contemptuous of the positive contributions of the Judeo-Christian world or the values and traditions of the parents. This tolerance appears to not be acceptable. The Judeo-Christian religions have played such an important part of our nation's heritage, but the texts that developed our political philosophy are now deemed illegal by some. With all the

problems facing American education, Idaho's Charter School Commission thinks it is worthwhile to try to eliminate a school with a balanced approach. Amos warned of the consequences for doing this. "Hear the word of the LORD, you Israelites, because the LORD has a charge to bring against you who live in the land: 'There is no faithfulness, no love, no acknowledgment of God in the land. There is only cursing, lying and murder, stealing and adultery; they break all bounds, and bloodshed follows bloodshed.'" (4:1-2)

America is guilty of having a lack of faithfulness, love and acknowledgment of God in the land. Many of America's students are involved in the aforementioned crimes. If the ruling goes against even permitting the reading of the ancient Judeo-Christian religious texts in a neutral manner, then this indicates how completely intolerant the Commission is to any Judeo-Christian student's worldview. While they are outlawing all religious texts, it is clearly the Bible reading provoking this conflict. The commission appears to be willing to only permit the indoctrination of humanistic, atheistic ideas in their education system. This dovetails perfectly with the goals of the multiculturalists who seek to put all cultures on the same plane. Again, the Muslims will benefit from this vacuum for they appear to be a protected religion by the politically correct movement. Humanism can be a very intolerant worldview and currently it seems to be bedfellows with Islam. Both seek to diminish the influence of Christianity in your generation.

Additionally, the prohibition of reading from the Qur'an fails to educate youth in what the principles of the Qur'an truly are. Our nation's leaders, media, teachers, etc. give their opinion about what type of religion Islam is. Their opinions may be wrong or right but it is this generation that will need to live with our policies and preparation. Presently, the United States is involved in a two front war in Afghanistan and Iraq. Iran is threatening to
wipe Israel, our best ally in the Middle East, off the map. Since 1979, the United States has been experiencing sneak attacks at home and abroad. We are guarding our borders, our shipping lanes and airplanes to eliminate more attacks. Nevertheless, it is clear most of the above authorities desire to express the idea that Islam is a peaceful religion. What if that is not true? Are we emotionally, mentally, physically and, most importantly, spiritually getting you prepared for the contest of wills? In this student of Islam's opinion, the answer is, "No." Consequently, an honest effort has been made to follow Jude's example,

Jude, a servant of Jesus Christ and a brother of James, To those who have been called, who are loved by God the Father and kept by Jesus Christ: Mercy, peace and love be yours in abundance. Dear friends, although I was very eager to write to you about the salvation we share, I felt I had to write and urge you to contend for the faith that was once for all entrusted to the saints.

Discussion Questions:

1. Is the issue of Islamic immigration a new issue or an old issue? Why is it now an important issue?

2. Who captured and sold the slaves to be transported to America? How many waves of Islamic Immigration have there been? How have the first and the last waves been different from those in the middle?

3. How did Moslems and Americans get along c. 1620? 1795? Who initiated these situations?

4. How did President L.B. Johnson and Teddy Kennedy change the course of the immigration policy? What did they promise? Has what they promised come true?

5. Haddad viewed this change of policy as a reflection of what? What does she envision or desire for Islam in America's future?

6. Who is Peter Brinelow and what opinions does he express about immigration?

7. What are the contrasting views of Teddy Roosevelt and Teddy Kennedy?

8. Can naiveté or wishful thinking be a problem when considering international affairs? Is the Bible naive about the nature of man? Explain.
9. Both Teddy Roosevelt and the Caners were concerned about hyphenated Americans while Haddad was not? Why the difference of opinion? Which side of the issue would you agree with and why?

10. Compare and contrast the emphasis in Wahhabi Arab schools, with that of the Multiculturalist America schools, with the educational philosophy of early American Judeo-Christian schools. What impact are the schools making in the lives of youth? As a Biblical Christian should we be concerned?

11. What was Mark A. Gabriel's attitude toward America and how was it different from Haddad's? Why the difference?

12. How did the ideological shift come from influences inside and outside of the United States? Do decisions have real life consequences?

13. What ideological shift has occurred in United States Schools that is paralleling schools in Britain? Is this a positive or negative occurrence?

14. What do you think the original intent of the first Amendment was? Is the original intent still being followed today? Research and find out if the phrase "a wall of separation between church and state" is in the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution or somewhere else? Significance?

15. What was the 1962 Engle v. Vitale case about and what do you think of that decision?

16. How does Johnson's appointment of Abe Fortas to the Supreme Court continue to impact American schools? Is the impact in the direction of good or bad?

17. What conclusion did the Boston Globe make about the impact of the Johnson/Kennedy immigration bill on the Obama election. If the immigration policy does not change in the near future will this effect have an increased chance of being repeated in the upcoming elections?

18. President Obama has commented on the religion(s) of America several times. What is his opinion and do you agree or disagree with him on this issue? How has the number of mosques in America changed since 1965? Is this a positive change for Muslims and Americans? In ultimate terms why or why not?

19. Who is John Bolton and what does he think of President Obama's speech and what kind of president does he feel President Obama is? What does that mean? Agree or disagree?

20. Obama's Camp David Navy Chaplain Carey Cash made what statement about Islam?
Do you agree with it? Do you think President Obama agrees with it? Why do you think the statement was made at all?

21. The author of this text wants to increase immigration for whom, from where? The United States needs to see itself as a preserver of what? What other country with this policy has been strengthened by it? Explain.

22. Political Science professor Lutz discovered what about most frequently cited literature by our Founding Fathers between 1760-1805? What is Nampa Classical Academy seeking legal permission to do? Why are they turning to the courts? What do you think the outcome of the courts will be? Why?

23. How is comparing the Code of Hammurabi with the Mosaic Law a comparison of two religious documents? Should this assignment be made in an ancient history class? Explain your reasoning.

24. What did the Hebrew prophet Amos say occurs when, "There is no faithfulness, no love, no acknowledgement of God in the land"? Is this occurring in the United States more than in the past? Do you think that with America's public schools in this condition they ought to be opposing any effort to teach traditional Western Civilization values in the schools? Why or why not?

25. If you could choose any nation in the world to live and raise your children in but you could not move out of it after you made your decision, which nation would that be? Why? Reflectively think about this before you answer. Explain.

26. What did Jude want to write about initially? But what did he feel like he had to write about? What does that tell us about Jude's age and is this still a need for the church today? Explain.
CHAPTER 13 A COMPARISON AND CONTRAST OF BIBLICAL & QUR'ANIC THEOLOGY

Someone has expressed something very similar to the following: "ideas lead to attitudes, attitudes to actions, actions to habits, habits to character and character to destiny." The connection and progression between idea to destiny, and the living out of one's faith and practice in-between, is obvious and yet profound. Mankind lives like he thinks and he thinks like he lives. "For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he..." (Proverbs 23:7a, KJV) Good ideas often lead to good practices, while poor ideas often lead to poor practices. Correct ideas about God will work as a magnet drawing you toward righteousness, or as a wall putting a fence around wickedness. Thus, it is critically important to think correctly about this most important idea of God. The study of God (god) is called theology.

The word Theology itself, is a compound Greek word made up of two ideas θεός (i.e. God) and λόγος (i.e. a word). Thus, theology is a word about God (or gods). There are generally nine areas Christians discuss when comparing theology. Christians evaluate whether one's theology is straight thinking or orthodox, by examining one's views

---


about God (Father, Son and Holy Spirit), man (anthropology, both physical and cultural),
sin (harmartiology), salvation (soteriology), heaven, hell, scripture, church (ecclesiology),
and end times (eschatology). Muhammad started with a collection of inaccurate *ideas*
about God, Jesus and the Bible. These ideas led him to have inaccurate *attitudes* toward
Christianity. Tragically, it led to wicked *actions* against Christians for centuries. This
negative mindset called for and produced a *habit* of violence perpetrated against
Christians and all non-Muslims and even different sects of Muslims. Today, when
speaking or writing of Islamic theology and its repeated call for *jihad*, Islam should be
described as a religion that encourages a *character* of intolerance and violence among its
followers toward others. But this goes against the spirit of our age. Former Muslim, now
Christian scholar, Ergun Mehmet Caner, observed that, “In 1,300 years of Islamic
history, we [Islamic peoples] have fought for 1,100 years. So there have been only 200
years of peace in Islam, by-in-large. In 1,100 years we have either fought each other or a
common enemy.”648 Tragically, Muhammad's false ideas, attitudes, habits, and character,
resulted ultimately in the loss of millions of lives in the past, will result in untold loss of
lives in the future, and the lost eternal *destiny* of all its followers.649 Christians should do
whatever they can to mitigate650 this situation as soon as possible.

The entire Islamic religion is based upon the reliability of the testimony of just one
illiterate man in A.D. 610. If Muhammad's testimony is false, then his entire religion is
false. The Qur'an conveys that many early observers of Muhammad felt he made the

648 http://www.cbn.com/spirituallife/ChurchAndMinistry/ChurchHistory/Crusades_Caner
whole story up, or was mad.

But the chieftains of his folk, who disbelieved, said: This is only a mortal like you who would make himself superior to you. Had Allah willed, He surely could have sent down angels. We heard not of this in the case of our fathers of old. He is only a man in whom is a madness, so watch him for a while….He is only a man who hath invented a lie about Allah. We are not going to put faith in him. (Surah 23:24-28)

The strongest negative opinions that have been expressed about Islam seem to come from those who have suffered under the Islamic dhimmitude system or by those who have been raised Muslim and then left the religion. Turkish president, Kemal Ataturk, a brutal man in his own life who dissolved the caliphate in 1924, had a very low opinion of Muhammad.

Cruel and criminal laws in Turkey have been fixed for more than five hundred years on the rules and theories of an old Arab sheik, and through the abusive interpretation of ignorant and filthy priests. . . Islam, this absurd theology of an immoral Bedouin, is a rotting corpse which poisons our lives. 651

Another group who call themselves apostates 652 of Islam state, "We left Islam." This group has clearly expressed their deep bitterness with the man Muhammad. They explain,

**Why Mohammed Was Not a Prophet.** The great disappointment of their experience in Islam is clear in the paragraph below.

One who claims to be a messenger of God is expected to live a saintly life. He must not be given to lust, he must not be a sexual pervert, and he must not be a rapist, a highway robber, a war criminal, a mass murderer or an assassin. One who claims to be a messenger of God must have a superior character. He must stand above the vices of the people of his time. Yet Muhammad’s life is that of a gangster godfather. He raided merchant caravans, looted innocent people, massacred entire male populations and enslaved the women and children. He

---

651 Fregosi. p. 407.  
raped the women captured in war after killing their husbands and told his followers that it is okay to have sex with their captives and their “right hand possessions.” (Quran 33:50) He assassinated those who criticized him and executed them when he came to power and became de facto despot of Arabia. Muhammad was bereft of human compassion. He was an obsessed man with his dreams of grandiosity and could not forgive those who stood in his way. Muhammad was a narcissist like Hitler, Saddam or Stalin. He was astute and knew how to manipulate people, but his emotional intelligence was less evolved than that of a 6-year-old child. He simply could not feel the pain of others. He brutally massacred thousands of innocent people and pillaged their wealth. His ambitions were big and as a narcissist he honestly believed he is entitled to do as he pleased and commit all sorts of crimes and his evil deeds are justified.  

It is good to believe in oneself, but not to be delusional and prideful.654 Paul warns, "Do not think of yourself more highly than you ought, but rather think of yourself with sober judgment, in accordance with the measure of faith God has given you." (Romans 12:3) But some people believe in themselves to such a degree that they put undue authority in what they think. G.K. Chesterton, in his book Orthodoxy, was in a friendly debate with a man who agreed with the sentiment that a man will do well if," he believes in himself." To which Chesterton responded "The men who really believe in themselves are all in lunatic asylums." To which the other man responded, "There were a good many men after all who believed in themselves and who were not in lunatic asylums." To which Chesterton retorted, "Yes there are."655 The problem is that far too many of those who completely believed in themselves started false religious movements (e.g. Buddha, Muhammad, Smith, Moon, Jones, Koresh, etc.). The Apostle Paul spoke of pseudo-religious persons in his day in unflattering terms, "Such a person goes into great detail about what he has seen, and his unspiritual mind puffs him up with idle notions. He has

654 "God opposes the proud but gives grace to the humble." James 4:6  
655 Chesterton, G.K., Orthodoxy (New York, Barnes and Noble, 1908) p. 6
lost connection with the Head. . ." They end up deceiving themselves and others.

Samuel M. Zwemer wrote an excellent book at the turn of the past century that is theologically as true today as it was the day it was written. His chart is helpful in getting one's bearings of Islamic theology from a Muslim perspective. Like all pseudo-Christian cults, Islam starts with a person who deviates from the Judeo-Christian scriptures. As Zwemer noted earlier, Islam is a synchronistic religion, incorporating ideas from many other pseudo-religions like Sabeanism, Arab idolatry, Zoroastrianism and Buddhism. 657

Superficially, some theologians have suggested that the three religions of Abraham (Judaism, Christianity and Islam) are similar and compatible. This idea deserves to be addressed a little more fully but it needs an introduction that ties Zwemer to a man named Miller. Samuel Zwemer went and spoke at the great convention of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions at Kansas City in 1913. Later Zwemer spoke at Princeton Seminary. William M. Miller was at both gatherings and was greatly inspired. Miller will address this idea of similarities of Islam and Christianity and be cited a number of other times in this chapter. Therefore he deserves an introduction. He writes,

"Zwemer gave a series of lectures at Princeton Theological seminary, where I was a student, and there brought powerfully to our attention the needs of the Muslim world. . . Dr. Zwemer challenged the students of Princeton Seminary to go as missionaries to Muslims. The fire in Dr. Zwemer's soul kindled a blaze in other hearts, and a number of us who listened to his appeal heard in it God's call to us to go . . . I volunteered to go to Meshed, a sacred city in northeastern Iran. . . It was my privilege to share in the work of Christ in Iran from 1919 to 1962 when I retired. Now in 1975 I can still say that my heart's desire is that Muslims may be saved and may know the love of Christ which passes knowledge. 658

656 Colossians 2:18b-19.
With this understanding of who Miller is we can now better appreciate the authority with which he writes.

A Muslim in Teheran or in Toronto says to his Christian friend, "Really, there is no great difference between my religion and yours. We both believe in God, we believe that Jesus was sent by God and was a great prophet, we believe in doing good deeds, and we both hope to be forgiven by God, and to go to paradise when we die. Why should we let our religions divide us?" . . . In fact there have been those who maintained that Islam is a Christian heresy. However, as Christians and Muslims discuss their beliefs together, it soon becomes evident that the doctrines which divide them are no fewer than the truths which seem to unite them. . . . It is therefore unfair to our Muslim friends, as well as disloyal to our faith, to conceal our differences and overlook our misunderstandings for the sake of good relations. The best relations can be established only on the foundation of understanding and truth. To that end we will now consider some of the important matters in which Muslims and Christians radically disagree. 659

Starting on the far left of Zwemer's chart below, Miller notes Islam's claim is that "Mohammed, the Apostle of God, is the sole channel of revelation from Allah and abrogates660 former revelations." In other words Allah is using Muhammad to nullify and replace all previous revelation, and the theology that arises from it given in the Bible. Muhammad becomes the new sole authority of all words concerning God (Allah). Christians cannot accept that Muhammad was more authoritative than Jesus. This idea will inevitably and quite naturally lead to a dialogue or debate between Muslims, Jews and Christians. Christians need to be up for this challenge.

659 Ibid. p. 69-70.
Muhammad tried to prepare his followers for the debate. He did this in a number of ways. First, he did it by alerting them to the fact that the debate would be forthcoming; second, by giving them a talking point. Third, it was by threatening the insecure Muslims with abandonment by Allah as the consequences if they ever were to accept Jewish or Christian theology.

And [1.] the Jews will not be pleased with you [Muslims], nor the Christians until you follow their religion. [2.] Say: Surely Allah's guidance, that is the (true) guidance. And [3.] if you follow your desires after the knowledge that has come to you, you shall have no guardian from Allah, nor any helper. (Surah 2:120, Translator Shakir)

661 Zwemer. 102-103.
In one sense, it is responsible for Christian educators to say the same to younger Christians. Muslims will not be pleased until you follow their religion. Jesus, not Allah, is the true guide and Islam will not bring about God's blessing in your life. It is at least possible that both faith claims could be false, but not possible they are both true. As a thoughtful Christian you need to learn how to take a stand for truth and learn to disagree with love in your heart toward those to whom you are witnessing. You would want them to do that for you if the roles were reversed, if Islam was true and Christianity was false. You do not have to be naive to be a good witness to Muslims. Our nation does not have to be naive either in regards to its immigration policy. Sadly, many fundamentalist Muslims spread Islam through violence. Today many Muslims still have contempt in their hearts for Jews, Christians and Hindus. They believe Allah expects and appreciates this attitude. We as individuals and as a nation need to have attitudes and policies that reflect this reality.

Muslims believe Allah's alleged theology has come down to the Islamic people through two sources of revelation. Both of these means of revelation are completely dependent on the one man, Muhammad. He alleges the Koran (Qur'an) was dictated to him, and him alone, through the angel Gabriel. He would then recite the words from Allah, which were then written down by those who heard him. In contrast, the Bible has over forty authors who received revelations over a fifteen hundred year period on three different continents.\footnote{Josh McDowell, \textit{Evidence that Demands a Verdict} (United States of America: Campus Crusade for Christ, 1972), 18.} One can compare the inspiration and the miraculous nature of the Bible by observing that a case can be made that the essence of the message did not
change throughout this entire period. There is no such test for the Qu'ran. That is why Muslims are required to affirm daily, "There is no God but Allah and Muhammad is his prophet." If Muhammad is not telling the truth, the whole system collapses. Many think Muhammad does not seem to be the sort of man God would use, even though to hear him described by some, he appears a saint. The second source of information came from observations collected by his followers of what Muhammad said, did, encouraged or allowed. Looking now at the lower part of the chart entitled Tradition we see that Muslims view Muhammad's life as an example of a perfect man and a warner. "Verily in the messenger of Allah ye have a good example for him who looketh unto Allah and the Last Day, and remembereth Allah much." 663 Allah allegedly states,

O followers of the Book! indeed Our Messenger [i.e. Muhammad] has come to you explaining to you after a cessation of the (mission of the) messengers, lest you say: There came not to us a giver of good news or a warner, so indeed there has come to you a giver of good news and a warner; and Allah has power over all things.664

The Traditions were handed down orally and then collected by a variety of persons, following Muhammad's death. The Sunni and Shi'a have some differences in their collections. The set of traditions, or Hadith, considered to be the most reliable were those collected by Bukhari (Buchari) and has been the Hadith most often cited in this study. The Hadith reveals much about Muhammad's obsessions, his ignorance, his superstition, and bad character. Remember, these were not collected by Muhammad's enemies but by his wives and followers. These were collected by those who knew him, who revered him,


664 Surah 5:19, Translator Shakirhttp://www.usc.edu/schools/college/crcc/engagement/resources/texts/muslim/quran/005.qmt.html
who loved him. It is in these Hadiths that one can clearly see the manic\(^665\) nature of this man's character. Reading the Hadith, to the non-indoctrinated, reveals that Muhammad was a greatly troubled man and not a prophet of God.

In the middle of Zwemer's chart we examine the Koran (Qur'an), "The Verbal revelation, which teaches the two-fold demands of Islam;" that is faith (Arabic *Iman*) and practice (Arabic, *Din*).

**The Six Articles of Islamic Faith "What to Believe"**


1. *God*: Muslims constantly repeat the famous creedal statement about their God, Allah.

   "There is no god but Allah, and Mohammed is His apostle [Prophet]."

2. *Angels*: They play a significant role in Islamic theology and daily life.

   Gabriel . . . appeared to Muhammad and was instrumental in delivering the revelations in the Quran to Muhammad. Al-Shaytan is the devil and most likely a fallen angel or jinn. Jinn are those creatures between angels and men which can be either good or evil. Angels do not perform bodily functions (sex, eating, etc.) since they are created from light. All angels have different purposes, such as Gabriel, or Jibril, who is the messenger of Inspiration. Each man or woman has two recording angels- one who records his good deeds the other, his bad deeds.\(^666\)

   Muslims are not dog lovers for we learn in the Hadith what Muhammad taught about angels and dogs. "I heard Allah's Messenger...saying, 'Angels do not enter a house wherein there is a dog or some images (or pictures etc.) of living creatures (a human


being or an animal etc.)."\(^{667}\)

3. Scriptures: Miller writes,

Islam is a religion of revelation. God has spoken, and has given his Word to his prophets to some of whom he has given also books. It is said that the number of books given to the prophets is 104. In the Koran there are references to the Torat (of Moses), the Suhuf (sheets or books of the prophets), the Zabur (Psalms of David), Injil (Gospel of Jesus), and Quran (Koran of Muhammad). It is supposed that Adam, Noah, Abraham, and other prophets had books which are now nonexistent. All of these books are the Word of God, and the teaching of all is basically the same. However, when God gives a new book to one of the Great prophets he thereby abrogates the previous books. For the present age the Koran is alone adequate, and after the coming of Muhammad only its commands are binding on believers.\(^{668}\)

My impression after reading the Quran is that the book is mostly a non-inspired harangue against non-Muslims or non-devout Muslims.

4. Prophets: "In Islam God has spoken through numerous prophets down through the centuries. The six greatest: Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus and Muhammad. Muhammad is the last and greatest of all Allah's messengers (Surah 33:40)."\(^{669}\)

The fact that Muhammad borrowed many names from the Bible (Adam, Enoch, Job, Moses, Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, even Jesus etc.) does not mean he got the critical theological ideas surrounding their lives or ministries correct. Muhammad did not know how to read. If he would have been able to read the scriptures, they might of had more of an impact in his life. As it was, he just used names he had heard, and retold or invented stories that only show the slightest resemblance to the original biblical stories. A careful reading of the stories about the above characters reveals they are quite different.


\(^{668}\) Miller, p. 51-52.
5. The Last Day (Judgment): Sir Norman Anderson in his book, *The World's Religions*, writes, "The last day (the resurrection and the judgment) figures prominently in Muslim thought. The day and hour is a secret to all, but there are to be twenty-five signs of its approach." 670 In the Hadith we read of some of those signs.

The Prophet said, ‘The Hour (Last Day) will not be established until (religious) knowledge will be taken away (by the death of religious learned men), earthquakes will be very frequent, time will pass quickly, *Fitân* (trials and afflictions) will appear, murders will increase and money will overflow amongst you.671

Elsewhere, the Hadith lists more of the signs.

Allah’s Messenger …said, ‘From among the portents of the Hour are (the following)
1. Religious knowledge will be taken away (the death of religious learned men).
2. Ignorance (of religion) will prevail.
3. Drinking of alcoholic drinks (will be very common).
4. There will be prevalence of open Illegal sexual intercourse…Women will increase in number and men will decrease in number so much so that fifty women will be looked after by one man.’ 672

According to Islamic theology, the end of times will be a very tumultuous period in history. As the world tensions rise and the conflicts prevail, one can see how leaders like Shi’ite Amadinejad of Iran can use tumult to frighten moderate Muslims into becoming more fundamental in their beliefs and practices. This conflict has the same effect on Christendom, but it aligns the forces on the opposite sides of each other.

There are several similarities between the eschatology of the Bible and the Qur’an. For example, both believe there is a day coming that is unknown to all but God and there will be judgment that occurs on that day. The differences are much more profound. Who

---

672 Ibid. Vol. 1, #81, p. 104.
goes to heaven or hell? How does one get to heaven and avoid hell? What is heaven like? Who is hell full of and why? These are much more important questions. Miller wrote part of the Islamic answer to these questions.

Each one's deeds will be weighed in God's balance, and the record of each will be placed in his hand, in the right hands of the blessed and in the left hands of the damned. Also the bridge Sirat must be crossed, which is very narrow and very long. True believers will be able to cross easily, but the wicked will fall into hell. Believers both men and women, who have feared God [i.e. Allah] and been humble and charitable, and have suffered for God's sake, will be welcomed to paradise. There they will dwell forever by flowing rivers, reclining on silken couches, praising God, and enjoying heavenly food and drink in company with the dark-eyed maidens. But the unbelieving and the worshipers of other gods will abide in the fires of hell forever, fed with boiling water. Some Muslims interpret these descriptions spiritually, but probably the majority take them literally. It seems that only the martyrs slain in battle for Islam are granted immediate entrance into paradise. All other believers must await the day of resurrection. Between death and the resurrection they are in a very deep sleep. One does not know till that day whether he is to go to hell or to paradise.

6. Predestination: The Islamic doctrine of Predestination is amazing in its totality about a person's destiny both in the here and in the hereafter. For example, four decisions are made about each person before they are born.

The Prophet said, "At every womb Allah appoints an angel who says, 'O Lord! . . . [1] Will it be a male or female [2], a wretched (cf. footnote: in the hereafter is he who will choose the way which will lead him to Hell-fire) or a blessed, (cf. footnote: in the hereafter is he who will choose the way which will lead him to Paradise.) [3] and how much will his provision be? [4] And what will his age be?' So all that is written while the child is still in the mother's womb." 673

The Six Islamic Practices (Din), "What to do"

The Practices (Din) of the Faith are five-fold: 1. The Creed (Shahada) 2. Prayer, (Salat) five times a day 3. Fasting (Sawm), during the month of Ramadan - daylight hours. 4. Alms, giving 1/40th or 2.5% of one's wealth annually. 5. Pilgrimage to Mecca,

---
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(Hajj) once in your lifetime. Hajji becomes part of your name at this point. 6. An unofficial but clearly taught practice is jihad (struggle or holy war). These six points of Islamic practice need to be briefly explained, compared and contrasted to the teachings of Christianity.

1. Creed (Shahada): The Islamic creed heard and uttered countless times throughout a Muslim's life is as follows: "There is no God but Allah and Muhammad is his prophet."

Creedal statements are a wonderful tool for passing on the faith if the creeds are correct doctrine. Unfortunately, this is not the case in Islam. Early Christians also used a number of creedal statements in the Bible that are true. I Corinthians 15:3-8 has that creedal introduction.

For what I received I passed on to you as of first importance: that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures, and that he appeared to Peter, and then to the Twelve. After that, he appeared to more than five hundred of the brothers at the same time, most of whom are still living, though some have fallen asleep. Then he appeared to James, then to all the apostles, and last of all he appeared to me also, as to one abnormally born.

Gary Habermas, a premier scholar on the death and resurrection of Jesus, has collected a number of testimonies from a variety of scholars that place this creed as early as the eyewitness testimony and within two years of the actual event.\(^\text{675}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Salah</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number of Fard Raka’at</th>
<th>1st two Fard Raka’at</th>
<th>Before Fard</th>
<th>After Fard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fajr</td>
<td>Between Dawn until Sunrise</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ALOUD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuhr</td>
<td>Between just past noon and mid-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SILENT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>afternoon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Asr</td>
<td>Between mid afternoon until before</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SILENT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sunset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maghrib</td>
<td>Between just after sunset until dark</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ALOUD</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Isha</td>
<td>Between dark and shortly before dawn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ALOUD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2+2+3+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Prayer (Salat): Muslims have a highly directed series of times and requirements for prayer. Some of the prayer ritual seems a bit unusual to Westerners. For example, the times of prayer are regulated. 676

Multiple hadiths direct the practice of bathing before prayer.

- Allah’s Apostle (p.b.u.h) said, "Anyone of you attending the Friday (prayers) should take a bath."
- Allah’s Apostle (p.b.u.h) used to order us to take a bath (on Fridays)?"
- Allah’s Apostle (p.b.u.h) said, "The taking of a bath on Friday is compulsory for every male (Muslim) who has attained the age of puberty." 677

Muslims to this day are directed to bathe after any of the following bodily functions.

"Wudi or ceremonial washing is necessary before prayer. It has to be redone
1. after “Breaking wind,
2. after Going to Toilet
3. after Deep Sleep
4. after significant bleeding
5. after sexual activity & after discharge
6. women should not pray during menstrual cycle" 678

The position of body during prayer is also considered very important and impacts the potency of the prayer.

"I asked the Prophet (p.b.u.h) about the prayer of a person while sitting. He said,
'It is better for one to pray standing; and whoever prays sitting gets half the reward of that who prays while standing; and whoever prays while lying gets half the reward of that who prays while sitting." 679

All this ritual seems very cumbersome and unnecessary to a Christian who was given these directions about prayer by Jesus in his sermon on the Mount.

"And when you pray, do not be like the hypocrites, for they love to pray standing..." 


677 Bukhari Hadith, Volume 2, Book 13, Number 2; Volume 2, Book 13, Number 3; Volume 2, Book 13, Number 4:


in the synagogues and on the street corners to be seen by men. I tell you the truth, they have received their reward in full. But when you pray, go into your room, close the door and pray to your Father, who is unseen. Then your Father, who sees what is done in secret, will reward you. And when you pray, do not keep on babbling like pagans, for they think they will be heard because of their many words. Do not be like them, for your Father knows what you need before you ask him. (Matthew 6:5-8)

3. Fasting (Sawm): Fasting during Ramadan:

Allah’s Apostle said, "Whoever observes fasts during the month of Ramadan out of sincere faith, and hoping to attain Allah's rewards, then all his past sins will be forgiven."680

Miller writes,

The fast begins when the new moon is seen, and lasts till the next new moon, from the first light of dawn in the morning till about a half hour after sunset in the evening all adults (except the sick and travelers) are forbidden to take food or drink, to smoke, and to have sexual intercourse. Some very strict Muslims will not even swallow their own saliva. If the fast is broken by letting a drop of water go down one's throat while he is cleaning his teeth he must atone by keeping another fast.681

This also seems to be the wrong focus for Christians. Fasting for Christians is a private internal experience, not a corporate external activity. Jesus said,

When you fast, do not look somber as the hypocrites do, for they disfigure their faces to show men they are fasting. I tell you the truth, they have received their reward in full. But when you fast, put oil on your head and wash your face, so that it will not be obvious to men that you are fasting, but only to your Father, who is unseen; and your Father, who sees what is done in secret, will reward you. (Matthew 6:16-18)

4. Alms (Zakat): Muhammad grew up as an orphaned child living with one relative after another. Perhaps this sensitized him to the plight of the poor. It is good practice to share with others. Zakat in the Qur'an:

**SHAKIR:** O you who believe! spend (benevolently) of the good things that you

---

680 Bukhari, Volume 1, Book 2, Number 37
681 Miller, p. 59.
earn and or what We have brought forth for you out of the earth, and do not aim at what is bad that you may spend (in alms) of it, while you would not take it yourselves unless you have its price lowered, and know that Allah is Self-sufficient, Praiseworthy (Surah 2:267).

**SHAKIR:** O you who believe! most surely many of the doctors of law and the monks eat away the property of men falsely, and turn (them) from Allah's way; and (as for) those who hoard up gold and silver and do not spend it in Allah's way, announce to them a painful chastisement, (Surah 9:34). . .

**SHAKIR:** Alms are only for the poor and the needy, and the officials (appointed) over them, and those whose hearts are made to incline (to truth) and the (ransoming of) captives and those in debts and in the way of Allah and the wayfarer; an ordinance from Allah; and Allah is knowing, Wise (Surah 9:60).

While it appears Muhammad originally felt the Zakat was for the poor and needy, he early on accepted it as a means to raise funds for jihad. Bukhari's Hadith records an exchange between a Zakat collector and a *jihadist*, as well as Muhammad's response.

Allah's Apostle (p.b.u.h) ordered (a person) to collect Zakat, and that person returned and told him that Ibn Jamil, Khalid bin Al-Walid, . . . had refused to give Zakat." The Prophet said, "What made Ibn Jamil refuse to give Zakat though he was a poor man, and was made wealthy by Allah and His Apostle ? [Muhammad's Response]  ... you are unfair in asking Zakat from Khalid as he is keeping his armor for Allah's Cause (for Jihad).

Muhammad did not ask Zakat to be paid by those engaged in *jihad* because that was a legitimate use of that money. In the footnote on this Hadith published in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia these words are written. "From this narration religious scholars consider it permissible to buy weapons (artillery, missiles, tanks, planes etc.) for *Jihad* from the *Zakat*."682

In contrast, both Jews and Christians are encouraged to practice a tithe or give a tenth of their income to God and not to the military. Malachi wrote, "Bring the whole tithe into

---

the storehouse, that there may be food in my house. 'Test me in this,' says the LORD Almighty, 'and see if I will not throw open the floodgates of heaven and pour out so much blessing that you will not have room enough for it.' (Malachi 3:10)

Zakat monies have been raised, perhaps under false pretenses, and used to cover terrorist expenses. The National Review, quoting an article prepared for the United Nations, reports that the 9/11 attack cost more than $500,000. In a 1998 interview with ABC News, Usama bin Laden, speaking of merchants in Afghanistan, said they should be supporting the fundamentalist regime of the Taliban through Zakat monies.

Muslims and Muslim merchants, in particular, should give their zakat and their money in support of this state [Taliban regime] which [Usama claimed] is reminiscent of the state of Medina . . . where the followers of Islam embraced the Prophet of God."683

Usama said the same thing for the Zakat support of the Lashkar Fundamentalists in support of their jihad in Southeast Asia. Usama said the Lashhar, "Deserve credit, those traders and businessmen, who give Zakat so that they can help arm that ill-equipped Lashkar."684 After discovering this charity money was being used in this way, President George Bush restricted donations going to certain groups. Since taking office, President Obama has reversed these prohibitions.

In the Bible, we read about charity to others. The advice given by Jesus is meaningful.

Be careful not to do your 'acts of righteousness' before men, to be seen by them. If you do, you will have no reward from your Father in heaven. So when you give to the needy, do not announce it with trumpets, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and on the streets, to be honored by men. I tell you the truth, they

have received their reward in full. But when you give to the needy, do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing, so that your giving may be in secret. Then your Father, who sees what is done in secret, will reward you. (Matthew 6:1-4)

5. Pilgrimage to Mecca (Hajj):

Normally, the study of the hajj does not raise too much objection and what usually follows is a description of what transpires during the hajj, or trip to Mecca, by the pilgrim. But there are several objections that need to be made to this practice. First, the

idea that following Hagar's expulsion from Abraham's camp (in Genesis 21) she then traveled approximately 800 miles before running out of water, needs to be called what it is, a religious myth. The map above shows the general route she would have taken and the text below conveys the details.

The child grew and was weaned, and on the day Isaac was weaned Abraham held a great feast. But Sarah saw that the son whom Hagar the Egyptian had borne to Abraham was mocking, and she said to Abraham, "Get rid of that slave woman and her son, for that slave woman's son will never share in the inheritance with my son Isaac. The matter distressed Abraham greatly because it concerned his son. But God said to him, "Do not be so distressed about the boy and your maidservant. Listen to whatever Sarah tells you, because it is through Isaac that your offspring will be reckoned. I will make the son of the maidservant into a nation also, because he is your offspring. Early the next morning Abraham took some food and a skin of water and gave them to Hagar. He set them on her shoulders and then sent her off with the boy. She went on her way and wandered in the desert of Beersheba. When the water in the skin was gone, she put the boy under one of the bushes. Then she went off and sat down nearby, about a bowshot away, for she thought, "I cannot watch the boy die." And as she sat there nearby, she began to sob. God heard the boy crying, and the angel of God called to Hagar from heaven and said to her, "What is the matter, Hagar? Do not be afraid; God has heard the boy crying as he lies there. Lift the boy up and take him by the hand, for I will make him into a great nation." Then God opened her eyes and she saw a well of water. So she went and filled the skin with water and gave the boy a drink. God was with the boy as he grew up. He lived in the desert and became an archer. While he was living in the Desert of Paran, his mother got a wife for him from Egypt. (Genesis 21:8-20)

It is written that, "Abraham took some food and a skin of water" and "When the water in the skin was gone she put the boy under one of the bushes. Then she went off and sat down nearby . . . Then God opened her eyes and she saw a well of water. So she went and filled the skin with water and gave the boy a drink." We do not know the size of the animal skin, but it is doubtful that it could hold more than one to three gallons of water. Since a gallon of water weighs approximately eight pounds, three gallons would have been twenty-four pounds. With a boy in tow, that would have been plenty to care for. With the two of them sharing the water, they could not have travel a great distance on
that amount of water. Therefore, they could not have discovered the zamzam (i.e. bubbling) water in Mecca and thus founded that city in Saudi Arabia. The Bible (Genesis 11:27-13:3) records Abraham traveled from Ur, to Haran, to Canaan, to Egypt and then back to Canaan. It does not record that he ever traveled to Mecca. Both of these facts make the foundation of the Hajj story impossible without miraculous intervention of travel which is not mentioned in the scriptures.

**SHAKIR:** Most surely the first house appointed for men is the one at Bekka [Mecca], blessed and a guidance for the nations.

**SHAKIR:** In it are clear signs, the standing place of Ibrahim, and whoever enters it shall be secure, and pilgrimage to the House is incumbent upon men for the sake of Allah, (upon) every one who is able to undertake the journey to it; and whoever disbelieves, then surely Allah is self-sufficient, above any need of the worlds.

**SHAKIR:** Say: O followers of the Book! why do you disbelieve in the communications of Allah? And Allah is a witness of what you do.

**SHAKIR:** Say: O followers of the Book! why do you hinder him who believes from the way of Allah? You seek (to make) it crooked, while you are witness, and Allah is not heedless of what you do. (Surah 3:96-99)

Second, Muslims praying toward a black draped boxlike structure with a meteorite on the corner of it is surely idol worship or at least idol adoration. The Ka'aba was formerly a polytheistic pagan shrine that has been converted into the holiest shrine in Islam with people praying in that direction five times a day. In Muhammad's day there were 360 idols in it. When he conquered Mecca in 630, he destroyed all the Arab deities except Allah and the black meteorite on the corner of the structure. Praying toward a boxlike building is not biblical.

Third, the Hajj to Saudi Arabia has historically been a means of inspiring and radicalizing pilgrims, Osama bin Laden is the latest example. John Olbert Voll wrote a chapter in *The Oxford History of Islam* entitled, *Foundations for Renewal and Reform: Islamic Movements in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries.* In that chapter he writes,
For two centuries…the combination of a renewal mission, opposition to local non-Islamic customs, and defense against foreign rule provided a highly successful format for the efforts to create alternative, authentically Islamic communities and states. For a time these jihad states were more effective than virtually all other alternatives in resisting European expansion.\textsuperscript{686}

To really appreciate what he is saying, one must understand that his phrase \textit{Renewal and Reform Movements} is really a euphemism\textsuperscript{687} for the attempted implementing of, what many in the West would call, radical Islamic fundamentalism on as many cultures as possible. \textit{Renewal and Reform} is really the violent implementing of the strict literal Qur’anic culture or sharia law of Mecca upon all cultures. Voll called those who implemented this cultural change (usually by violent means) \textit{reformers}. By this definition, Osama bin Laden was just such a reformer and many would call him a terrorist. Voll clearly documents that the hajj experience was the starting point for inspiring and motivating many men to return to their homeland and implement this pattern of intimidation and jihad. The hajj served this purpose in Arabia, Iran, West Africa, Southeast Asia, Indonesia, China, Russia, Turkey, India, Somalia and even Brazil.

Voll begins his renewal section by calling attention to the Wahhabi movement. Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab (1703-91) was educated in the schools of Mecca and Medina, Arabia. The teaching had a profound impact upon him.

He soon became convinced that most Muslims were not living in accord with the rules of the Quran and the traditions of the Prophet, and he was especially disturbed by the popular religious practices that were common in central Arabia. These included visitation of tombs and apparent veneration of natural sites. He began a campaign against this idolatry in the name of the special theme of his renewalism: the absolute one-ness and sovereignty of God (\textit{tawid})…al-Wahhab expanded its [i.e.tawid] meaning to include opposition to anything that appeared to be claiming

\textsuperscript{686} Esposito, p. 543.
\textsuperscript{687} Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1), "euphemism," the substitution of a mild, indirect, or vague expression for one thought to be offensive, harsh, or blunt.

authority separate from God….This brought him into opposition to the Sufi orders…al-Wahhab began his campaign of renewal in the smaller city-states of central Arabia, and his zeal aroused the opposition of establish authorities who feared that he might cause unrest. In 1745 he established a relationship with Muhammad ibn Saud, the ruler of Ad Diriyah (in modern central Saudi Arabia). The alliance between the warrior and the teacher was successful and a militant renewalist state was established.  

Scholar, and former Ambassador from Israel to the United Nations, Dore Gold, has written on this connection between the Wahhabi-Saudi Emirate in his book on Saudi Arabia entitled, Hatred's Kingdom, How Saudi Arabia Supports the New Global Terrorism.

The United States and its allies can win the most spectacular military victories . . . they can eliminate terrorist masterminds. But even taken together such triumphs are not enough to remove the terrorist threat, for they do not get at the source of the problem. . . All terrorists must be indoctrinated--indeed brainwashed. . . In short, unless the ideological roots of the hatred that led to September 11 are addressed, the war on terrorism will not be won. It will be only a matter of time before the next Osama bin Laden emerges.

Indoctrination is what has historically transpired during the hajj, at least for some Muslims. Today, the Wahhabi sect continues to export these radical ideas with Saudi monies going to schools throughout Pakistan, Afghanistan, the Sudan and around the world.

6. Unofficial Holy War (Jihad): It is interesting Zwemer did not include this in his list of religious practices. It must not have figured in as dramatically as it does today. In September 2001, in a interview with Pakistani newspaper, Ummat, Osama declared that, "Al-Qaida was set up to wage a jihad against infidelity, particularly to counter the onslaught of the infidel countries against the Islamic states. Jihad is the sixth undeclared

---
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pillar of Islam."691

Both Jesus and Muhammad were asked what is the greatest commandment. Jesus answered the question well.

"Teacher, which is the greatest commandment in the Law?" Jesus replied: "'Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind.' This is the first and greatest commandment. And the second is like it: 'Love your neighbor as yourself.' All the Law and the Prophets hang on these two commandments." (Matthew 22:36-40).

Jesus condensed the Ten Commandments into its natural two-fold focus, Commandments 1-4 focuses on God, while commandments 5-10 focuses on man. Muhammad gives an initial answer similar to Jesus' but the second response goes far afield from where he should be.

“Allah’s Messenger was asked, ‘What is the best deed?’
He replied, ‘To believe in Allah and His Messenger (Muhammad).’
The questioner then asked, ‘What is the next (in goodness)?’
He replied, ‘To participate in Jihad (holy fighting) in Allah’s Cause.’ …
‘What is …next… Hajj (pilgrimage to Makkah).’692

Thomas Patrick Hughes, in his classic work, Dictionary of Islam, defines Jihad.

Jihad Lit. an effort, or a striving. A religious war with those who are unbelievers in the mission of Muhammad. It is an incumbent religious duty, established in the Qur'an and in the Traditions as a divine institution, and enjoined specially for the purpose of advancing Islam and of repelling evil from Muslims. When an infidel's country is conquered by a Muslim ruler, its inhabitants are offered three alternatives:-
(1) the Reception of Islam in which case the conquered become enfranchised citizens of the Muslim state.
(2) The payment of a poll-tax (Jizyah), by which unbelievers in Islam obtain protection, and become Zimmis [i.e. dhimmis], provided they are not the idolaters of Arabia.
(3) Death by the sword, to those who will not pay the poll tax.693

693 Hughes, Thomas Patrick, Dictionary of Islam (Chicago, Kazi Publications, 1886) p. 243
From the reading of the Qur'an, it seems evident Allah is angry at the Jews and Christians and wants to force them to submit to Islam. This is an indication that the Islamic Allah is not the same person as the Yahweh of the Bible. Allah uses four means to motivate Muslims to attack others. Allah uses words of encouragement, promising words of booty, challenging words and threatening words to his Islamic followers to convince them to fight against Jews, Christians, Hindus and others until they submit to Islam.

**Encouragement to Jihad**

"O Prophet! Exhort the believers to fight. If there be of you twenty steadfast they shall overcome two hundred, and if there be of you a hundred (steadfast) they shall overcome a thousand of those who disbelieve [Jews and Christians], because they (the disbelievers) [Jews and Christians], are a folk without intelligence"

(Surah 8:65).

"They will not fight against you in a body save in fortified towns or from behind walls; their fighting between them is severe, you may think them as one body, and their hearts are disunited; that is because they are a people who have no sense"

(Surah 59:14).

"And certainly Allah made good to you His promise when you slew them by His permission. . .(Surah 3:152a.).

**Promise of Booty for Jihadists**

"And know that out of all the booty that ye may acquire (in war), a fifth share is assigned to Allah,- and to the Messenger, and to near relatives, orphans, the needy, and the wayfarer,- if ye do believe in Allah and in the revelation. . ."

(Surah 8:65).

**Challenging Words to Jihad**

"And fight with them until there is no more persecution and religion should be only for Allah" (Surah 8:39a).

"Lo! Allah loveth them who battle for His cause in ranks, as if they were a solid structure" (Surah 61:4).

**Threatening Words to Jihad**

"Fighting is obligatory for you, much as you dislike it" (Surah 2:216).

"Believers, when you encounter the infidels on the march, do not turn your backs
to them in flight. If anyone on that day turns his back to them, except it be for tactical reasons...he shall incur the wrath of God and Hell shall be his home..." (Surah 8:12).

"If you do not fight, He will punish you sternly, and replace you by other men." (Surah 9:37)

The side by side comparison of Islamic and Christian doctrine that follows may be helpful. There are many charts similar to this one, but this is a thorough and easy to follow synopsis of the two very different doctrines. The comparisons follow the nine areas of theology mentioned at the beginning of the chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biblical Theology</th>
<th>Islamic Theology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biblical Theology</strong></td>
<td><strong>Islamic Theology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblical Theology is an understanding of God and his teachings based exclusively upon the Biblical revelation.</td>
<td>Islamic Theology claims to incorporate the Old and New Testaments but it is actually based upon Muhammad's 114 new revelations recorded in the Qur'an and his lifestyle recorded in the various collections of the Hadith. Neither his words nor deeds match the Bible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus warned about pseudo-cults.</td>
<td>SHAKIR: O you who believe! do not take the Jews and the Christians for friends; they are friends of each other; and whoever amongst you takes them for a friend, then surely he is one of them; surely Allah does not guide the unjust people. 5:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15Watch out for false prophets. They come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ferocious wolves. 16By their fruit you will recognize them. Matt. 7:15</td>
<td>SHAKIR: They desire that you should disbelieve as they have disbelieved, so that you might be (all) alike; therefore take not from among them friends until they fly (their homes) in Allah's way; but if they turn back, then seize them and kill them wherever you find them, and take not from among them a friend or a helper. 4:89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The apostle Paul gave this necessary direction to church leaders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9He must hold firmly to the trustworthy message as it has been taught, so that he can encourage others by sound doctrine and refute those who oppose it. Titus 1:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>God the Father:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Allah:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* This, then, is how you should pray: * &quot;Our Father in heaven, hallowed be your name. Matt. 6:9</td>
<td><strong>Muslims reject the idea that God is our &quot;Father in Heaven&quot; calling this blasphemy.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God is our heavenly Father (Matt.6:9-13). Jesus taught us to relate and pray to God as our Father in heaven. Christianity is the only religion that emphasizes that God is our Father in heaven. The dictionary defines a father as a &quot;nurturer and protector&quot; The very first words out of God's mouth after the fall of man were, &quot;Where are you?&quot; (Gen. 3:9b). When man fell God's work became &quot;to seek and save the lost&quot;. God told us to, &quot;Be merciful to those who doubt, snatch others from the fire and save them; to others show mercy, mixed with fearing even the clothing stained by corrupted flesh.&quot;(Jude 1:22,23)</td>
<td>&quot;Christians often assume that all who believe in one God can agree that God is our heavenly Father. But Muslims cannot call God 'Father.' Once when I was reading from the sixth chapter of Matthew in Persian to a group of patients waiting to see the doctor in a Christian hospital in Iran, I came to the first words of the Lord's Prayer, &quot;Our Father, which art in heaven.&quot; But I was rudely interrupted in my reading. &quot;Don't call God 'Father'&quot; said a man sitting opposite to me, 'that is blasphemy, God is not a father!'&quot; Op. cit Miller, <em>A Christian's Response to Islam</em> (Wheaton, IL, Tyndale, 1976) p. 73-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is God the Father's Nature?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Allah loves those that Love him but not those who do not &quot;.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nature:
The nature of anything its qualities, essence and essential traits. Historically, many theologians have sought to define God through His natural attributes and moral attributes. Using scripture we can see a clear picture of God’s nature.

God is omniscient “His understanding has No limits” (Ps. 147:5)

God is omnipotent “I know that you can do all things; no plan of yours can be thwarted.” Job 42:2 “…He got up and rebuked the wind and the raging waters, the storm subsided and ALL was calm” (Luke 8:24b)

God is omnipresent “Where can I go from your Spirit where can I flee from your presence” (Ps. 139:7)

God is eternal “From everlasting to everlasting you are God” (Ps. 90:2)

God is immutable “I the Lord do not change…” (Malachi 3:6)

God is perfect “As for God, his way is perfect…” (2 Sam. 22:31, Ps. 18:30)

Moral Attributes:

God is Holy “Be holy, because I am holy” (1 Peter 1:16)

God is Loving “The Lord is compassionate and gracious, slow to anger abounding in love” (Ps.103:8)

I John 4:8, 16 "God is love."

7Dear friends, let us love one another, for love comes from God. Everyone who loves has been born of God and knows God. 8Whoever does not love does not know God, because God is love. 9This is how God showed his love among us: He sent his one and only Son into the world that we might live through him. 10This is love: not that we loved God, but that he loved us and sent his Son as an atoning sacrifice for our sins.

11We know that we live in him and he in us, because he has given us of his Spirit. 12And we have seen and testify that the Father has sent his Son to be the Savior of the world. 13If anyone acknowledges that Jesus is the Son of God, God lives in him and he in God. 14And so we know and rely on the love God has for us. God is love. Whoever lives in love lives in God, and God in him.

Jesus:

Jesus Christ's nature and work.

Jesus is our God, Savior, and High Priest Hebrews 4:14-16, “Therefore, since we have a great high priest who has gone through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold firmly to the faith we profess. For we do not have a high priest who is unable to sympathize with our weaknesses, but we have one who has been tempted in every way, just as we are—yet was without sin. Let us then approach the throne of grace with

Jesus[Isa]

PICKTHAL: They [Jews and Christians] have taken as lords beside Allah their rabbis and their monks and the Messiah son of Mary, when they were bidden to worship only One Allah. There is no Allah save Him. Be He Glorified from all that they ascribe as partner (unto Him)! 9:31

Jesus (Isa) is just a prophet:

YUSUFALI: "On the Day when every soul will be confronted with all the good it has done, and all the evil it has done, it will wish there were a great distance between it and its evil. But Allah cautions you (To remember) Himself. And Allah is full of kindness to those that serve Him." Say: "If ye do love Allah, Follow me: Allah will love you and forgive you your sins: For Allah is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful.” Say: "Obey Allah and His Messenger": But if they turn back, Allah loveth not those who reject Faith, 3:30-32

"In Islam God is unknowable because he has not made himself known. The commands of God are made known to men in the Koran, but God himself is not there revealed. . . But while they know much about God that is correct, there is much that they do not know, and there are also many of their conceptions which are incorrect. It is as though a person in the dim light of dawn should look at a distant building. He sees the building, he is unable to tell whether it is a residence or a factory. . . Just so when a Muslim looks toward God in the imperfect light of Koranic revelation and of his own reason, he sees God's power and will, but he does not see that he is Trinity in unity. Such true knowledge of God is possible only when one sees God in his son Jesus Christ. (op. cit. Miller pp.75-76.)"
confidence, so that we may receive mercy and find grace to help us in our time of need.

Jesus’ nature (i.e. his qualities, essence and essential traits) is the same as God the Father. Jesus limited himself only during his ministry on earth. In Colossians 2:9 we learn how much of God was in Jesus. “For in Christ all the fullness of the Deity lives in bodily form…” Philippians 2:5-8 states “Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness. And being found in appearance as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient to death— even death on a cross!…”. Jesus was also fully man, born of a woman conceived by the Holy Spirit in Matthew 1:18 we learn “This is how the birth of Jesus Christ came about: His mother Mary was pledged to be married to Joseph, but before they came together, she was found to be with child through the Holy Spirit.” Yet Jesus was tempted like us but was the only man who resisted sin completely (cf. Hebrews 4:15). Therefore Jesus does NOT need a savior. In Hebrews 9:11-14 we read that His work was superior to all other priests, “When Christ came as high priest of the good things that are already here, he went through the greater and more perfect tabernacle that is not man-made, that is to say, not a part of this creation. He did not enter by means of the blood of goats and calves; but he entered the Most Holy Place once for all by his own blood, offering himself unblemished to God, cleanse our consciences from acts that lead to death, so that we may serve the living God!”

Islam cannot improve upon what Jesus did by returning us to a different type of works salvation (i.e. 6 articles of faith and 6 pillars or practices of faith).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holy Spirit:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>John 14:15-17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 “If you love me, you will obey what I command. 16 And I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Counselor to be with you forever — the Spirit of truth. The world cannot accept him, because it neither sees him nor knows him. But you know him, for he lives with you and will be in you. 17 I will not leave you as orphans; I will come to you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holy Spirit:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mohammad as the Promised Holy Spirit?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Yusef Ali** And remember, Jesus, the son of Mary, is the same as God the Father. Jesus limited himself only during his ministry on earth. In Colossians 2:9 we learn how much of God was in Jesus. “For in Christ all the fullness of the Deity lives in bodily form…” Philippians 2:5-8 states “Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness. And being found in appearance as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient to death— even death on a cross!…”. Jesus was also fully man, born of a woman conceived by the Holy Spirit in Matthew 1:18 we learn “This is how the birth of Jesus Christ came about: His mother Mary was pledged to be married to Joseph, but before they came together, she was found to be with child through the Holy Spirit.” Yet Jesus was tempted like us but was the only man who resisted sin completely (cf. Hebrews 4:15). Therefore Jesus does NOT need a savior. In Hebrews 9:11-14 we read that His work was superior to all other priests, “When Christ came as high priest of the good things that are already here, he went through the greater and more perfect tabernacle that is not man-made, that is to say, not a part of this creation. He did not enter by means of the blood of goats and calves; but he entered the Most Holy Place once for all by his own blood, offering himself unblemished to God, cleanse our consciences from acts that lead to death, so that we may serve the living God!”

Islam cannot improve upon what Jesus did by returning us to a different type of works salvation (i.e. 6 articles of faith and 6 pillars or practices of faith).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holy Spirit:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>John 14:15-17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 “If you love me, you will obey what I command. 16 And I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Counselor to be with you forever — the Spirit of truth. The world cannot accept him, because it neither sees him nor knows him. But you know him, for he lives with you and will be in you. 17 I will not leave you as orphans; I will come to you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holy Spirit:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mohammad as the Promised Holy Spirit?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Yusef Ali** And remember, Jesus, the son of Mary, is the same as God the Father. Jesus limited himself only during his ministry on earth. In Colossians 2:9 we learn how much of God was in Jesus. “For in Christ all the fullness of the Deity lives in bodily form…” Philippians 2:5-8 states “Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness. And being found in appearance as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient to death— even death on a cross!…”. Jesus was also fully man, born of a woman conceived by the Holy Spirit in Matthew 1:18 we learn “This is how the birth of Jesus Christ came about: His mother Mary was pledged to be married to Joseph, but before they came together, she was found to be with child through the Holy Spirit.” Yet Jesus was tempted like us but was the only man who resisted sin completely (cf. Hebrews 4:15). Therefore Jesus does NOT need a savior. In Hebrews 9:11-14 we read that His work was superior to all other priests, “When Christ came as high priest of the good things that are already here, he went through the greater and more perfect tabernacle that is not man-made, that is to say, not a part of this creation. He did not enter by means of the blood of goats and calves; but he entered the Most Holy Place once for all by his own blood, offering himself unblemished to God, cleanse our consciences from acts that lead to death, so that we may serve the living God!”

Islam cannot improve upon what Jesus did by returning us to a different type of works salvation (i.e. 6 articles of faith and 6 pillars or practices of faith).
The Holy Spirit? his nature and work.

The Holy Spirit is the third person of the trinity (i.e. three persons: Father, Son and Holy Spirit, who all share the same essence and nature described above). Genesis 1:2 Says the Spirit was at the creation of the universe. “2 Now the earth was formless and empty, darkness was over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was hovering over the waters.” The Holy Spirit and Jesus were being spoken of in Gen. 1:26 when we read, “Then God said, “Let us make man in our image, in our likeness...” Matthew 1:18 explain above that it was the Holy Spirit who came upon Mary to impregnate her. Acts 5:3-4 make it clear that the Holy Spirit is God when Peter spoke with Ananias and Sapphira. “Then Peter said, "Ananias, how is it that Satan has so filled your heart that you have lied to the Holy Spirit ... You have not lied to men but to God." The Holy Spirit was promised by Jesus in John and came upon the Church in Acts 2 and today calls and comforts people to come to Jesus and gives gifts to the church for ministry.

---

### Trinity

The Trinity is a compound Latin word expressing the idea of tri + unity or three and one. The Three are the number of divine persons. The one is the number of essences or divine natures. Thus three persons (Father, Son, in his pre-incarnate state, and Holy Spirit) all share a common nature or essence ( Omniscient, Omnipotent, Omnipresent, Eternal, Immutable, Holy and Love) 

Nicene Creed A.D. 325  
"We believe in one God, the Father, the Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all that is, seen and unseen. We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only Son of God... true God from true God, begotten, not made, of the same substance as the Father [οὐκοῦσιν τῷ Πατρί]. ... We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the giver of life, who proceeds from the Father (and the Son). With the Father and the Son he is worshipped and glorified. He has spoken through the Prophets.  "The Greek word οὐκοῦσιν indicates in orthodox theology that The Father and the Son are "of the same substance" or "of the same essence" because the Son is begotten of the Father’s own being (καὶ τὴς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός)"  

---

### No Trinity

Muhammad cannot be the promised Holy Spirit because
1. Muhammad was not with Muslims "forever."
2. He does not live "in you."
3. He did leave Islam as orphans upon his death in 732.
4. It was not necessary for Jesus to leave for Muhammad to be born. Jesus was born 500 years before Muhammad.
5. Muhammad should be the one convicted for crimes he committed in the world. He has no room to judge anyone.

Surah 61:9 SHAKIR: He [Allah] it is Who sent His Messenger [Muhammad? Gabriel] with the guidance and the true religion, that He may make it overcome the religions, all of them, though the polytheists may be averse."

Surah 16:102  
Muslims commonly believe that the Holy Spirit is the angel Gabriel.  
YUSUFALI: Say, the Holy Spirit has brought the revelation from thy Lord in Truth, in order to strengthen those who believe, and as a Guide and Glad Tidings to Muslims.

Surah 2:297  
YUSUFALI: Say: Whoever is an enemy to Gabriel— "for he brings down the (revelation) to thy heart by Allah’s will, a confirmation of what went before, and guidance and glad tidings for those who believe

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trinity</th>
<th>No Trinity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Trinity is a compound Latin word expressing the idea of tri + unity or three and one. The Three are the number of divine persons. The one is the number of essences or divine natures. Thus three persons (Father, Son, in his pre-incarnate state, and Holy Spirit) all share a common nature or essence ( Omniscient, Omnipotent, Omnipresent, Eternal, Immutable, Holy and Love)</td>
<td>Muhammad cannot be the promised Holy Spirit because 1. Muhammad was not with Muslims &quot;forever.&quot; 2. He does not live &quot;in you.&quot; 3. He did leave Islam as orphans upon his death in 732. 4. It was not necessary for Jesus to leave for Muhammad to be born. Jesus was born 500 years before Muhammad. 5. Muhammad should be the one convicted for crimes he committed in the world. He has no room to judge anyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We believe in one God, the Father, the Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all that is, seen and unseen. We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only Son of God... true God from true God, begotten, not made, of the same substance as the Father [οὐκοῦσιν τῷ Πατρί]. ... We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the giver of life, who proceeds from the Father (and the Son). With the Father and the Son he is worshipped and glorified. He has spoken through the Prophets.  &quot;The Greek word οὐκοῦσιν indicates in orthodox theology that The Father and the Son are &quot;of the same substance&quot; or &quot;of the same essence&quot; because the Son is begotten of the Father’s own being (καὶ τὴς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός)&quot;</td>
<td>YUSUFALI: O People of the Book! Commit no excesses in your religion: Nor say of Allah aught but the truth. Christ Jesus the son of Mary was (no more than) a messenger of Allah, and His Word, which He bestowed on Mary, and a spirit proceeding from Him: so believe in Allah and His messengers. Say not “Trinity” : desist: it will be better for you: for Allah is one Allah 4:171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicene Creed A.D. 325</td>
<td>YUSUFALI: And behold! Allah will say: “O Jesus the son of Mary! Didst thou say unto men, worship me and my mother as gods in derogation of Allah?” He will say: “Glory to Thee! never could I say what I had no right (to say). Had I said such a thing, thou wouldst indeed have known it. Thou knowest what is in my heart, Thou I know not what is in Thine. For Thou knowest in full all that is hidden. 5:116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He has spoken through the Prophets.</td>
<td>YUSUFALI: They do blaspheme who say: Allah is one of three in a Trinity: for there is no god except One Allah. If they desist not from their word (of blasphemy), verily a grievous penalty will befall the blasphemers among them. 5:73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gen. 1:26
Then God said, "Let us make man in our image, in our likeness,..."

Gen. 11:7-8
"Come, let us go down and confuse their language so they will not understand each other." So the LORD scattered them from there over all the earth,

Isaiah 6:8
"Then I heard the voice of the Lord saying, "Whom shall I send? And who will go for us?" And I said, "Here am I. Send me!"

The Father is called God. Genesis 1:1
The Son is called God. (Isaiah 9:6, John 1:1,14, 18, John 20:28).
God the Father calls God the Son God, Heb. 1:8. "But about the Son he says, "Your throne, O God, will last for ever and ever, and righteousness will be the scepter of your kingdom"

The Holy Spirit is called God. (cf. above Acts 5:3-4)
God is one (Hebrew echod)
Deut. 6:4 "Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God, the LORD is one."
Isaiah 44:6
"This is what the LORD says— ... I am the first and I am the last; apart from me there is no God.
45:18
"I am the LORD, and there is no other..."
46:9
"I am God, and there is no other; I am God, and there is none like me."

Therefore the three persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit all share a common divine essence or nature.

Philippians 2: 5-6
"Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: Who, being in very natureGod...

John 10:30
Jesus said, "I and the Father are one."

Col. 2:9
"For in Christ all the fullness of the Deity lives in bodily form,..."

John 14:8-11
"Philip said, "Lord, show us the Father and that will be enough for us." Jesus answered: "Don't you know me, Philip, even after I have been among you such a long time? Anyone who has seen me has seen the Father. How can you say, Show us the Father? "Don't you believe that I am in the Father, and that the Father is in me? The words I say to you are not just
my own. Rather, it is the Father, living in me, who is doing his work. 11Believe me when I say that I am in the Father and the Father is in me; or at least believe on the evidence of the miracles themselves.

All three persons are referenced in...

Matthew 28:19 the Great Commission.
19Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in 10 the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, 20 and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you. And surely I am with you always, to the very end of the age."

Matthew 3:16-17 the Baptism of Jesus
16As soon as Jesus was baptized, he went up out of the water. At that moment heaven was opened, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and lighting on him. 17And a voice from heaven said, "This is my Son, whom I love; with him I am well pleased."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test of a True Prophet</th>
<th>Prophet Muhammad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 18:18</td>
<td>Muslims claim that Jesus predicted the coming of Muhammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 But a prophet who</td>
<td>YUSUFALI: And remember, Moses said to his people:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presumes to speak in</td>
<td>&quot;O my people! why do ye vex and insult me, though ye know that I am the messenger of Allah (sent) to you?&quot; Then when they went wrong, Allah let their hearts go wrong. For Allah guides not those who are rebellious transgressors. And remember, Jesus, the son of Mary, said: &quot;O Children of Israel! I am the messenger of Allah (sent) to you, confirming the Law (which came) before me, and giving Glad Tidings of a Messenger to come after me, whose name shall be Ahmad.&quot; But when he came to them with Clear Signs, they said, &quot;this is evident sorcery!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the name of other gods, must be put to death. 21 You may say to yourselves, &quot;How can we know when a message has not been spoken by the LORD?&quot; 22 If what a prophet proclaims in the name of the LORD does not take place or come true, that is a message the LORD has not spoken. That prophet has spoken presumptuously. Do not be afraid of him.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Man: Creation of Man:</th>
<th>Man: Creation of Man:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 1:26, &quot;Let us make man in our image and in our likeness.&quot;</td>
<td>PICKTHAL: Verily We created man from a product of wet earth; Then placed him as a drop (of seed) in a safe lodging; Then fashioned We the drop a clot, then fashioned We the clot a little lump, then fashioned We the little lump bones, then clothed the bones with flesh, and then produced it as another creation. So blessed be Allah, the Best of creators!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesians 2:10</td>
<td>PICKTHAL: O mankind! Lo! We have created you male and female, and have made you nations and tribes that ye may know one another. Lo! the noblest of you, in the sight of Allah, is the best in conduct. Lo! Allah is Knower, Aware.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10For we are God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus to do good works, which God prepared in advance for us to do.</td>
<td>49:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus 1:6, 6An elder must be blameless, the husband of but</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Tim. 3:2, 12, 2Now the overseer must be above reproach, the husband of but one wife... 6An elder must be blameless, the husband of but one wife,

Polygamy
YUSUFALI: "Marry women of your choice, Two or
Divorce & Beating wives:
5 Has not the LORD made them one? In flesh and spirit they are his. And why one? Because he was seeking godly offspring. [1] So guard yourself in your spirit, and do not break faith with the wife of your youth. 16 "I hate divorce," says the LORD God of Israel, "and I hate a man's covering himself [1] with violence as well as with his garment," says the LORD Almighty. So guard yourself in your spirit, and do not break faith. Malachi 2:15

Divorce
31: It has been said, 'Anyone who divorces his wife must give her a certificate of divorce.' [2] But I tell you that anyone who divorces his wife, except for marital unfaithfulness, causes her to become an adulteress, and anyone who marries the divorced woman commits adultery. Matt. 5

Divorce
2: Some Pharisees came to him to test him. They asked, "Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife for any reason?"
4: "Haven't you read," he replied, "that at the beginning the Creator made them male and female [4] and said, 'For this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife, and the two will become one flesh' [5]. So they are no longer two, but one. Therefore what God has joined together, let man not separate."
6: "Why then," they asked, "did Moses command that a man give his wife a certificate of divorce and send her away?"
9: Jesus replied, "Moses permitted you to divorce your wives because your hearts were hard. But it was not this way from the beginning. [4] I tell you that anyone who divorces his wife, except for marital unfaithfulness, and marries another woman commits adultery."
10: The disciples said to him, "If this is the situation between a husband and wife, it is better not to marry."
11: Jesus replied, "Not everyone can accept this word, but only those to whom it has been given. [2] For some are eunuchs because they were born that way; others were made that way by men; and others have renounced marriage [3] because of the kingdom of heaven. The one who can accept this should accept it." Matthew 19

Women:
8: "Husbands love your wives." Eph. 5:25-28
28: "Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her [2] to make her holy, cleansing [3] her by the washing with water through the word, [2] and to present her to himself as a radiant church, without stain or wrinkle or any other blemish, but holy and blameless. [2] In this same way, husbands ought to love their wives as their own bodies. He who loves his wife loves himself.

three or four 4:3

Wife a sex object
Yusufali: "Your women are a tilth for you (to cultivate) so go to your tilth as ye will," 2:223

Divorce & Beating wives:
"I Divorce thee" can be said 2 times and the wife retained. 3 times she is divorced.

Divorce & Beating wives:
"Divorce may be (pronounced) twice, then keep (them) in good fellowship or let (them) go. . . So if he divorces her she shall not be lawful to him afterwards until she marries another husband; then if he divorces her there is no blame on them both if they return to each other 2:229-230

Bukhari Hadith: Narrated 'Aisha:
A man divorced his wife thrice (by expressing his decision to divorce her thrice), then she married another man who also divorced her. The Prophet was asked if she could legally marry the first husband (or not). The Prophet replied, "No, she cannot marry the first husband unless the second husband consummates his marriage with her, just as the first husband had done." Volume 7, Book 63, Number 187:

SHAKIR: Maybe, his Lord, if he divorce you, will give him in your place wives better than you, submissive, faithful, obedient, penitent, adorers, fasters, widows and virgins. 66:5

Allah may forgive persons who force slaves into prostitution 24:33

PICKTHAL: . . . Force not your slave-girls to whoredom that ye may seek enjoyment of the life of the world, if they would preserve their chastity. And if one force them, then (unto them), after their compulsion, lo! Allah will be Forgiving, Merciful.

Women
Men superior to Women:
... and men are a degree above them. Allah is Mighty, Wise. 2:228

Testimony worth half of a man’s: 2:282
"And call to witness, from among your men, two witnesses. And if two men be not (at hand) then a man and two women, of such as ye approve as witnesses, so that if the one erreth (through
Wives and Husbands "Hindered prayers"

1 Wives, in the same way be submissive to your husband's so that, if any of them do not believe the word, they may be won over without words by the behavior of their wives. Then they see the purity and reverence of your lives. 2 Your beauty should not come from outward adornment, such as braided hair and the wearing of gold jewelry and fine clothes. Instead, it should be that of your inner self, the unfading beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is of great worth in God's sight.

3 For this is the way the holy women of the past who put their hope in God used to make themselves beautiful. They were submissive to their own husbands, like Sarah, who obeyed Abraham and called him her master. You are her daughters if you do what is right and do not give way to fear.

4 Husbands, in the same way be considerate as you live with your wives, and treat them with respect as the weaker partner and as heirs with you of the gracious gift of life, so that nothing will hinder your prayers. 1 Peter 3:17

Adam and Eve: Genesis 2:18-25

18 The LORD God said, "It is not good for the man to be alone. I will make a helper suitable for him." . . . 21 So the LORD God caused the man to fall into a deep sleep; and while he was sleeping, he took one of the man's ribs and closed up the place with flesh. 22 Then the LORD God made a woman from the rib he had taken out of the man, and he brought her to the man.

23 The man said, "This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman, 1 for she was taken out of man."

24 For this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife, and they will become one flesh. 25 The man and his wife were both naked, and they felt no shame.

Beating NOT permitted Ephesians 4:26

"In your anger do not sin": Do not let the sun go down while you are still angry, and do not give the devil a foothold. 1 Cor. 7:1b, 9 It is good for a man not to touch a woman . . .

But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn. (KJV)

Depriving wife NOT permitted. I Cor. 7:3-5

3 The husband should fulfill his marital duty to his wife, and likewise the wife to her husband. 4 The wife's body does not belong to her alone but also to her husband. In the same way, the husband's body does not belong to him alone but also to his wife. 5 Do not deprive each other except by mutual consent and for a time, so that you may devote yourselves to prayer. Then come together again so that Satan will not tempt you because of your lack of self-control.

Born in Sin
Psalm 51:5 Surely I was sinful at birth, sinful from the time my mother conceived me.

Sin:

All Children born Muslim w/o sin:

"Another radical difference between Islamic and Christian beliefs is seen in the conception of Man's nature and needs. Christians and Muslims agree that Adam disobeyed God and was punished by being
Inherited Depravity

Therefore, just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all men, because all sinned—death reigned from the time of Adam to the time of Moses, even over those who did not sin by breaking a command, as did Adam, who was a pattern of the one to come. Rom. 5:12-14

J Cor. 6:9-11
Do you not know that the wicked will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: Neither the sexually immoral nor idolaters nor adulterers nor male prostitutes nor homosexual offenders nor thieves nor the greedy nor drunkards nor slanderers nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God. And that is what some of you were. But you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God.

Rev. 21:8
But the cowardly, the unbelieving, the vile, the murderers, the sexually immoral, those who practice magic arts, the idolaters and all liars— their place will be in the fiery lake of burning sulfur. This is the second death.

Adultery

John 8:3-11
The teachers of the law and the Pharisees brought in a woman caught in adultery. They made her stand before the group and said to Jesus, "Teacher, this woman was caught in the act of adultery. In the Law Moses commanded us to stone such women. Now what do you say?" "They were using this question as a trap, in order to have a basis for accusing him. But Jesus bent down and started to write on the ground with his finger. When they kept on questioning him, he straightened up and said to them, "If any one of you is without sin, let him be the first to throw a stone at her." Again he stooped down and wrote on the ground.

At this, those who heard began to go away one at a time, the older ones first, until only Jesus was left, with the woman still standing there. Jesus straightened up and asked her, "Woman, where are they? Has no one condemned you?"

Jesus said, "Neither do I condemn you." Jesus declared. "Go now and leave your life of sin."
Drinking Alcohol

Proverbs. 20:1 Wine is a mocker and beer a brawler; whoever is led astray by them is not wise.

John 2: 1-11 Jesus Changes Water to Wine

1 On the third day a wedding took place at Cana in Galilee. Jesus' mother was there, 2 and Jesus and his disciples had also been invited to the wedding. 3 When the wine was gone, Jesus' mother said to him, "They have no more wine."

4 "Dear woman, why do you involve me?" Jesus replied, "My time has not yet come."

5 His mother said to the servants, "Do whatever he tells you."

6 Nearby stood six stone water jars, the kind used by the Jews for ceremonial washing, each holding from twenty to thirty gallons. [a]

7 Jesus said to the servants, "Fill the jars with water"; so they filled them to the brim.

8 Then he told them, "Now draw some out and take it to the master of the banquet."

They did so, 9 and the master of the banquet tasted the water that had been turned into wine. He did not realize where it had come from, though the servants who had drawn the water knew. Then he called the bridegroom aside 10 and said, "Everyone brings out the choice wine first and then the cheaper wine after the guests have had too much to drink; but you have saved the best till now."

11 This, the first of his miraculous signs, Jesus performed in Cana of Galilee. He thus revealed his glory, and his disciples put their faith in him.

1 Tim. 5:23 Paul wrote about wine.

23 Stop drinking only water, and use a little wine because of your stomach and your frequent illnesses.

Salvation:

John 3:16-17

16 For God so loved the world that he gave his one and only Son, that whoever believes in him shall not perish but have eternal life. 17 For God did not send his Son into the world to condemn the world, but to save the world through him.

John 14:6

6 Jesus answered, "I am the way and the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me.

Acts 4:12

12 Salvation is found in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given to men by which we must be saved.

Ephesians 2:8-9

8 For it is by grace you have been saved, through faith—and this not from yourselves, it is the gift of God—9 not by works, so that no one can boast.

Romans 1:16-17 I am not ashamed of the gospel, because it is the power of God for the salvation of everyone who believes: first for the Jew, then for the Gentile. 17 For in the gospel a righteousness from God is revealed, a righteousness that is by

Salvation:

Islam has no savior. Each Muslim is expected to save himself by becoming a Muslim, embracing the six articles of belief "Iman" (God, Angels, Books, Prophets, Last Day and Predestination) and practicing the six pillars "Din" (Creed, Prayer, Fasting, Alms, Pilgrimage, Jihad).

Yusuf Ali: Every man's fate We have fastened on his own neck: On the Day of Judgment We shall bring out for him a scroll, which he will see spread open. (It will be said to him:) "Read thine (own) record: Sufficient is thy soul this day to make out an account against thee." 17:13-14

Bukhari Hadith: Salvation through Works:

A man from Najd with unkempt hair came to Allah's Apostle and we heard his loud voice... he was asking about Islam. Allah's Apostle said, "You have to offer prayers perfectly five times in a day and night (24 hours)."... "You have to observe fasts during the month of Ramadan."... "You have to pay the Zakat (obligatory charity)."... And then that man retreated saying, "By Allah! I will neither
faith from first to last, just as it is written: "The righteous will live by faith."

No Other Gospel

Galatians 1:6-9

I am astonished that you are so quickly deserting the one who called you by the grace of Christ and are turning to a different gospel—7 which is really no gospel at all. Evidently some people are throwing you into confusion and are trying to pervert the gospel of Christ. 8But even if we or an angel from heaven should preach a gospel other than the one we preached to you, let him be eternally condemned! 9As we have already said, so now I say again: If anybody is preaching to you a gospel other than what you accepted, let him be eternally condemned!

Righteousness Through Faith Romans 3:21-28

But now a righteousness from God, apart from law, has been made known, to which the Law and the Prophets testify. 22This righteousness from God comes through faith in Jesus Christ to all who believe. There is no difference, 23for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, 24and are justified freely by his grace through the redemption that came by Christ Jesus. 25God presented him as a sacrifice of atonement, through faith in his blood. He did this to demonstrate his justice, because in his grace through the redemption that came by Christ Jesus, 26God presented him as a sacrifice of atonement, through faith in his blood. He did this to demonstrate his justice, because in his grace through the redemption that came by Christ Jesus, 27in his blood. He did this to demonstrate his justice, because in his grace through the redemption that came by Christ Jesus, 28through faith in his blood. He did this to demonstrate his justice, because in his grace through the redemption that came by Christ Jesus. 29All we like sheep have gone astray, each of us has turned his own way; and the Lord has punished every sin by his rule. 30He has laid on him the iniquity of us all. 31He was oppressed and afflicted, yet he did not open his mouth; like a lamb led to the slaughter, and like a sheep before its shearer, he was silent, and he did not open his mouth. 32He was taken from the land of the living, and the transgressors conceal his death, lest anyone should praise him. 33Therefore, my dear friends, inasmuch as you have met mercy, strive to bestow mercy also, inasmuch as you have received mercy. 34Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me, bless his holy name. 35Praise the Lord. 36(I am astonished that you are so quickly deserting the one who called you by the grace of Christ and are turning to a different gospel—7 which is really no gospel at all. Evidently some people are throwing you into confusion and are trying to pervert the gospel of Christ. 8But even if we or an angel from heaven should preach a gospel other than the one we preached to you, let him be eternally condemned! 9As we have already said, so now I say again: If anybody is preaching to you a gospel other than what you accepted, let him be eternally condemned!

Romans 12:17-21

Do not repay anyone evil for evil. Be careful to do what is right in the eyes of everybody. 18If it is possible, as far as it depends on you, live at peace with everyone. 19Do not take revenge, my friends, but leave room for God's wrath, for it is written: "It is mine to avenge; I will repay," says the Lord. 20On the contrary: 21"If your enemy is hungry, feed him; if he is thirsty, give him something to drink. 22In doing this, you will heap burning coals on his head." 23Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good.

Salvation Guaranteed to jihadists

The Prophet said, "The person who participates in (Holy battles) in Allah's cause and nothing compels him to do so except belief in Allah and His Apostles, will be recompensed by Allah either with a reward or booty (if he survives) or will be admitted to Paradise (if he is killed in the battle as a martyr). Had I not found it difficult for my followers, then I would not remain behind any sariya going for Jihad and I would have loved to be martyred in Allah's cause and then made alive, and then martyred and then made alive, and then again martyred in His cause." Volume 1, Book 2, Number 35:

Universalism in Mecca (610-622)

was abrogated, annulled, replaced by new revelation.

PICKTHAL: Lo! Those who believe (in that which is revealed unto thee, Muhammad), and those who are Jews, and Christians, and Sabaeans - whoever believeth in Allah and the Last Day and doeth right - surely their reward is with their Lord, and there shall no fear come upon them neither shall they grieve.
Conversion by Force in Yathrib/Median (622-632)

**PICKTHAL:** slay the idolaters wherever ye find them, and take them (captive), and besiege them, and prepare for them each ambush. But if they repent and establish worship and pay the poor due, then leave their way free. Lo! Allah is Forgiving, Merciful. 9:5

**PICKTHAL:** And fight them until persecution is no more, and religion is for Allah. 2:193

**SHAKIR:** So when you meet in battle those who disbelieve, then smite the necks until when you have overcome them, then make (them) prisoners, and afterwards either set them free as a favor or let them ransom (themselves) until the war terminates. 47:4

**SHAKIR:** Fight those who do not believe in Allah, nor in the latter day, nor do they prohibit what Allah and His Messenger have prohibited, nor follow the religion of truth, out of those who have been given the Book, until they pay the tax in acknowledgment of superiority and they are in a state of subjection. 9:29

---

**Heaven & Angels:**

There are 195 times the word "Angel" is used in the NIV. There are 99 references to Angels in the NIV.

Angels carry out various missions of the Lord. "7In speaking of the angels he says, "He makes his angels winds, his servants flames of fire." (Heb. 1:7). Angels destroyed the city of Sodom (Gen.18-19) On another day the angels came to present themselves before the LORD, and Satan also came with them to present himself before him Job 2:1. In Heb. 13:2 we are advised, "2Do not forget to entertain strangers, for by so doing some people have entertained angels without knowing it." Fallen angels will be judged for sin, "6And the angels who did not keep their positions of authority but abandoned their own home—these he has kept in darkness, bound with everlasting chains for judgment on the great Day." Angels announced Jesus' birth to the shepherds, "13Suddenly a great company of the heavenly host appeared with the angel, praising God and saying, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men on whom his favor rests." "39Do you think I cannot call on my Father, and he will at once put at my disposal more than twelve legions of angels?" Matt. 26:53. They will come with Jesus when he returns at his second coming. (Mark 8:38)

John 14:1-4

---

**Heaven and Angels:**

Angels come to Mary and tell her of Jesus' birth: **YUSUFALI:** Behold! the angels said: "O Mary! Allah hath chosen thee and purified thee—chosen thee above the women of all nations. "O Mary! worship Thy Lord devoutly: Prostrate thyself, and bow down (in prayer) with those who bow down."... Behold! the angels said: "O Mary! Allah giveth thee glad tidings of a Word from Him: his name will be Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, held in honour in this world and the Hereafter and of (the company of) those nearest to Allah; "He shall speak to the people in childhood and in maturity. And he shall be (of the company of) the righteous." She said: "O my Lord! How shall I have a son when no man hath touched me?" He said: "Even so: Allah createth what He willeth: When He hath decreed a plan, He but saith to it, 'Be,' and it is! "And Allah will teach him the Book and Wisdom, the Law and the Gospel, "And (appoint him) a messenger to the Children of Israel, (with this message): "I have come to you, with a Sign from your Lord, in that I make for you out of clay, as it were, the figure of a bird, and breathe into it, and it becomes a bird by Allah's leave: And I heal those born blind, and the lepers, and I quicken the dead, by Allah's leave; and I declare to you what ye eat, and what ye store in your houses. Surely therein is a Sign for you if ye did believe; "(I have come to you), to attest the Law which was before me. And to make lawful to you part of what was (Before) forbidden to you; I have come to you with a Sign from your Lord. So fear Allah, and obey me. "It is Allah Who is my Lord and your Lord; then worship Him. This is a Way that is straight.” 3:42-51
Revelation 21 The New Jerusalem

1 Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, and there was no longer any sea. 2 I saw the Holy City, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride beautifully dressed for her husband. 3 And I heard a loud voice from the throne saying, “Now the dwelling of God is with men, and he will live with them. They will be his people, and God himself will be with them and be their God. 4 He will wipe every tear from their eyes. There will be no more death or mourning or crying or pain, for the old order of things has passed away."

5 He who was seated on the throne said, "I am making everything new!” Then he said, "Write this down, for these words are trustworthy and true."

6 He said to me: “It is done. I am the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the End. To him who is thirsty I will give to drink without cost from the spring of the water of life. 7 He who overcomes will inherit all this, and I will be his God and he will be my son. 8 But the cowardly, the unbelieving, the vile, the murderers, the sexually immoral, those who practice magic arts, the idolaters and all liars— their place will be in the fiery lake of burning sulfur. This is the second death."

9 One of the seven angels who had the seven bowls full of the seven last plagues came and said to me, "Come, I will show you the bride, the wife of the Lamb." 10 And he carried me away in the Spirit to a great and high mountain, and showed me the Holy City, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God. 11 It shone with the glory of God, and its brilliance was like that of a very precious jewel, like a jasper, clear as crystal. 12 It had a great, high wall with twelve gates, and with twelve angels at the gates. On the gates were written the names of the twelve tribes of Israel. 13 There were three gates on the east, three on the north, three on the south and three on the west. 14 The wall of the city had twelve foundations, and on them were the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb.

15 The angel who talked with me had a measuring rod of gold to measure the city, its gates and its walls. 16 The city was laid out like a square, as long as it was wide. He measured the city with the rod and found it to be 12,000 stadia in length, and as wide and high as it was long. 17 He measured its wall and it was 144 cubits thick, by man's measurement, which the angel was using. 18 The wall was made of jasper, and the city of pure gold, as pure as glass. 19 The foundations of the city walls were decorated with every kind of precious stone. The first foundation was jasper, the second sapphire, the third chalcedony, the fourth emerald, 20 the fifth sardonyx, the sixth carnelian, the seventh chrysoprase, the eighth beryl, the ninth topaz, the tenth chrysoprase, the eleventh jacinth, and the twelfth amethyst. 21 The twelve gates were twelve pearls, each gate made of a single pearl. The great street of the city...
was of pure gold, like transparent glass.

---

21 I did not see a temple in the city, because the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are its temple. 22 The city does not need the sun or the moon to shine on it, for the glory of God gives it light, and the Lamb is its lamp. 23 The nations will walk by its light, and the kings of the earth will bring their splendor into it. 24 On no day will its gates ever be shut, for there will be no night there. 25 The glory and honor of the nations will be brought into it. 26 Nothing impure will ever enter it, nor will anyone who does what is shameful or deceitful, but only those whose names are written in the Lamb's book of life.

---

Hell, Devil and Demons:

Revelation 12:9
The great dragon was hurled down—that ancient serpent called the devil, or Satan, who leads the whole world astray. He was hurled to the earth, and his angels with him.

Luke 10:19 18 He replied, "I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven." 19 I have given you authority to trample on snakes and scorpions and to overcome all the power of the enemy; nothing will harm you. 20 However, do not rejoice that the spirits submit to you, but rejoice that your names are written in heaven."

---

John 13:2b, "the devil had already prompted Judas Iscariot, son of Simon, to betray Jesus."

James 4:7, Submit yourselves, then, to God. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you.

Matthew 25:41b ... the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels.

---

Rev. 20:10
18 And the devil, who deceived them, was thrown into the lake of burning sulfur, where the beast and the false prophet had been thrown. They will be tormented day and night for ever and ever.

---

Revelation 20
The Thousand Years

1 And I saw an angel coming down out of heaven, having the key to the Abyss and holding in his hand a great chain. 2 He seized the dragon, that ancient serpent, who is the devil, or Satan, and bound him for a thousand years. 3 He threw him into the Abyss, and locked and sealed it over him, to keep him from deceiving the nations anymore until the thousand years were ended. After that, he must be set free for a short time. 4 They answered him, "We are Abraham's descendants and have never been slaves of anyone. How can you say that we shall be set free?"

5 Jesus replied, "I tell you the truth, everyone who sins is a slave to sin. 6 Now a slave has no permanent place in the which the righteous are promised: in it are rivers of water incorruptible; rivers of milk of which the taste never changes; rivers of wine, a joy to those who drink; and rivers of honey pure and clear. In it there are for them all kinds of fruits; and Grace from their Lord. 47:15a (for a look at hell 47:15b)

---

Hell, Devil and Demons:

Satan's Fall:

YUSEFAL: He said: "O Adam! Tell them their names." When he had told them, Allah said: "Did I not tell you that I know the secrets of heaven and earth, and I know what ye reveal and what ye conceal?" And behold, We said to the angels: "Bow down to Adam" and they bowed down. Not so Iblis: he refused and was haughty: He was of those who reject Faith. We said: "O Adam! dwell thou and thy wife in the Garden; and eat of the bountiful things therein as (where and when) ye will; but approach not this tree, or ye run into harm and transgression." Then did Satan make them slip from the (garden), and get them out of the state (of felicity) in which they had been. We said: "Get ye down, all (ye people), with enmity between yourselves. On earth will be your dwelling-place and your means of livelihood - for a time." Then learnt Adam from his Lord words of inspiration, and his Lord Turned towards him; for He is Oft-Returning, Most Merciful. 2:33-37

---

Satan in the Bedroom

The Prophet said, "If anyone of you on having sexual relations with his wife said (and he must say it before starting) 'In the name of Allah. O Allah! Protect us from Satan and also protect what you bestow upon us (i.e. the coming offspring) from Satan, and if it is destined that they should have a child then, Satan will never be able to harm that offspring.'" Volume 1, Book 4, Number 141.[3] p.139:

Majority of those in Hell are women: Why?

Once Allah's Apostle went on... Then he passed by the women and said, "O women! Give alms, as I have seen that the majority of the dwellers of Hellfire were you (women)." They asked, "Why is it so, O Allah's Apostle?" He replied, "You curse frequently and are ungrateful to your husbands... I have not seen anyone more deficient in intelligence and religion than you. A cautious sensible man could be led astray by some of you." The women asked, "O Allah's Apostle! What is deficient in our intelligence and religion?" He said, "Is not the evidence of two women equal to the witness of one man?" They replied in the affirmative. He said, "This is the deficiency in her intelligence.

Isn't it
family, but a son belongs to it forever. “So if the Son sets you free, you will be free indeed. ‘I know you are Abraham’s descendants. Yet you are ready to kill me, because you have no room for my word. ‘I am telling you what I have seen in the Father’s presence, and you do what you have heard from your father. ”

Matthew 5:22
But I tell you that anyone who is angry with his brother will be subject to judgment. Again, anyone who says to his brother, ‘Raca,’ is answerable to the Sanhedrin. But anyone who says, ‘You fool!’ will be in danger of the fire of hell.

Matthew 5:29-30
If your right eye causes you to sin, gouge it out and throw it away. It is better for you to lose one part of your body than for your whole body to be thrown into hell. And if your right hand causes you to sin, cut it off and throw it away. It is better for you to lose one part of your body than for your whole body to go into hell.

true that a woman can neither pray nor fast during her menses?” The women replied in the affirmative. He said, “This is the deficiency in her religion.” Vol. 1, book 6, chapter 304 p. 210

SHAKIR: (As for) those who disbelieve, surely neither their wealth nor their children shall avail them in the least against Allah, and these it is who are the fuel of the fire. 3:10

Lips displaced:
YUSUFALI: The Fire will burn their faces, and they will therein grin, with their lips displaced. 23:14

Showers of molten lead:
PICKTHAL: We have prepared for disbelievers Fire. Its tent encloseth them. If they ask for showers, they will be showered with water like to molten lead which burneth the faces. Calamitous the drink and ill the resting-place! 18:29

Boiling Water to Drink:
YUSUFALI: (Can those in such Bliss) be compared to such as shall dwell forever in the Fire, and be given, to drink, boiling water, so that it cuts up their bowels (to pieces)? 47:15b (look at heaven cf. beginning of verse)
PICKTHAL: If those who disbelieved but knew the time when they will not be able to drive off the fire from their faces and from their backs, and they will not be helped! Nay, but it will come upon them unawares so that it will stupefy them, and they will be unable to repel it, neither will they be reprieved. 21:39-40

Climate Controlled Hell
YUSUFALI: Truly Hell is as a place of ambush, For the transgressors a place of destination: They will abide therein for ages. Nothing cool shall they taste therein, nor any drink. Save a boiling fluid and a fluid, dark, murky, intensely cold, A fitting recompense (for them). For that they used not to fear any account (for their deeds), But they (impudently) treated Our Signs as false. And all things have We preserved on record "So taste ye (the fruits of your deeds); for no increase shall We grant you, except in Punishment." 78:21-30

PICKTHAL: Lo! Those who disbelieve Our revelations, We shall expose them to the Fire. As often as their skins are consumed We shall exchange them for fresh skins that they may taste the torment. Lo! Allah is ever Mighty, Wise. 4:56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture:</th>
<th>Qur’an and Hadiths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revelation: <em>Thus saith the LORD</em> used 413 times in the KJV. 2000 more times an equivalent phrase is used. 1 Samuel 10:18 18 And said unto the children of Israel, <em>Thus saith the LORD</em> God of Israel, I brought up Israel out of Egypt, and delivered you out of the hand of the Egyptians, and out of the hand of all kingdoms, and of them that oppressed</td>
<td>114 alleged Revelations in the Qur’an given via Gabriel from Allah to Muhammad A.D. 610-632. Miller 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Feared Possessed by demons *“The veiling of the head and the use of rhymed prose* | }
Hebrews 1:1-2

1 In the past God spoke to our forefathers through the prophets at many times and in various ways, 2 but in these last days he has spoken to us by his Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, and through whom he made the universe.

John 10:36

"You know the message God sent to the people of Israel, telling the good news of peace through Jesus Christ, who is Lord of all."

Inspiration:

2 Peter 1:20,21  "Above all you must understand that NO prophecy of Scripture came about by the prophet's own interpretation. For prophecy never had its origin in the will of man, nor was I taught it; rather, I received it by revelation from Jesus Christ."

Galatians 1:11-12

"I want you to know, brothers, that the gospel I preached is not something that man made up. I did not receive it from any man, nor was I taught it; rather, I received it by revelation from Jesus Christ."

1 Thessalonians 2:13

"And we also thank God continually because, when you received the word of God, which you heard from us, you accepted it not as the word of men, but as it actually is, the word of God, which is at work in you who believe."

Illumination:

John 17:17 "Sanctify them by the truth your word is truth."

2 Tim. 3:16,17 "ALL Scripture is God-breathed and is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness, so that the man of God may be thoroughly equipped for every good work."

Hebrews 4:12-13

"For the word of God is living and active. Sharper than any double-edged sword, it penetrates even to dividing soul and spirit, joints and marrow; it judges the thoughts and attitudes of the heart. Nothing in all creation is hidden from God's sight. Everything is uncovered and laid bare before the eyes of him to whom we must give account."

Muhammad Depressed, thoughts of suicide

“When revelation came to him his whole frame would become agitated, and perspiration would pour down his face. He would often fall to the ground and foam at the mouth. The messages always came to him in the Arabic language, and Muhammad spoke the words that he received, and they were written down by people who heard them from Muhammad's lips. It is generally supposed by Muslims that Muhammad was himself illiterate. After his death these messages were collected and incorporated in the Koran ... Qur'an, which means 'recitation' Muslims believe that the Koran is not Muhammad's book, but God's.” Miller p. 20

No more revelations given to Muslims since Muhammad's death.

Muhammad told by Allah that he wasn't crazy or demon possessed.

YUSUFALI: Thou art not, by the Grace of thy Lord, mad or possessed. Soon wilt thou see, and they will see, Which of you is afflicted with madness.

Yusuf Ali: Whoso is wont to think (through envy) that Allah will not give him (Muhammad) victory in the world and the Hereafter (and is enraged at the thought of his victory), let him stretch a rope up to the roof (of his dwelling), and let him hang himself. Then let him see whether his strategy dispelleth that whereat he rageth! 22:15
2 Peter 3:15b-16
...our dear brother Paul also wrote you with the wisdom that God gave him. He writes the same way in all his letters, speaking in them of these matters. His letters contain some things that are hard to understand, which ignorant and unstable people distort, as they do the other Scriptures, to their own destruction.

No Second Chance:
Hebrews 9:27-28
27 Just as man is destined to die once, and after that to face judgment. 28 So Christ was sacrificed once to take away the sins of many people; and he will appear a second time, not to bear sin, but to bring salvation to those who are waiting for him.

Weeping and gnashing of teeth:
40 As the weeds are pulled up and burned in the fire, so it will be furnace, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth. be at the end of the age. 41 The Son of Man will send out his angels, and they will weed out of his kingdom everything that causes sin and all who do evil. 42 They will throw them into the fiery furnace, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth... 49 This is how it will be at the end of the age. The angels will come and separate the wicked from the righteous and throw them into the fiery

Church:
The English word “Church" is really a compound Greek word made up of two ideas. κολλω is (i.e. I call" and the preposition "εκ" meaning “out of”. So the church is made up of people called out by God out of the world to his body. Jesus said, "For the Son of Man came to seek and to save what was lost” Luke 19:10. Jesus started Christianity with 1. He gathered 12 disciples. There were 120 in the upper room when the Holy Spirit fell upon them in the upper room. 3,000 were converted and later 5,000. Today 2 billion call themselves Christians.

Mosque:
The first mosque building site selected by a camel: "When Muhammad rode into Medina on his camel and many people of different tribes urged him to become their guest. Not wishing to offend any of them by a refusal, he allowed his camel to decide for him. When the camel sat down of its own accord to permit its rider to dismount, there Muhammad established his residence and built the first mosque ever built for worship." Op. cit. Miller p. 26
In Ephesians 4:11-12
11It was he who gave some to be apostles, some to be prophets, some to be evangelists, and some to be pastors and teachers, 12to prepare God's people for works of service, so that the body of Christ may be built up 13until we all reach unity in the faith and in the knowledge of the Son of God and become mature, attaining to the whole measure of the fullness of Christ.

Overseers and Deacons 1 Tim. 3:1-7

1Here is a trustworthy saying: If anyone sets his heart on being an overseer,[l] he desires a noble task. 2Now the overseer must be above reproach, the husband of but one wife, temperate, self-controlled, respectable, hospitable, able to teach, 3not given to drunkenness, not violent but gentle, not quarrelsome, not a lover of money. 4He must manage his own family well and see that his children obey him with proper respect. 5(If anyone does not know how to manage his own family, how can he take care of God's church?) 6He must not be a recent convert, or he may become conceited and fall under the same judgment as the devil. 7He must also have a good reputation with outsiders, so that he will not fall into disgrace and into the devil's trap.

John 8:31-47

The Children of the Devil

31To the Jews who had believed him, Jesus said, "If you hold to my teaching, you are really my disciples. 32Then you will know the truth, and the truth will set you free." 33They answered him, "We are Abraham's descendants;[b] and have never been slaves of anyone. How can you say that we shall be set free?" 34Jesus replied, 'I tell you the truth, everyone who sins is a slave to sin. 35Now a slave has no permanent place in the family, but a son belongs to it forever. 36So if the Son sets you free, you will be free indeed. 37I know you are Abraham's descendants, yet you are ready to kill me, because you have no room for my word. 38I am telling you what I have seen in the Father's presence, and you do what you have heard from your father.'" 39-Abraham is our father," they answered. 40If you were Abraham's children," said Jesus, "then you would do the things Abraham did. 41As it is, you are determined to kill me, a man who has told you the truth that I heard from God. Abraham did not do such things. 42You are doing the things your own father does." 43"We are not illegitimate children," they protested. "The only Father we have is God himself." 44The Children of the Devil

Jesus preached Islam to Jews:

YUSUFAI: O ye who believe! Be ye helpers of Allah: As said Jesus the son of Mary to the Disciples, "Who will be my helpers to the work of Allah?" Said the disciples, "We are Allah's helpers!" then a portion of the Children of Israel believed, and a portion disbelieved: But We gave power to those who believed, against their enemies, and they became the ones that prevailed. 61:14

Islam claims to be the same religion as Judaism and Christianity:

YUSUFAI: The same religion has He established for you as that which He enjoined on Noah - the which We have sent by inspiration to thee - and that which We enjoined on Abraham, Moses, and Jesus: Namely, that ye should remain steadfast in religion, and make no divisions therein: to those who worship other things than Allah, hard is the (way) to which thou callest them. Allah chooses to Himself those whom He pleases, and guides to Himself those who turn to (Him). 42.13

What did Allah do to Jews and Christians who disapproved of Islam?

YUSUFAI: Say: 'O people of the Book! Do ye disapprove of us for no other reason than that we believe in Allah, and the revelation that hath come to us and that which came before (us), and (perhaps) that most of you are rebellious and disobedient?" Say: "Shall I point out to you something much worse than this, (as judged) by the treatment it received from Allah? those who incurred the curse of Allah and His wrath, those of whom some He transformed into apes and swine, those who worshipped evil:- these are (many times) worse in rank, and far more astray from the even path!" 5:59-60

Pickthall: These twain (the believers and the disbelievers) are two opponents who contend concerning their Lord. But as for those who disbelieve, garments of fire will be cut out for them; boiling fluid will be poured down on their heads, Whereby that which is in their bellies, and their skins too, will be melted; And for them are hooked rods of iron. 22:19-21
Matthew 24:4-13

Jesus answered: "Watch out that no one deceives you. For many will come in my name, claiming, 'I am the Christ,' and will deceive many. You will hear of wars and rumors of wars, but see to it that you are not alarmed. Such things must happen, but the end is still to come. Nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom. There will be famines and earthquakes in various places. All these are the beginning of birth pains. Then you will be handed over to be persecuted and put to death, and you will be hated by all nations because of me. At that time many will turn away from the faith and will betray and hate each other, and many false prophets will appear and deceive many people. Because of the increase of wickedness, the love of most will grow cold, but he who stands firm to the end will be saved. And this gospel of the kingdom will be preached in the whole world as a testimony to all nations, and then the end will come.

Christians are to be a part of the Government and submit to its authorities.

Romans 13:1-7

Everyone must submit himself to the governing authorities, for there is no authority except that which God has established. The authorities that exist have been established by God. Consequently, he who rebels against the authority is rebelling against what God has instituted, and those who do so will bring judgment on themselves. Therefore, it is necessary to submit to the authorities, not only because of possible punishment but also because of conscience. This is also why you pay taxes, for the authorities are God's servants, who give their full time to governing. Give everyone what you owe him: If you owe taxes, pay taxes; if revenue, then revenue; if respect, then respect; if honor, then honor.

Titus 3:1

Remind the people to be subject to rulers and authorities, to be obedient, to be ready to do whatever is good, "to slander no one, to be peaceable and considerate, and to show true humility toward all men."

1 Peter 2:13-15

"Submit yourselves for the Lord's sake to every authority instituted among men: whether to the king, as the supreme authority, or to governors, who are sent by him to punish those who do wrong and to commend those who do right. For it is God's will that by doing good you should silence the ignorant talk of foolish men."

Islamic Mosque is to rule Over the State:

YUSUFALI: We have sent down to thee the Book in truth, that thou mightest judge between men, as guided by Allah: so be not (used) as an advocate by those who betray their trust; 4:105

YUSUFALI: If anyone desires a religion other than Islam (submission to Allah), never will it be accepted of him; and in the Hereafter He will be in the ranks of those who have lost (All spiritual good). 3:85

PICKTHAL: And fight them until persecution is no more, and religion is for Allah. 2:193
Submission to government is not absolute. After a miraculous healing Peter and James were commanded not to speak in the name of Jesus. Here is what they said in Acts 4:18-19

Then they [Sanhedrin] called them in again and commanded them not to speak or teach at all in the name of Jesus. But Peter and John replied, “Judge for yourselves whether it is right in God’s sight to obey you rather than God. For we cannot help speaking about what we have seen and heard.”

After further threats they let them go. They could not decide how to punish them, because all the people were praising God for what had happened. For the man who was miraculously healed was over forty years old.

Throughout modern times leading Moslems have given their opinions on Democracy.

In Iran during the constitutional Movement of 1905-11, Shaykh Fadlallah Muri, in debates over the formulation, argued that one key democratic idea— the equality of all citizens— is “impossible” in Islam. He maintained that unavoidable and insurmountable inequalities exist, such as those between believers and unbelievers …husbands and wives…Islam does not have any shortcoming that require completion.” John L. Esposito, The Oxford History of Islam (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 675

Mawlana Abul Ala Mawdudi, 1909-1973, of India, founder of Jammat-i-Islami “held that Islam constitutes its own form of democracy” and Islam is “the very antithesis of secular Western democracy.” Ibid. Esposito pp. 675-676

King Fahd of Saudi Arabia, 1921-Aug. 1, 2005, declared “[D]emocracy is a Western institution foreign to Islam…[T]he democratic system prevalent in the world is not appropriate in this region. The election system has no place in the Islamic creed, which calls for a government of advice and consultation and for the shepherd’s openness to his flock, and holds the ruler fully responsible before his people.” Ibid. Esposito p. 677

Even when Islamic nations accept democracy it does not always mean a peaceful outcome

"On January 12, [1992] the Algerian military in a de facto coup seized power to prevent the FIS (i.e. the Islamic Salvation Front) from winning their democratic victory. Their rationale was that the FIS was an antidemocratic 'radical' Islamic movement that would use the ballot box to 'seize' power. Once in power, it was asserted, the FIS would hijack democracy, taking control of the government. The Algerian military's message, aimed in part at the West…The governments in power are worth preserving. For no matter what their shortcomings, ranging from political exclusion to severe human rights violations, they form the only barrier against fanatics who want to confront the West.' . . . The military takeover . . . precipitated a virtual civil war in which more than seventy-five thousand Algerians . . . lost their lives.” Ibid. Esposito p. 672.

Eschatology:

Jesus will witness against Christians:

YUSEF ALI: And there is none of the People of the Book but must believe in him before his death; and on the Day of Judgment he [i.e. Jesus] will be a witness against them.- 4:159

(Source of chart unknown)
A. The Second Coming of Christ, 19:1-21
1. Announcement, 19:1-10
2. Advent of Christ, 19:11-16
3. Armageddon, 19:17-21

B. The Millennium, 20:1-15
1. Satan bound, 20:1-3
2. Saints resurrected, 20:4-6
3. Sinners rebelling, 20:7-9
4. Satan doomed, 20:10
5. Sinners Judged, 20:11-15

C. The Eternal State, 21-22:5
1. Descent of the New Jerusalem, 21:1-8
2. Description of the New Jerusalem, 21:9-27


Crucifixion & Resurrection:
Habermas presents a number of facts accepted by virtually all scholars:
1. Jesus died by Roman crucifixion.
2. He was buried, most likely in a private tomb.
3. Soon afterward, the disciples were discouraged, bereaved, and despondent, having lost hope.
4. Jesus's tomb was found empty very soon after his internment.
5. The disciples had experiences that they believed were actual appearances of the risen Jesus.
6. Due to these experiences, the disciples' lives were thoroughly transformed, even being willing to die for this belief.
7. The proclamation of the resurrection took place very early, at the beginning of church history.
8. The disciples' public testimony and preaching of the resurrection took place in the city of Jerusalem, where Jesus had been crucified.
10. Sunday was the primary day for gathering and worshipping.
11. James, the brother of Jesus and a former skeptic, was converted when, he believed, he saw the risen Jesus.
12. Just a few years later, Saul of Tarsus (Paul) became a Christian believer due to an experience that he believed was an appearance of the risen Jesus.


Naturalistic Explanations cannot explain the above away.
1. Hallucinations are not experienced in groups.
2. Went to the wrong tomb?
3. Jesus switched with Judas? Judas would not have kept quiet on the cross if they were crucifying the wrong person.
4. Swoon theory weak. Romans are experts on death and sagging on cross for a few minutes creates asphyxiation.

"Cruci-Fiction"

Yusufali: O mankind! if ye have a doubt about the Resurrection, (consider) that We created you out of dust, then out of sperm, then out of a leech-like clot, then out of a morsel of flesh, partly formed and partly unformed, in order that We may manifest (our power) to you; and We cause whom We will to rest in the wombs for an appointed term, then do We bring you out as babes, then (foster you) that ye may reach your age of full strength; and some of you are called to die, and some are sent back to the feeblest old age, so that they know nothing after having known (much), and (further), thou seest the earth barren and lifeless, but when We pour down rain on it, it is stirred (to life), it swells, and it puts forth every kind of beautiful growth (in pairs). 22:5
Discussion Questions:

1. How important are ideas regarding our relationship to God? Explain. How did Muhammad's ideas about God hurt his chance of a true relationship with God?

2. What does theology literally mean and list 9 areas that should be examined when comparing theology?

3. The Islamic and Christian Scholar Ergun Mehmet [Mehmet is Turkish for Mohammad] Caner has studied 1,300 years of Islamic history. What did he discover from Islamic history that relates to one of the focuses of this paper? How important should this fact be to America's policy makers? Educators? Theologians?

4. The theology of Islam is based entirely on the testimony of whom? How reliable was this person based on his character?

5. Muhammad questions:
   a. What did Arab chieftains initially think of Muhammad?
   b. What did the Turkish president think of Muhammad?
   c. What do those in the group who call themselves Apostates of Islam think of Muhammad?
   d. What did Muhammad think of Muhammad? Are there other religious leaders who have had an elevated view of themselves? List a few.

6. Samuel Zwemer made an insightful chart about what? Give some specific examples of borrowing that you can share with others.

7. Who did Zwemer inspired to invest his life in ministry to Muslims?

8. Miller describes that superficially what case can be made by some irenic theologians? In reality, however, what is true?

9. Muhammad tried to get his followers prepared for the debate by making what points in surah 2:120? Should Christian theologians prepare you to do the same?

10. How does the reception of revelations of the Bible compare to the alleged revelations of the Quran? If Muhammad is not telling the truth then what happens to Islam?

11. Why should every Christian young person read the Hadith? Who wrote them and what is revealed about Muhammad after reading them?
12. If someone said to you that Islam and Christianity are alike because they have these six beliefs in common what would you say? On the chart on the next page briefly compare and contrast the six Islamic beliefs explaining the difference in the teachings of these to faiths.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Islam:</th>
<th>Biblical Christianity:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Angels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prophets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Judgment Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Predestination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. The Islamic faith has five official and one unofficial deeds that every faithful Muslim should participate in. List them and briefly explain what activities are a part of the deed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deed:</th>
<th>Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. There are many rules about prayer. Some of them seem bizarre diminishing the value of prayer or preventing the effectiveness of prayer. Identify several problems that may arise during prayer time. Compare the Islamic teaching on prayer with Jesus' instruction.

15. What is zakat and what percent of the Muslim's wealth is to be given. What most do not realize is that zakat monies can be used for what activity? What was President Bush's policy because of this? What was President Obama's policy? What do you think?
16. Pilgrimage questions:
   a. How is one's name changed after going on a trip to Mecca?
   b. Why is the story of Hagar traveling to Mecca from Jerusalem based on the Biblical narrative impossible?
   c. Many young Muslims have returned to their home countries and done what after their trip to Mecca?
   d. Praying toward a small structure in Mecca that has a part of a meteorite in its wall was borrowed from Arab paganism and seems rather what by most Christians?
   e. What euphemisms are often used to describe radical fundamentalist Muslims?

17. Who was Wahhabi and what impact did his teachings have on 9/11?

18. If all terrorists suddenly perished what insight did Ambassador Gold make about where they originate?

19. Identify the three options Hughes lists for those who are having jihad waged against them. Which one would you choose? Are you sure? Which one would you want your children to choose?

20. What four ways does the Qur'an encourage jihad?

21. Identify some of the interesting ideas you learned as you compare and contrast the teachings of Biblical and Islamic Theology in each of the nine areas.
CHAPTER 14 FRIENDSHIP EVANGELISM

Friendship Evangelism is based on being a genuine friend. We should express God's love to all those around us as often and in as many ways as possible. Muslims are part of our world and becoming more so. If the roles were reversed and we were devoted followers of the Qur'an and they were the Christian disciples, we would want them to do all within their power to share the Good News with us! We should do no less for them. My genuine hope is that some of you will commit yourself to learning as much about Islam as possible, so that you will be an effective tool in the hands of the Holy Spirit in planting, watering and harvesting among Muslims. Paul's testimony was, "I planted the seed, Apollos watered it, but God made it grow." (I Corinthians 3:6) Remember, Islam is a challenging religion to get a hearing from because they incorporate arguments against Jews and Christians in their very scriptures. We should be content with watering and planting and pray that brings the harvest.

Walter Martin gives us specific topics of theology to share when in conversation with a Muslim friend.

The key topics of discussion between a Christian and a Muslim should be the nature of God, the identity and deity of Jesus Christ, and salvation by grace alone apart from works. Christians can share with Muslims that the Christian God transcends humankind's finitude and sinfulness because He cares about and loves people individually. Divine love is a concept missing from Islam and yet essential to human peace and happiness with God. A powerful witness of Scripture to God's love is John 3:16. . .

One lifelong missionary to Muslims, William M. Miller, gave some witnessing advice to Christians in his book, *A Christian’s Response to Islam*. His major points in Chapter 7, “Presenting the Gospel to Muslims,” were as follows:

1. Become Acquainted with the Muslims and with Islam  
2. Pray without Ceasing  
3. Teach the Bible to Inquirers  
4. Receive Believers into Christian Fellowship  
5. Make clear what it Means to be a Christian  
6. Emphasize what is Unique in the Gospel  
7. Avoid Controversy whenever Possible  
8. Confess Christ as the Spirit Directs.  

Mark Gabriel, in his book *Islam and Terrorism*, listed what he calls the Ten Commandments for Sharing the Gospel with Muslims:

1. Use the Word.  
2. Be constantly in prayer.  
3. Be a genuine friend.  
4. Ask thought-provoking questions.  
5. Listen attentively.  
6. Present your beliefs openly.  
7. Reason, do not argue.  
8. Never denigrate Muhammad or the Qur’an.  
9. Respect their customs and sensitivities.  

The Caners, in their chapter “Inside the Muslim: Earning a Hearing and Winning a Soul,” give direct instructions for Christians witnessing to Muslims. They write, “To witness to the 1.2 billion Muslims on the earth, the western Christian has many cultural hurdles and potholes to maneuver. The mission field is littered with the carcasses of

---

failed missionary endeavors.” Their book covers twelve “Relational Land Mines” of which Christians should be mindful. First, “Do not commit sins of ‘familiarity,’” the issue of respect looms large in the Islamic culture. Second, in your “Greeting and Approach…never greet a Muslim by shaking his left hand. The left hand is used for personal hygiene.” Third, “calling a Muslim ‘Brother’ presumptively is not wise…One may call a Muslim ‘my friend,’ which is a positive social statement that does not assume agreement of philosophy or belief.” Fourth, “accepting hospitality” when offered is strongly recommended. Fifth, if you “extend hospitality,” then “certain protocols …must be observed.” Sixth, “speaking to the opposite sex” must not be done without tacit approval. Seventh, “Interruption of Religious Service…If invited to a Mosque …the Christian is not a participant in this worship.” Eighth, “Rushing to Evangelize… [it] is a slow process of building relationship.” Ninth, “avoid political arguments.” Tenth, “Patriotism vs. Evangelism…Worldwide, Muslims do not distinguish between Christianity and America.” Eleventh, “be candid about the sins of supposed Christians.” Twelfth, “Remember What Conversion May Mean…conversion often means rejection by family, expulsion from country, and in some cases, facing a possible death sentence.”

Now that the Christian has navigated some of the hurdles and potholes, the Caners emphasize the message must be clear. “Speak in clear terms, without using language that assumes previous knowledge.” The two ideas Muslims will appreciate the most is the message of God’s grace and God’s love.

---

698 Braswell. p. 223.
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…For most converts from Islam the finished and atoning work of Jesus Christ on the cross speaks powerfully…liberation from works and the fear of the scales. Emphasize the forgiveness of Christ of all sin, and the payment of the debt owed. Grace, in all of its elements, is a magnificent doctrine…Islam does not know an intimate, personal and loving God. Allah is an impersonal creator and judge. The only term of ‘intimacy’ in the Qur’an refers to a threat of judgment: Allah is as ‘close as your jugular vein’ (surah 50:16). The omni benevolence of Christ on the cross and His transcendent love overwhelms the Muslim mind.  

The Caners’ approach to Muslims begins with a positive relational ministry. Braswell also used friendship evangelism. Friendship evangelism must always be attempted and maintained even if conversion does not take place. Unfortunately, it appears that friendship evangelism has historically not been very effective. Braswell describes Samuel Zwemer as “the Apostle to Islam, more than anyone else [he] focus[ed] the attention of the world on Islam in about 1900.” Braswell writes, “Ruth Tucker has written that Zwemer, ‘dwelt with Muslims on a plane of equality—sharing his own faith (a very conservative theology) as he sought to learn more about theirs, always showing them the utmost respect. Although his converts were few—probably fewer than a dozen during his nearly forty years of service…’” This amounts to only a fraction better than one convert every four years.  

Jay Smith is using a more direct approach with his ministry to Muslims. On a weekly basis, he drives to Hyde Park in London, England, and with the help of seminary students, he begins to invite an Islamic and Christian audience to hear him preach. His audience is made up of Muslims who would never enter a Christian church. He unashamedly invites a comparison between the teachings of the Qur’an and the Bible.

701 Ibid. p. 228.  
702 Ibid. pp. 228-229.  
703 Ibid. p.265.  
704 Ibid. p. 266.
This is always accompanied by various responses from the Islamic crowd. This method, while unusual to an American audience, is a regular, acceptable practice similar to the English experience of parliament. In any case, it appears to be close to the evangelism style of the early apostles as they spread the Gospel in various communities. Smith has been knocked out and his life is often threatened, yet he continues to plant seeds. He is not the typical soap box preacher, for he holds a M.A. from Fuller and a Ph.D. from a London Seminary.\textsuperscript{705}

In spite of the mixed messages concerning salvation, Caner can report that “indeed more than 20,000 Muslims adopt Christianity as their faith each year in the United States.”\textsuperscript{706} This has to be balanced out by the fact that Caner also writes, “an estimated 7,000 American women annually recite the Creed (Shahada) for the first time and thus begin their spiritual pilgrimage in Islam.”\textsuperscript{707}

Christians, using a positive polemic, should seek to put a wedge between the religion of Islam and the devout Muslim, demonstrating it is not their devotion that is wrong but their religion that has deceived them. Christians should seek to draw Muslims to themselves as they draw near to the biblical Jesus. If done with a Christ-like spirit, this could not be less effective than previous attempts and has the potential of bringing many out of darkness and into the light. If the Muslim rejects the argumentation against the authorities of Islam, nothing is lost, and potentially, seeds are planted for a future harvest. This book does not follow perfectly the advice given by the experts referenced above

\textsuperscript{706} Caner. Out of the Crescent Shadows. p. 121.
\textsuperscript{707} Ibid. p. 58.
because the intended audience is not Muslims who need to be convinced of the heresy and danger of Islam, but young Christians who need to be informed, empowered, prepared and protected as you face an ever increasing Islamic presence in your lifetime.

Whatever the methodology, more Christians need to be equipped to minister to Muslims. The greatest resource of future ministers to Muslims will be from the youth. Consequently, young people like yourselves need to be prayerfully and purposefully introduced to Islam by orthodox Christian churches and schools. The curriculum should present a positive polemic that exposes the fallen nature of the man, Muhammad.

Students in Christian schools often do not presume they are right and a pseudo-religion like Islam is wrong. Once students are exposed to Muhammad’s unorthodox views of Jesus, his failed personal life (as expressed in the hadiths), his aggressive personality, and the words coming out of the mouths of present radical imams, students come to appreciate and understand the Christian faith even more. Every student should also read enough surahs (chapters) out of the Qur’an to come to appreciate the flavor of the book. All of this will provide a motivation and foundation for young people to pray for Muslims, witness to Muslims, and also vaccinate themselves from becoming Muslims.

Islam can no longer be ignored or neglected; it is demanding worldwide attention.

For our part of the peace making, Martin has some very insightful advice for us. He writes,

Since almost all systems of authority in cult organizations indoctrinate their disciples to believe that anyone who opposes their beliefs cannot be motivated by anything other than satanic force or blind prejudice and ignorance, a cultist’s encounter with Christians who do not fit this pattern can produce startling results. A discerning Christian who gives every indication of being unprejudiced, reasonably
learned, and possessed of a genuine love for the welfare of the cultist himself...can have a devastating effect upon the conditioning apparatus of any cult system.\textsuperscript{708}

As Christians and Americans, we are only part of the equation. Even in kindness, bitterness blinds the eyes of some of those we assist. These are not easy times; this is not an easy task. But it is the challenge with which we are faced. We cannot turn back the clock and ignore the Middle East. We need men who understand our times just as David did in his, "men of Issachar, who understood the times and knew what Israel should do." (2 Chronicles 12:32) All we can do is be strong in character, will, morality and military as we continue to await a willing partner in peace. Papering over legitimate threats is not the same as seeking real peace. Speaking the truth in love both to ourselves and others is beneficial. We can have confidence, however, that the Lord wants us to be successful in ministering to the Islamic world, both for their sake and for our own.

Discussion Questions:

1. Friendship evangelism is really based upon what?

2. If the roles were reversed and you were lost, what would you want from those with the true Gospel? Can you keep this in mind when witnessing for Jesus to Muslims?

3. What types of witnessing should we be content with based on 1 Corinthians 3:6?

4. Dr. Walter Martin suggests some specific topics to share with Muslims. What are the most important ideas?

5. Miller, Gabriel, and the Caners all had lists of witnessing suggestions. While the lists are not the same re-read each of the lists and see what is the spirit, attitudes or qualities that are common in each list?

6. The Caner's believe there are two ideas that will be most appreciated by Muslims. What are they? Do you appreciate these in your own life as well?

\textsuperscript{708} Ibid. pp. 36-37.
7. What do Muslims not appreciate about the real Jesus? How personal and loving is the God of Islam to the Muslim? How would this make you feel?

8. How successful was Zwemer? She we be less committed?

9. View the YouTube and describe what interesting ministry Jay Smith has in England.

10. What encouraging number did the Caners share about Islam conversions to Christianity? What discouraging number did they share? About whom?

11. Why did this book not follow the directions of the experts on witnessing to Muslims?

12. Should Christians read the Qur'an for spiritual insight? Should Christians read the Qur'an to understand the truth about Islam rather than the propaganda often told of Islam?

13. Martin notes that these pseudo-religions and cults often indoctrinate their disciples to believe what about orthodox Christians? What can have a devastating effect upon the conditioning of the cult member?

14. Of all the things you have read what is most important?

15. What could be done to make this curriculum better?

16. On a scale from 1 (low) and 100 (high) how much have you learned about Islam

1 ..........25 ..............50........................75..................100
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APPENDIX 1

A LIST OF SOME OF THE ATTACKS SINCE 9/11/01


• August 2004, Dhiren Barot: Indian-born leader of terror cell plotted bombings on financial centers (see additional images).

• August 2004, James Elshafay and Shahawar Matin Siraj: Sought to plant bomb at New York's Penn Station during the Republican National Convention.

• August 2004, Yassin Aref and Mohammed Hossain: Plotted to assassinate a Pakistani diplomat on American soil.

• June 2005, Father and son Umer Hayat and Hamid Hayat: Son convicted of attending terrorist training camp in Pakistan; father convicted of customs violation.

• August 2005, Kevin James, Levar Haley Washington, Gregory Vernon Patterson and Hammad Riaz Samana: Los Angeles homegrown terrorists who plotted to attack National Guard, LAX, two synagogues and Israeli consulate.

• December 2005, Michael Reynolds: Plotted to blow up natural gas refinery in Wyoming, the Transcontinental Pipeline, and a refinery in New Jersey. Reynolds was sentenced to 30 years in prison.

• February 2006, Mohammad Zaki Amawi, Marwan Othman El-Hindi and Zand Wassim Mazloum: Accused of providing material support to terrorists, making bombs for use in Iraq.

• April 2006, Syed Haris Ahmed and Ehsanul Islam Sadequee: Cased and videotaped the Capitol and World Bank for a terrorist organization.

• June 2006, Narseal Batiste, Patrick Abraham, Stanley Grant Phanor, Naudimar Herrera, Burson Augustin, Lyglenson Lemorin, and Rotschild Augstine: Accused of plotting to blow up the Sears Tower.

• July 2006, Assem Hammoud: Accused of plotting to bomb New York City train tunnels.

• August 2006, Liquid Explosives Plot: Thwarted plot to explode ten airliners over the United States.

• March 2007, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed: Mastermind of Sept. 11 and author of numerous plots confessed in court in March 2007 to planning to destroy skyscrapers in New York, Los Angeles and Chicago. Mohammed also plotted to assassinate Pope John Paul II and former President Bill Clinton.

• May 2007, Fort Dix Plot: Six men accused of plotting to attack Fort Dix Army base in New Jersey. The plan included attacking and killing soldiers using assault rifles and grenades.

• June 2007, JFK Plot: Four men are accused of plotting to blow up fuel arteries that run through residential neighborhoods at JFK Airport in New York.

• September 2007, German authorities disrupt a terrorist cell that was planning attacks on military installations and facilities used by Americans in Germany. The Germans arrested three suspected members of the Islamic Jihad Union, a group that has links to Al Qaeda and supports Al Qaeda's global jihadist agenda.

• December 25, 2009, Umar Abdulmutallab, a Nigerian, flew from Algiers to Amsterdam to Detroit Michigan. Umar was thwarted from his attempt to blow up a plane carrying three hundred passengers.