

ISLAM ON TRIAL: THE PROSECUTION'S CASE

Amber Pawlik

This publication is protected under the US Copyright Act of 1976. All rights are reserved.

First edition 2010.

For ease of use for the reader, digital rights are not being applied to this document. Feel free to use this document on whatever computer, handheld device, etc., that you find most easy to use, but please do not offer a free copy to any other person.

Please send requests to reprint this material to amber@amberpawlik.com. Updated contact information can be found at www.amberpawlik.com. The author is open to discussing reprint of the material for classroom or circulatory use (provided it is done in a constructive manner) but written permission is required before use.

Islam on Trial

September 11, 2001 changed the world. Islamic terrorists hijacked American airplanes and flew them into several major, symbolic buildings of hers, causing thousands to fall, crash, or burn to their early death. The terrorists who did it did not do it for land or money: they did it fully, openly, and proudly in the name of their religion, Islam, being promised 72 virgins in their so-called heaven. It thrust unto us Middle Eastern politics, Islam, and a new enemy. Islam itself has come into the forefront of public debate. Or at least, it should have.

The majority of us have at least a crude knowledge of Islam and what Islamic countries are like. We know that the majority of common people live in abject poverty. We know that their progress is slim to none. We know that they still publicly stone and hang alleged criminals. We know that they cover their women head-to-toe and often deny them education. We know that they defy just about all Western ideals.

One would think that, especially after September 11, 2001, there would be criticism of Islam coming from every which way. Feminists, Christians, capitalists, secularists, human rights activists, hell even animal rights activists should have something to say about Islam. We are, after all, a country with free speech aren't we? Yet, even after September 11, there has been nothing but haunting silence.

In the current state of the world, Muslims are involved in almost every war or battle. It was *Muslim* terrorists who bombed a train in Madrid Spain; *Muslim* terrorists who held a school hostage in Russia, killing children; *Muslim* terrorists who flew planes into the World Trade Center. The past 1400 years of Islamic history has been riddled with terrorism, from the days of Muhammad to Al-Zarqawi.

But, for whatever reason, Islam is above any kind of critical look or debate. It is given a holy status. People don't just avoid criticism of it; they are quick to defend it. Those who criticize Islam do so at the risk of political suicide. The defenses given for Islam are so hysterical; you would think you just insulted their mothers.

"Islam is not the problem," we keep getting told. The terrorists, they assure us, had the "wrong interpretation" of the Koran and are not true Muslims.

We have watched Islamic terrorists behead innocent civilians. We have been told that this is completely and totally against Islam.

From *The Koran*:

When thy Lord spake unto the angels, "I will be with you: therefore stablish ye the faithful. I will cast a dread into the hearts of the infidels." *Strike off their heads then*, and strike off from them every finger tip. (8:12; emphasis mine)

We have watched Islamic terrorists commit "jihad" against the West. Under no circumstances, we are lectured, does the Koran tell its followers to attack nonbelievers.

From *The Koran*:

Make war upon such of those to whom the Scriptures have been given as believe not in God, or in the last day, and who forbid not that which God and His Apostle have forbidden, and who profess not the profession of the truth, until they pay tribute out of hand, and they be humbled. (9:29)

We know that the Islamic terrorists envision a world that is entirely Muslim. Surely this has nothing to do with the Islamic religion.

From *The Koran*:

Say to the infidels: If they desist from their unbelief, what is now past shall be forgiven them, but if they return to it, they have already before them the doom of the ancients! *Fight then against them till strife be at an end, and the religion be all of it God's.* If they desist, verily God beholdeth what they do. (8.38-39; emphasis mine)

It is interesting the responses I usually get when I start quoting the Koran directly. The responses are usually:

- That I must not be quoting from the Koran but another book that quotes the Koran, which must be wrong.
- That Muslims believe that some parts of the Koran were written by Satan (and it must be these bad quotes that I gave them).
- That what I quoted to them was only one or two verses and I must take into consideration the whole book (which I happily will).
- That the translation I am reading is wrong, and the original Koran is much gentler and nicer.

It is really rather obvious: quoting what the Koran actually says is too much for their ears. Shut it off: let them see and hear no evil.

Today, our unwillingness to identify the enemy is so bad that producers of movies are completely unwilling to make a movie in which the enemies are Islamic terrorists. Not only will we not create new fiction, we won't even report the facts. The bloody history of Islam is whitewashed in regular history books and courses. In fact, the more violent Islam gets, it seems, the more excuses and protection it gets. Islam was not called a "Religion of Peace" before 9/11. It did not get that moniker until 3,000 people were killed in its name.

Perhaps it should be our new slogan: Ignorance is Strength; Freedom is Slavery; Islam is Peace.

September 11, 2001 changed world politics forever. The oppression, mass murder, and terrorism that marked the Middle East for 1400 years hurled itself unto Western society. Yet no one is willing to identify the enemy, scared, not for fear of political persecution or assassination but of becoming *unpopular*. When something so obvious and so horrible becomes so wrong to talk about, that is when you know it is time to talk about it.

Ladies and Gentleman, this is the prosecution's case against Islam. I am charging it with creating and promoting oppression, poverty, slavery, rape, and terrorism.

The Case against Islam

When it comes to the connection between Islam and Islamic terrorism, it is our ability to reason—in this case the ability to read the Koran—that is so often under attack. Therefore, let us begin by reviewing our fundamentals: our *philosophical* fundamentals.

When reading a book, the two fundamentals involved are what is involved for all of man's interaction with reality: existence and consciousness. Existence is what exists and consciousness is awareness of what exists. A person's views on existence and consciousness, which is their views on metaphysics and epistemology, is the foundation of their philosophical beliefs and will affect every other aspect of their worldly views. Is existence firm and absolute or an ever-moldable flux? Can human consciousness understand existence or are humans doomed to be in a blind stupor, never able to understand the reality around them?

Please note that *reason* is the process by which man absorbs sensory data and categorizes it in his mind as to understand it. Therefore reason is only possible if existence is absolute and

man's consciousness is potent enough to understand existence. It is the philosophy of objectivism that maintains that reality is what it is and man is capable of understanding it.

When reading a book, what exists is the text and the degree to which you are conscious of what it says is the degree to which you focus your mind on it. The purpose is to study the text so that you can develop an understanding of it, i.e., discover its identity. You do not re-invent what you are reading or come to your own arbitrary conclusion regarding what the text says: your goal is to come to a clear, precise understanding of what the text means. The ability to do this is called reading comprehension.

You do not typically have an "interpretation" of a text. "Interpretations" are only necessary when some aspect of reality is confusing, vague, or hard to understand. For instance, an interpreter is needed to translate one language to another for people, as the foreign language is otherwise incomprehensible to those people. "Interpretations," therefore, also imply that only a person with an advanced or specialized knowledge can interpret something—it is not open to a lay person. Interpretations, such as the interpretation of the law or the interpretation of someone's behavior, are also generally regarded as only someone's opinion—only quasi-based on fact—apt to be right or wrong.

It is revealing that those who discuss Islam always refer to human understanding of the Koran as a mere "interpretation." By identifying human understanding of the Koran as an "interpretation," it automatically establishes the text as fluid, subjective, and moldable—as an incomprehensible text that anyone can take any different way.

There may perhaps be parts of the Koran that are confusing and contradictory and indeed need an interpreter. But if so, one must point out *what* text is confusing or contradictory and *what* the different "interpretations" thereof might be, especially, given their claims, as it pertains to terrorism. This would open the debate up to human reason. But those who defend Islam do not do this. Instead they typically make a broad, generic statement that people make the "wrong interpretation" of the Koran. Broad statements such as this are not indicative of a confusing or contradictory text but of *an assault on objectivity itself*.

Notice this author's defense of not being able to understand a "real Islam." This is an article entitled, "What is Real Islam?" by M.A. Hussain from a website called humiliateamerica.com:

It is impossible to tell what Islam is objectively and what Islam is not. There are several problems of interpretation of religious scriptures which are insurmountable such that there cannot be "real Islam" or real Christianity". The interpretation of religious scripture whether by a nonbeliever or of any believer is a subjective process. The religious scriptures belong to history and history is nothing but a point of view. The "objective history" or "objective historical process" is not accessible whatever methodology you adopt, *you can never give an objective account of history*. (Emphasis mine; incorrect punctuation and grammar the author's)

Not even history, according to the author, is objectively determinable. This is not just an attack on the ability to understand Islam but *reality itself*.

I propose that the arguments about the inability to interpret the Koran are not meant to emphasize the confusing nature of the Koran but to *exempt it from the Law of Identity*. They want you to regard what is written in front of you in plain language as not being what it *is* but that it can be anything at all. Up can mean down; black can be white; or any A can be any other non-A.

This same attack on objectivity does not just happen with the study of the Koran. It has infiltrated all of the major humanities and even some of the hard sciences. For instance, indeed in history, the new breed of historians (known as revisionists) will tell you that there is no objective history; that it is, of course, “open to interpretation.” In political science, new supposed scholars tell us that The Constitution is more of a suggestion than a hard set of rules, and, of course, “open to interpretation.” (The Constitution *was* designed to be living but this means it can be *amended* not re-“interpreted.”)

Why do they do this? So *they* can do the interpreting.

History, The Constitution, and reality get in the way of their ideologies. When reality gets in your way, doubt reality.

If you notice, despite the fact that these scholars believe that reality can never be objectively deciphered, they never become skeptics. One would think if reality is such a foggy haze that humans can never objectively decipher, we would be forever unsure and doubtful of the world around us. Instead, such new scholars charge right on, asserting absolute knowledge—“interpreting” history, law, and reality for you.

Notice that *they* don’t become skeptics over what the interpretation of the Koran is. Even though interpretations are generally regarded as not right or wrong, and they insist that the Koran is too “profound” to understand, they say that the terrorists most definitely had the “*wrong* interpretation,” and that Islam *is* actually a religion of peace. The Koran is mostly incomprehensible, but apparently they have the magical ability to understand its true meaning and dictate it to us.

This is a game that has been being played for decades. This attack on objectivity stems from the root, from the philosophical level of our ideas on existence and consciousness. The ideas that have permeated academia for decades have been the notion that reality isn’t real and that reason is impotent in understanding reality. This philosophical foundation was formalized into an official philosophical system by Immanuel Kant.

Kant attacked reason (and, therefore, reality) from the inside: by re-defining it. Allow me to re-emphasize the definitions of some terms. *Reason* is the process by which man absorbs sensory data and uses it to understand the world around him. *Logic* is the *method* by which man processes that knowledge in order to make accurate, i.e., non-contradictory, identifications of reality. *Mysticism* is to develop a conclusion or understanding of the world through some non-sensory means.

Kant said that reason was “a priori,” that is to say “without experience.” How can man have any knowledge, understanding, or enlightenment while void of reality? Kant made the most offensive attack on reason possible: smearing it by defining *reason* as *mysticism*, i.e., to develop knowledge with no sensory data.

This is why academic elites are unabashed in dismissing reality, history, and the obvious in front of your eyes in favor of their bizarre ideologies. Attacking reality doesn’t seem awkward or illogical to them: it seems sophisticated—the very definition of reason. Reality is an ever changing and contradictory flux, apt to be whatever they say it is. Everything is considered moldable today, from history to human nature itself. Kant laid the groundwork for full-scale, institutionalized propaganda.

This is the same game being played with the Koran. It comes utterly natural to them to portray the Koran as being subjective, fluid, and totally incomprehensible—outside the realm of the human mind. They wield manipulation as effectively as a knight with his sword.

There is one thing in the way of their schemes: your rational mind. While thwarting everyone's eyes away from the obvious, their enemy is that one person who insists on facts and demands evidence. Therefore, they need to make you doubt your own mind, i.e., your ability to reason. In the case of the Koran, this means your ability to read a book correctly.

Therefore they need to infuse waves of doubt and confusion over anyone trying to read or understand the Koran. "You are no Islamic scholar!" they will shout at you. "The Koran is so profound!" they cry. "It has so many commentaries and notes!" Don't even bother to read it; you will not understand it.

Ladies and Gentlemen, the Koran is not hard to read or understand. These are merely the hysterics of intellectual snobs trying to create an inferiority complex in you.

Notice that there is a double standard. If someone says the Koran is peaceful, it is taken as a plain, simple fact, regardless that said person has usually never even read the Koran. But the person who challenges Islam is held to the most excruciating of standards to prove themselves and their ability to judge the Koran. Unless you read the Koran in its original language, under a renowned scholar in Mecca, they will tell you that you have no idea what you are talking about. Indeed, it is usually people who have never read the Koran who are the most hysterical in these kinds of accusations.

When these methods don't work, they can always resort to ad hominem attacks: calling you an "idiot," "moron," etc., simply for having the "incorrect" view. However, they don't even have to do this anymore. Today, it is not just limited to a select few who want to insult you. It is popularly accepted to call anyone who questions Islam a "bigot" or "ignorant." People have been "educated" from birth to believe that to challenge Islam—a religion, which, like other religions, has its problems and should be looked at critically—is evil. Nothing could be more anti-enlightened.

Islam apologists, including Muslims themselves, have gotten very good at thwarting people from reading and understanding the Koran. They do so in the most effective way possible: by appealing to your respect for intelligence. Whenever you cite a verse in the Koran, without skipping a beat, they will cry that you, "Took the verse out of context." This appeals to people's sense of wanting a full conceptual understanding of any given thing. If you notice though, they never actually put the verse in context. This is not an appeal to conceptual understanding, as it seems to be, but is used to make you believe that somehow, somehow, the other verses around a particular verse will change said verse's identity.

They will also tell you whenever you quote a verse from the Koran that you have the "wrong translation." On some level this appeals to people's respect for those who take the time to learn another language. But it is utterly ridiculous to think that only those people who speak Arabic can judge the Koran. There are many, many translations of the Koran, all of which say essentially the same things. These are nothing but silly, awkward, and for some unknown reason—often effective—methods of controlling information as to control thought.

One would think if Muslims were so proud of their religion, they would be encouraging people to read their holy text to prove its righteousness, not thwarting people away from it at every step. People who are *just* want nothing more than for others to take a good, hard look at them—not generalizing them with others or brushing them aside. An innocent person being charged with murder will want and demand that all of the facts of the case to come out, to shine as much light on the case as possible, and to be allowed to take the stand to make his or her case. The unjust person seeks to manipulate and deceive others, always trying to stop people from taking too hard of a look at them.

So let's do just that: shine light onto the Koran to see what it *is*. We are going to give Islam what it frankly does not deserve: the nicety of a trial.

In order to judge Islam, I did what most Islam apologists and most Muslims (many of whom are illiterate) did not do: I read the Koran.

I find it interesting that interest in the Koran skyrocketed after 9/11. But there are hardly any commentaries describing what is actually in the Koran.

Anyone who has ever sat down to read the Koran has my deepest sympathies. It is an extremely boring, mind-numbing, and repetitive book

The Koran is considered the written word of Muhammad's teachings, who was inspired by the angel Gabriel. According to the introduction to the Koran I read (print version), Muhammad was born into a poor family but lived in a wealthy city. He grew up without a father and ended up marrying a rich widow (and then went on to have many different wives, including at least one six-year-old girl). The Koran was written down by others as he could not read or write.

The Koran is broken up into "Suras," which are like books in the Bible or chapters in a book. There are 114 Suras and over 6,100 verses. The Suras range in size from as small as 4 verses to as many as 286. For the most part, the larger Suras are at the beginning and they get progressively smaller until the very short Suras at the end.

This is how the very beginning of the Koran starts out.

Sura 2.4-7, which falls on the first page of the Koran:

And who believe in what hath been sent down to thee, and in what hath been sent down before thee, and full faith have they in the life to come:

These are guided by their Lord; and with these it shall be well.

As to the infidels, alike is it to them whether thou warn them or warn them not—they will not believe:

Their hearts and their ears hath God sealed up; and over their eyes is a covering. For them, a severe chastisement!

The very beginning of the Koran starts out with stating that nonbelievers are wrong, wrong, wrong and believers are good, good, good. It doesn't say what the believers should do—there are no principles, values, or morals laid out—just that believers are good and non-believers are wrong.

It didn't take long for me to be utterly shocked at what I read in *The Koran*:

O our Lord! punish us not if we forget, or fall into sin; O our Lord! and lay not on us a load like that which thou has laid on those who have been before us; O our Lord! and lay not on us that for which we have not strength: but blot out our sins and forgive us, and have pity on us. Thou art our protector: *give us victory therefore over the infidel nations.* (2.286; emphasis mine)

This, quite frankly ... is it! The Koran is nothing but one long vitriolic speech aimed at infidels: claiming that they are dumb, blind, stupid, thankless, and liars; that they will have boiling water poured on them; that they will be sent to hell where they will be choked with food and without any friends; that Allah hates them; and also loves those who fights against them.

I wanted to be able to give you, my reader, some kind of percentage estimate of just how much of the Koran deals with nothing but infidels. I could give you an eyeballed estimation of how much of it is nothing but hatred at infidels, but I would not expect you to take my word for it. Going through the Koran and summing up every single verse to get a percentage would be way too cumbersome. However, I thought of a way to get across to you, my reader, a warranted

percentage. I could take a random sampling of verses from the Koran and make projections from there.

Now this is not some sort of literary review, not that the Koran is complex enough to warrant a literary review. I performed the study I did, at first, solely to get an accurate percentage to present.

I originally did a small study. I wanted at least 30 samples because, statistically, so as long as there are 30 samples, the central limit theorem applies, i.e., the sampling is large enough to be statistically significant. I tried to think of a fair way to pick samples. Had I gone through and just pointed to verses, I likely would have been accused of cherry picking. So I took verse 10 from randomly chosen Suras. I did this to show I was not picking one verse over another. I ended up with 34 verses. You can read the verses I took along with commentary regarding what context the verse is in, why I assigned it to the category I did, and the calculations of my confidence interval [here](#).

I was really quite pleased with the results. I felt they provided a nice broad overview of the Koran and even captured one good verse! It also hit some of the bigger but smaller aspects of the Koran—the fact that it mentions Noah's Ark many times (where it gleefully describes how the infidels drowned); that it thinks infidels are utterly thankless; that Allah actually makes nonbelievers not believe, etc. These were the results:

- 18/34 (52.9%)—over half—of these random verses is vitriol aimed at infidels.
- 6/34 (17.6%) deal with Allah.
- 5/34 (14.7%) deal with believers.
- 4/34 (11.8%) deal with Day of Judgment or Day of Doom.
- 1/34 (3.4%) is a good verse. Do not steal from the poor / Give to the poor.

However, upon some contemplation, I decided that my study could be done better. I took the verses from an online Koran (it was easier to cut and paste quotes from an online source), and it was an anti-Islamic site so perhaps there was some bias. (It turns out there was not; the same translation is used by some pro-Islamic sites). I also felt there was at least one major theme that was ignored in my sampling: how Islam treats women. The confidence interval I ended up with was that one could be 95% confident that the percentage of hatred of infidels in the Koran was between 36.1% and 69.7%. That really is not very tight.

So I did a bigger study. This time I took it from a pro-Islamic site. I wanted to have at least 200 samples. I tried to think of the most diplomatic way to take random verses. I could go in and take every 30th verse, giving me approximately 200 verses. But that would skip over several Suras as many of them only have 5-9 verses in them. So I decided to give the verses a representation similar to the way our founding fathers set up our Congress: every Sura (just like every state) would be given a certain minimum representation and then larger Suras (just like larger states) would also have some kind of larger representation. So I took one verse from each Sura, thereby representing each Sura. I took the verse right in the middle. That gave me 114 verses. I wanted about 86 more. So then I went through and took every 70th verse. This naturally gave the larger Suras more of a representation. I ended up with 201 verses.

And, after hours of work, the results are in: they are *exactly the same* as my first study. For the percentage I was most interested in, how much of the Koran is hatred at infidels, it was exactly 53%. I was also quite happy that this sampling captured several verses about women. The confidence interval was also much better this time. With 95% confidence, we can say that

the percentage of the Koran that deals with hatred aimed at infidels is somewhere between 45.8% and 59.6%. You can read the verses I took, my commentaries, and the calculation of the confidence interval [here](#).

Here are the results of my larger study:

106/201 (52.7%) is hatred aimed at infidels, defined as:

- Threats towards infidels either in the afterlife or this life.
- Degrading infidels by calling them evil, stupid, blind, deaf, liars, thankless, etc.
- Calls to fight against them.
- Verses that say "except the believers" when wishing death on nonbelievers were counted as hatred since avoiding death is not a positive to believers.
- The threat or insult can be aimed at infidels in general or any specific infidel.

50/201 (24.9%) deals with believers, defined as:

- Mentioning them.
- Saying they are righteous.
- Saying they will get good things.
- Any mentions of one of the prophets was put into this category too.

23/201 (11.4%) deal with Allah:

- Who he is.
- That he is almighty.
- Any of his creations.

10/201 (5%) deal with the Day of Doom or the Day of Judgment:

- The Day of Doom is when destruction is sent on the earth.
- The Day of Judgment is when all are judged before Allah.
- Any message pertaining to how God records what men do was assigned this category.

4/201 (2%) are anti-woman:

- That it's OK to beat a woman.
- Women and slaves get married off but have no choice in the matter and is very self-serving to Muhammad or men in general.

4/201 (2%) deal with giving to the poor in some way

2/201 (1%) deal with some kind of Muslim custom or etiquette, for instance:

- How to divorce your wife.

1/201 (0.5%) Disapproves of a man who murdered someone, for it was for the wrong reason to kill someone.

1/201 (0.5%) says it is OK for people to have their religion while Muslims have theirs.

Over 50% of the Koran deals with hatred aimed at infidels. You will notice Allah is mentioned a lot, as well as the goodness of believers and the Day of Doom/Judgment, the former being a day when the Koran gleefully exclaims that Allah will send destruction to the earth and destroy the infidels. Notice how much of the Koran deals with not just infidels but with the theme of believers versus nonbelievers, setting up believers as holy, righteous, almost perfect human beings and nonbelievers as not just wrong but as wretched scum. If you add up the number of verses that deal with infidels, believers, Allah, and the Day of Judgment/Doom, that percentage is a full 94%. This is really the only thing in the Koran, repeated over and over, as the Koran itself readily admits: "... This book is no other than a warning and a clear Koran, To warn whoever liveth; and, that against the Infidels sentence may be justly given." (36.69-70)

You may notice that details outlining Muslim customs and etiquette do not take up much room in the Koran. In fact, Ramadan, from what I can tell, is only mentioned once in the Koran. You can see how seriously Muslims take Ramadan. Now imagine how seriously they take 94% of the Koran.

There is no moral system outlined in the Koran—with the exception of allowing men to beat their wives, sleep with their slaves, and there is an occasional, "give to the poor." There certainly is no unequivocal "Do not kill;" "Do not steal;" or "Do not lie," let alone any other insight into how to behave properly as a human being. Most of the "moral" guidance given in the Koran is not a restraint on humans but permission to do what they want—mostly for men to do what they want.

The Koran is very self-serving to men and especially Muhammad when it comes to having access to women. It promises men young virgins in heaven with "supple breasts" and "large brown eyes," but what about the women? Muhammad had up to fifteen wives at one time, but the rest of the believers were limited to four. Sura 66.1 shows not only the self-serving nature of the Koran for Muhammad but the entire purpose of the Koran itself:

Why, O Prophet! dost thou hold that to be FORBIDDEN which God hath made lawful to thee, from a desire to please thy wives, since God is Lenient, Merciful?

Note 1 from Sura 66 further clarifies this verse:

The first verses of this Sura were revealed on occasion of Muhammad's reviving affection for Mary, a Copt slave sent him by the governor of Egypt from whom he had recently sworn to his wife Hafsa to separate entirely. Hafsa, who had been greatly incensed at their amour, of which Muhammad had himself informed her, communicated the matter in confidence to Ayesha, from whose altered manner, probably, the prophet found that his secret had been betrayed. To free Muhammad from his obligation to Hafsa was the object of this chapter. (Print)

Muhammad had told his wife that he would stop having sex with a slave. However, he came back to tell her that he is allowed because Allah does not forbid it. Hence, to hell with her wishes!

Indeed, the Koran gives men full right to have sex with female slaves and their allotted four wives:

It is not permitted thee to take other wives hereafter, nor to change thy present wives for other women, though their beauty charm thee, except slaves whom thy right hand shall possess. And God watcheth all things. (33.52)

I propose the purpose of the Koran is nothing but a rationalization: Muhammad's rationalization to do whatever he wants in the name of "religion."

Thus my charges against Islam of creating and promoting rape and slavery.

A verse in the Koran that needs no further comment:

And we said, "Take in thine hand a rod and strike with it, nor break thine oath." Verily, we found him patient! (38.44)

Note 15 in Sura 38:

Thy wife; - on whom he had sworn that he would inflict an hundred blows, because she had absented herself from him when in need of her assistance, or for her words (Job ii.9). The oath was kept, we are told, by his giving her one blow with a rod of a hundred stalks. This passage is often quoted by the Muslims as authorising any similar manner of release from an oath inconsiderately taken. (Print)

The only arguable good verses in the Koran are commandments to give to the poor, which according to the study I did accounts for about 2% of the Koran. Some may argue that giving to the poor is a good thing. Perhaps. But, in the Koran, it is couched inside commandments of *not* getting wealthy.

These are they who purchase this present life at the price of that which is to come: their torment shall not be lightened, neither shall they be helped. (2.86)

Let not prosperity in the land on part of those who believe not, deceive thee. Tis but a brief enjoyment. Then shall Hell be their abode, and wretched the bed! (3.196-197)

What! prefer ye the life of this world to the next? But the fruition of this mundane life, in respect of that which is to come, is but little. (9.38)

And if this isn't malicious enough, the Koran's wish for people who have wealth:

Let not, therefore, their riches or their children amaze thee. God is only minded to punish them by these, in this life present, and *that their souls may depart while they are unbelievers*. (9.55; emphasis mine)

The Koran is hostile to any kind of wealth, pleasure, or success on this earth. Even having children is considered a test from God of where a Muslim's loyalties lie. Man is meant to remain humble with only modest earnings, pouring most of his earnings to the cause of Islam. How can business, technology, art, music, or any other form of wealth or happiness develop out of this? Those who "purchase this present life," according to the teachings of Islam, have done so at the price of the afterlife. Given Muslims, Muslims who follow the Koran anyway, are forbidden any pleasure while on this earth, death must feel like liberation to them

Thus my charge against Islam of creating poverty.

What has a tendency to shock most people about Islam and the Koran is its belief in predestination, which you may notice in the study I performed. Allow me to introduce you to one of the biggest theological contradictions of all time. The Koran is filled with threat after threat

directed at nonbelievers. And yet the Koran says that it is Allah who causes people to believe or not believe.

He whom God guideth is the guided, and they whom he misleadeth shall be the lost. (7.178)

No soul can believe but by the permission of God: and he shall lay his wrath on those who will not understand. (10.100)

And they who believe not say, "Unless a sign be sent down to him from his Lord . . ." SAY: God truly will mislead whom he will; and He will guide to Himself him who turneth to Him. (13.27)

Had God pleased, He could have made you one people: but He causeth whom He will to err, and whom He will He guideth: and ye shall assuredly be called to account for your doings. (16.93)

So, if God and God only can cause people to not believe, then why all of the threats? What good will they do? Whose fault is it that they are nonbelievers and why should they be punished for something out of their control? (I argued that the Koran had an identity, i.e., a specific meaning; I never promised it would make sense.)

Imagine you are a Muslim and want more than anything to be a good Muslim and to get into heaven. How do you know that Allah will pick you to be one that he will guide? Every person, according to Islam, has no control over his fate but rather is at the mercy of Allah's whim.

This belief in predestination is not just mysticism; it is much worse. Not only do men gain knowledge through faith only; it is only some men (and the Koran says only a few men) are privy to such knowledge. And now the most pressing question: If all the world is to be Muslim, as the Koran commands, but people cannot be converted, how can that happen? There is only one way.

Almost the entire Koran is dedicated to relegating infidels to an inferior status. They are called blind, stupid, and ignorant. No proof is given of why they should believe; Muhammad performed no miracles for people. When some skeptics asked for proof, the response was:

And when ye said, "O Moses! we will not believe thee until we see God plainly;" the thunderbolt fell upon you while ye were looking on. (2.55)

Infidels are accused of being thankless. The Koran says infidels promise that they will believe in God if God relieves them of their affliction, but when God does, they forget him. Infidels mock the prophets when they come to give their message to them. All of this sets up for what the Koran, at heart, is: *one long battle cry against infidels*.

I find it interesting that the Koran is not in chronological order. It was re-arranged, and most of the downright violent Suras were put at the beginning.

Is it not proved to those who inherit this land after its ancient occupants, that if we please we can smite them for their sins, and put a seal upon their hearts, that they hearken not? (7.100)

Say to the infidels: If they desist from their unbelief, what is now past shall be forgiven them, but if they return to it, they have already before them the doom of the ancients! Fight then against them till strife be at an end, and the religion be all of it God's. (8.38-39)

And when the sacred months are passed, kill those who join other gods with God wherever ye shall find them; and seize them, besiege them, and lay wait for them

with every kind of ambush: but if they shall convert, and observe prayer, and pay the obligatory alms, then let them go their way, for God is Gracious, Merciful. (9.5)

Yes, this is straight from the Holy Book of the religion that gets called a “Religion of Peace.”

Muslims are commanded to fight. Only the weak are excused.

It shall be no crime on the part of the blind, the lame, or the sick, if they go not to the fight. But whoso shall obey God and His Apostle, He shall bring him into the gardens 'neath which the rivers flow: but whoso shall turn back, He will punish him with a sore punishment. (48.17)

After fighting, believers have a right to the infidels' houses.

And He made you heirs to their land and their dwellings and their property, and (to) a land which you have not yet trodden, and Allah has power over all things. (33.27)

Thus my charge against Islam of creating oppression.

The Koran is clear on when fighting can stop. Some may say that the Koran says fighting can stop once “peace” is made, which is how they spin the following:

Yet if they turn to God and observe prayer, and pay the impost, then are they your brethren in religion. We make clear our signs to those who understand.

But if, after alliance made, they break their oaths and revile your religion, then do battle with the ring-leaders of infidelity—for no oaths are binding with them—that they may desist. (9.11-12)

Please notice that this verse is 9.11.

Muslims are taught to wage war on nonbelievers. It is written in plain language. Muslims are to fight until nonbelievers convert or pay taxes. All else are to be killed. Ladies and Gentlemen, thus my charge against Islam of *terrorism*.

Let me remind you of the September 11, 2001 attacks. Along with the Pentagon (and another plane which never made its destination of the White House as some courageous heroes took it down before it could get there), the Islamic terrorists targeted the twin towers of the World Trade Center, symbols of American wealth and prosperity.

And when we willed to destroy a city, to its affluent ones did we address our bidding: but when they acted criminally therein, just was its doom, and we destroyed it with an utter destruction. (17:16)

We will not burden a soul beyond its power: and with us is a book, which speaketh the truth; and they shall not be wronged:
But as to this Book, their hearts are plunged in error, and their works are far other than those of Muslims, and they will work those works,
Until when we lay hold on their affluent ones with punishment; lo! they cry for help. (23.62-64)

I will remind you the reason why the terrorists were willing to kill themselves to kill Americans: they were promised 72 virgins in heaven.

But, for the God-fearing is a blissful abode,
Enclosed gardens and vineyards;
And damsels with swelling breasts, their peers in age. (78.31-33)

But the pious shall be in a secure place,
Amid gardens and fountains,
Clothed in silk and richest robes, facing one another:
Thus shall it be: and we will wed them to the virgins with large dark eyes. (44.51-54)

For being people who damn the riches of this life (which are earned through production), they are sure excited to get freebies and women in heaven.

The terrorists who attacked us on September 11, 2001 did not do so in the name of their country or for any demand, such as money or land: they did it openly and proudly in the name of Islam. *They were not misguided; they were in every way Islamic.*

The very last Suras in the Koran are very short and riddled with cries about the evilness of infidels. Even as I read them, I could feel the burning hatred of infidels that one is meant to feel after reading them. These ending Suras can be considered chants—short, quick, hysterical chants—against infidels.

Some will insist that my quoted verses were totally lifted out of context. This argument does not have much merit. As you can tell from my study, the context of just about all verses in the Koran is a sea of hatred. It is in fact the Islam apologists who do not put things in context. Islam apologists comb the Koran for any and all good quotes and take it as proof that the Koran is peaceful. For instance, there is a quote in the Koran which says Muslims can have their religion and other people can have theirs. This may seem good until you realize that, in the Koran, it says other religions may exist with Muslims, but people from those other religions are to live as second class citizens, paying taxes to Muslims.

The other argument usually given is that the Koran does call for violence but only in self-defense. This is spin taken to new heights.

The Koran does not unequivocally say that your enemies are people *who threaten your life*. The enemies, according to the Koran, *are* the infidels, who, it argues, *are* by definition “transgressors”—thus any attack on an infidel, who by definition is a transgressor, is an act of self-defense.

And when ye go forth to war in the land, it shall be no crime in you to cut short your prayers, if ye fear lest the infidels come upon you; *Verily, the infidels are your undoubted enemies!* (4.101; emphasis mine)

They [the polytheists] sell the signs of God for a mean price, and turn others aside from his way: evil is it that they do!

They regard not in a believer either ties of blood or faith; *these are the transgressors!* (9.9-10; emphasis mine)

I asked a Muslim once about Muhammad. Muhammad was a warlord—apparently the very first Islamic terrorist to hijack the Islam religion. This man I talked to insisted that that Islam was a religion that advocated violence only in self-defense. I asked him if Muhammad fought in self-defense or in aggression. He answered, “Both.” So I asked him why Muhammad fought in aggression—perhaps it was a pre-emptive strike against enemies about to strike. And, if it was a pre-emptive strike, I asked if Muhammad had significant intelligence data suggesting that enemy nations were about to attack. He told me that Allah “in his infinite wisdom” told Muhammad that these people were his enemies.

This is the problem with Islam and this is the problem with blind faith. There are no exacting standards for who is an enemy and who is not. Whoever is perceived to be an enemy is

an enemy. They regard any attack on *Islam*, not an attack on a person's life, to be a justified reason for a retaliatory attack "in self-defense." Just drawing a picture of Muhammad, forbidden by Islam, is enough to warrant death against infidels—infidels who do not even make the picture—as happened in 2005 when a Dutch newspaper published cartoon drawings of Muhammad. In retaliation, Muslims attacked Dutch embassies, resulting in 100 deaths.

All hate movements have argued that they fight only in self-defense. Every person in the world must feel like they are moral. A very basic moral rule—that is accepted by virtually all human beings—is that you do not hurt another person unless they have hurt you first. As such, for all hate movements, they need to be convinced that someone or several people hurt them first before they commit their heinous acts. The group they accuse of oppression is not specific people—that would require evidence. Instead they blame it on a broad, general group of people and play off of stereotypes and racial hatred to convince themselves that they are the victims. Hitler had the Jews. Communists had the bourgeois. Muslims have infidels.

Everything about Islam prepares its people to be fighters. It riles them with hatred. It prods them to fight. Even the "holidays" in Islam trains fighters. Take for instance Ramadan. Instead of feasting and celebrating, Muslims are to sacrifice during the daylight hours for a month. I propose that this is an effective way to train its followers for war. Besides the practical ability to go without food for extended amounts of times, it trains people to accept a tough life. The only place you will see this kind of extreme behavior in America is for various types of military training.

This isn't a matter of clamoring over a few verses or of deciding whether or not some verses contradict other verses in the Koran. This is about the *fundamental theme* of the Koran, which is burning hatred of infidels and wishes of death and destruction for them. Any Muslim who picks up the Koran and takes it seriously will at the very least believe infidels are evil and deserving of death. Islam is a fighting ideology with an uncanny hatred for those who don't believe as they do. But don't take my word for it. Please, by all means, read the Koran for yourself.

Many people, naïve to Islam, will point to the fact that there are 1.3 billion Muslims in the world and not all of them become terrorists. True, they do not. The problem is not the regular people but the leaders. Most people, anywhere, just accept the major philosophy or religion of their time and usually do not take it very seriously. Observe that it isn't the poor or ignorant who typically become terrorists but the rich and educated. It is the Muslims who are capable of understanding the Koran (the educated) and have the means to implement what it says (the rich) who become terrorists. This is about what Islam is as an *ideology* and what the ramifications are when adopted.

Many others give other reasons for why terrorism is created. Typically, many assign the cause of terrorism to some pet cause that they have. Feminists blame the "patriarchy". Socialists blame it on poverty. These are obviously grounded not in reality but ideology. They are not honest evaluations; they would rather continue grinding their axe against men, the wealthy, whoever it is they hate.

Blaming it on poverty is particularly sneaky. It is simply not true: most terrorists are middle class if not filthy rich. When the religious fundamentalists are poor, they do not have the means to fight. It is when they became wealthy, recently mostly from oil money, that they can launch bigger, more effective attacks. Blaming it on poverty suggests that the solution is to pour more money—more money to go to jihad—into their hands. Indeed, what we need is the exact opposite: we need to starve them of all resources, especially financial ones.

Some try to argue that Islam has produced scientific achievements in the past. Most people tend to attribute the invention of Algebra to Muslims. But it was not Muslims or even Arabs that discovered Algebra: it was the Iranians. The Iranians have a rich history of enlightenment and are more influenced by their heritage, which is one that emphasizes education and scholarship, than religion. Another person some point to is a man named Razi, who made advancements in medicine, as evidence of Muslim accomplishment. But Razi was not an Arab or a Muslim but again an Iranian. In fact, he was so hostile to Islam that he wrote several books denouncing faith and upholding reason and had to live as a heretic. To give credit of this achievement to Muslims, when Muslims made him live as a gypsy, is beyond outrageous. Razi was to the Muslim world what Galileo was to ours—except that the Muslims were much worse to him than Christians were to Galileo.

It should be obvious to Western people that faith, mysticism, and blind religion are antagonistic to science, reason, and progress. We can easily see how Christianity was responsible for The Dark Ages, but we refuse to see how Islam is responsible for the violence and primitive life in the Middle East. Islam cannot even uphold a *decent* society let alone a prosperous one. Progress is not some kind of gift from the heavens. If you look at all successful societies, you will see the influence of one man: *Aristotle*. Progress requires a commitment to reason. The only way for peace or stability to come to the Middle East is for Islam to leave and for Enlightenment to reign.

One would think that liberals would be the first to condemn Islam. It is the polar opposite of all of their stated values, and they have a tendency to think they are enlightened. But, eerily enough, they almost seem to side with Islam, although they go after Christianity with an unusual tenacity. This seems odd since Islam is by far a more faith-based and hateful religion than Christianity. And, while I disagree with Christianity, it upholds at least a decent, stable moral framework for people to co-exist peacefully. Islam does not. The fact that liberals speak out against Christianity, allegedly in the name of reason, but not Islam shows that the left is not *anti-faith* but *anti-values*. If you notice, liberals didn't embrace Islam until they realized its potential for terrorism. This speaks volumes.


Even if we take down every cell of Islamic terrorism or every Islamic dictatorship that harbors and finances terrorists, so as long as this malignant ideology is around, it will inspire its followers to pick up and fight infidels. We attempted to fight communism militarily, fighting aggressive communist nations, to fail. For over a half of a century we refused to call communism itself evil. Then, in the 1980s, Ronald Reagan was willing to challenge communism *ideologically*. Communism came tumbling down with hardly a shot fired. Like with Islam, for decades we were told it was “bad people” running the communist countries that was the problem. It was not; like with Islam, the problem is not that bad people hijacked an otherwise peaceful ideology, the problem *is* the ideology. I am, however, more hopeful that people will call Islam evil, and sooner, as if people can see how communism, which comes in the package of equality and peace, is an evil ideology, they can certainly see how *Islam* is evil.

Never underestimate the power of a simple, consistent *moral* argument against the ideology of our enemies. If we are going to fight terrorism, we need to fight the ideology that inspires terrorism. As far as those hysterical people who say that challenging Islam is akin to starting a mass genocide: fighting—and winning—in the realm of ideas is a far more humane and peaceful way to end threats to our lives and nation.

Most seem to believe that Islam needs to be “secularized” for peace and freedom to come to the Middle East. Frankly, this is just a politically correct way to say Islam is the problem.

Whether you believe Islam has to be secularized or eradicated, the simple fact remains that Islam is the problem. Until we are willing to prosecute Islam as a violent religion, our war on terror will never end.

The jury is out. May all those with a rational mind judge accordingly.

Enjoy this article? Please consider leaving a review on [amazon](#). 

Works Cited

The Koran. Trans. J.M. Rodwell. New York: Dulton, 1977. Print.

The Koran. Trans. J.M. Rodwell. New York: Dulton, 1977. *Online Quaran Project*. Web. 22 May 2010.