

# **Why all Democrats Need to Start Speaking Out Against Islamic Indoctrination and Supremacist Islam**



**Embracing Multiculturalism based  
on Tolerance and Mutual Respect**

## **Purpose of this document**

This document contains excerpts, quotes and summaries from various websites. It allows readers who are open to learning about the underlying problems with orthodox Islam to print out a single comprehensive document, or read it on a computer screen, without having to click on hundreds of hyperlinks. It also makes it easier to forward a single file via email to other interested readers, which we'd like to ask you to do. The document offers a good overview of Islam and why it matters to all of us, but we also encourage you to check out additional material online using the provided website addresses. Our sources include Wikilslam, Human Rights Watch, Faithfreedom International, Islam Watch, Jihad Watch, Charter for Compassion and others. We explore the question of how to best safeguard human rights and freedom in our democracies. For a list of our online sources, see chapter 4. Some of the original text was slightly modified to ensure the consistent use of terminology and better readability. In order to protect the identities of contributors who are critical of Islam, we avoid mentioning (full) names in this document.

After the heinous attacks on the Pentagon and World Trade Center in 2001, most people were still under the impression that militant Muslims are a tiny minority and that we are able to keep them in check. Especially liberals remain extra careful not to offend anyone in the Muslim community, pointing out that they are criticizing terrorism, not Islam. Many of us know really nice, friendly and peace-loving Muslims. Therefore it is very difficult to challenge the assumption that Islamist extremists misunderstand the peaceful religion of Islam. They don't and that's hard for us to accept.

The Danish cartoon incident in 2005 opened the eyes of many people in the West. For weeks, numerous demonstrations and other protests against the cartoons took place worldwide. Innocent people got killed because of some drawings. Many conservatives began looking for in-depth material about Islam, hoping to find some explanation why millions of Muslims are getting so upset, some waving placards that demand the beheading of journalists. Concerned conservatives even read English translations of the Qur'an. Yet only a tiny minority of liberals seem to be willing to make a similar effort. This is unfortunate, because most people left of the center reject totalitarian ideologies. Most liberals still fail to recognize the connection to orthodox Islam, which is the standard Islam as defined 1,400 hundred years ago and still applicable today. Muslims are a problem for us exactly to the degree to which they understand their religion and take it seriously. The peace-loving Muslims are no problem, because they don't take Islam seriously. But there is increasing peer pressure. More and more Muslims are asked to take Islam seriously and support its doctrines.

Let's take the situation in Germany as an example. Most Germans have noticed that far more women of Turkish origin wear veils compared to 20 years ago. They have also noticed that many Muslim immigrants and their children no longer seek German friends. Children often enter elementary school without being able to speak German. Many of the boys don't respect female teachers, let alone their arrogant fathers who support them. The girls are forbidden to go on field trips with the rest of their classes. Some are even told not to befriend unclean German girls. It seems like 1933 all over again. It's happening in a country that successfully got rid of Nazism's evil ideology. Only this time devout Muslim men think they are the super-race and all the others are inferior and unworthy. Islam, when taken seriously, is a totalitarian ideology. In May 2012, the German police, while protecting anti-Islam demonstrators, were attacked by militant Salafists. They claimed that the Prophet had been insulted by the demonstrators. Twenty-nine police officers were wounded. Two of them were stabbed with a knife. This document attempts to explain why this happened.

## Table of contents:

1. Manifesto against totalitarianism .....	4
2. Islam, orthodox Islam and Islamism .....	4
3. Getting a better understanding of Islam .....	9
3.1 A conversation with Phil and Stan	
3.2 Twelve good reasons why you should learn more about Islam	
3.3 Rational fear and the Islamophobia misnomer	
3.4 The inability of devout Muslims to counter valid criticism	
3.5 Liberté, égalité, fraternité	
3.6 Why the majority of Muslims are peaceful citizens	
4. Online resources used in this document .....	17
5. The incompatibility of Islamic doctrines with fundamental Western values .....	24
5.1 Apostasy in Islam	
5.2 Intolerance and incitement to hatred	
5.3 Second-class citizens in Islamic societies	
5.4 Islamic anti-Semitism	
5.5 Islam and freedom of expression	
5.6 The rights of women	
5.7 Barbaric punishments	
5.8 Homosexuality	
5.9 Pedophilia	
6. Major concerns related to the indoctrination pandemic .....	37
6.1 The intentional use of religious deception	
6.2 Widespread support for violence and terror	
6.3 Violence in the Bible versus the Qur'an	
6.4 Islam and the silent majority	
6.5 Why some don't consider Islam to be a religion	
6.6 The adverse effects of Ramadan fasting	
6.7 Islam and modern science	
6.8 The steady decline of the Islamic world and spread of Islamic fundamentalism	
6.9 The social, political and intellectual state of contemporary Arab countries	
7. The unrestricted export of Islamic doctrine to the free world .....	53
8. Why conservative Islam critics need to welcome liberals into the movement.....	56

9. Developing strategies to counter Islamic indoctrination and protect human rights .....	59
9.1 The main challenges to developing successful strategies	
9.2 Educating yourself and educating others	
9.3 Multiculturalism based on tolerance and mutual respect	
9.4 Energy independence and boycotts	
9.5 Seeking alliances and building good relations with truly moderate Muslims	
9.6 A double-agent strategy stealth anti-Jihadist Muslims can use	
9.7 The importance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights	
9.8 Getting people to sign the Charter for Compassion	
9.9 Final note	

## Appendix

A - An overview of Islam and why it has been so successful .....	71
B - The difference between the 7 <sup>th</sup> century and 21 <sup>st</sup> century mindset .....	78
C - Excerpts from the book 'The Crisis of Islam' by Bernard Lewis.....	79
D - Spiegel interview with the Islamic reformer Bassam Tibi.....	82
E - Excerpts from a Spiegel interview with German feminist Alice Schwarzer.....	84
F - An interview with Zeyno Baran, editor of 'The Other Muslims: Moderate and Secular'...	86
G - Excerpts from 'The Muslim Community is Hemorrhaging' article .....	90
H - Excerpts from the 'Human Rights Watch 2012 World Report' .....	92
I - The World after 9/11 - An interview with Ibn Warraq .....	96
J - An interview with Nasr Hamid Abu Zayd about reforming Islam.....	100
K - Excerpts from the Declaration Toward a Global Ethic .....	103
L - The Anti-Jihadist Glossary of Terms.....	106

## **Chapter 1: Manifesto against totalitarianism**

In the year 2006, a group of 12 writers have put their names to a statement in the French weekly newspaper Charlie Hebdo warning against Islamic totalitarianism. Here is the text in full:

'After having overcome fascism, Nazism, and Stalinism, the world now faces a new global totalitarian threat: Islamism. We writers, journalists, intellectuals, call for resistance to religious totalitarianism and for the promotion of freedom, equal opportunity and secular values for all. Recent events, prompted by the publication of drawings of Muhammad in European newspapers, have revealed the necessity of the struggle for these universal values. This struggle will not be won by arms, but in the ideological field. It is neither a clash of civilizations nor an antagonism between West and East that we are witnessing, but a global struggle that confronts democrats and theocrats. Like all totalitarian ideologies, Islamism is nurtured by fear and frustration.

Preachers of hatred play on these feelings to build the forces with which they can impose a world where liberty is crushed and inequality reigns. But we say this, loud and clear: nothing, not even despair, justifies choosing darkness, totalitarianism and hatred. Islamism is a reactionary ideology that kills equality, freedom and secularism wherever it is present. Its victory can only lead to a world of injustice and domination: men over women, fundamentalists over others. On the contrary, we must ensure access to universal rights for the oppressed or those discriminated against. We reject the cultural relativism which implies an acceptance that men and women of Muslim culture are deprived of the right to equality, freedom and secularism in the name of the respect for certain cultures and traditions.

We refuse to renounce our critical spirit out of fear of being accused of 'Islamophobia', a wretched concept that confuses criticism of Islam as a religion and stigmatization of those who believe in it. We defend the universality of the freedom of expression, so that a critical spirit can exist in every continent, toward each and every maltreatment and dogma. We appeal to democrats and free spirits in every country that our century may be one of light and not dark.'

Signed by Ayaan A., Chahla C., Caroline F., Bernard L., Irshad M., Mehdi M., Maryam N., Taslima N., Salman R., Antoine S., Philippe V. and Ibn W.

## **Chapter 2: Islam, orthodox Islam and Islamism**

Islam is a cultural, religious and political system, which creates durable, self-stabilizing social structures. Orthodox Islam (sometimes called dogmatic Islam or pure Islam) is based on the Qur'an (instructions from God) and the Sunnah (way of Muhammad). The Sunnah consists of the Hadith (traditions of Muhammad) and the Sira (biography of Muhammad). Islamic laws are made up of the Sharia and Islamic jurisprudence. The latter is a complimentary expansion of the former by Islamic jurists, for example to determine whether the use of new technical devices are allowed (halal) or strictly forbidden (haram). The Sharia not only governs public life, but also many facets of one's personal life. Orthodox Islam is Islam taken seriously by its followers, who are often referred to as true believers. Indoctrination of a Muslim can be understood as the process of taking Islam more and more seriously. Salafism and Wahhabism are seen as the most literalist,

strict and puritanical approaches to dogmatic Islam rooted in the complete rejection of individuality. Strict forms of dogmatic Islam are also referred to as fundamentalist Islam. It claims that the instructions contained in the Qur'an and the Sunnah do not only apply to all Muslims, but to all people in the world in the past, the present and the future. Pure, dogmatic Islam which includes the Sharia can be seen as a supremacist religion. Its self-declared aim is to rule the world and establish a worldwide caliphate.

The term Islamism was coined to differentiate Islam as a modern political ideology from Islam as a faith, but very often it's difficult or even impossible to distinguish between the two. The political system is of interest to non-Muslims, since it determines how free Western societies are viewed and how people in free societies are treated. Leading Islamist thinkers emphasize the enforcement of Islamic law and pan-Islamic political unity, or even the elimination of non-Muslim, particularly Western economic, political, social, or cultural influences in the Muslim world, which are believed to be incompatible with pure Islam. Some Islamic scholars favor the term activist Islam or militant Islam, since the term Islamism is considered derogatory by many pious Muslims. We use the terms political Islam, orthodox Islam and Islamism interchangeably.

In this document you will learn more about orthodox Islam and its supremacist doctrine. According to Islamic scriptures, Jibreel (Gabriel) is the angel who first appeared to Muhammad in the cave of Hira and taught Muhammad the Qur'an. The initial experience frightened Muhammad and he was thinking that he was possessed by a demon. The Qur'an was revealed to Muhammad gradually over a period of years until his death in 632 CE. It is not clear how much of the Qur'an had been written down by the time of Muhammad's death, but it seems probable that there was no single manuscript in which the Prophet himself had collected all the revelations. Nonetheless, there are traditions which describe how Muhammad dictated various portions of the Qur'an to his secretaries. While there is not a single verse in the Qur'an that commands love for those outside Islam, there are over 493 that either promote violence or speak of Allah's hatred for unbelievers. The holy text is therefore largely about how to think of and deal harshly with those outside the one true faith. Any form of orthodox Islam that is based on a strict interpretation of the Qur'an meets the criteria of dangerous cults as defined by Michael Shermer:

- 1) Veneration, glorification and inerrancy of the former or current leader to the point of virtual sainthood or divinity
- 2) Acceptance of beliefs and pronouncements on all subjects without applying critical thinking
- 3) Persuasive techniques from benign to coercive are used to recruit new followers and reinforce current beliefs
- 4) Hidden agendas exist and the true nature of the group's beliefs and plans is obscured from or not fully disclosed to potential recruits and the general public
- 5) There is deceit, therefore recruits and followers are not told everything they should know
- 6) Sometimes there is financial exploitation and recruits and followers are persuaded to invest money and other assets
- 7) There is absolute truth which also means that the group has discovered final knowledge on any relevant number of subjects
- 8) Absolute morality is also being claimed, which means the cult's system of right and wrong are applicable to members and non-members alike. Those who strictly follow the moral code become and remain members and those who do not are either dismissed or punished.

We have all heard the terms *radicalized* Muslims and *fundamentalist* Muslims. We use those terms to make sure everyone knows we are not talking about normal or moderate or progressive Muslims. There is a good reason to try to make this distinction. The main reason is because if we say Muslim, we might mean all Muslims, and clearly all Muslims are not behaving the same. The only piece of information missing from most peoples' understanding is that the radicalized Muslims are not really radical. They are orthodox. They are simply doing what it says in their scriptures they are supposed to do. They are not hijacking their religion or misinterpreting it. One definition for the term *orthodox* is this: 'Adhering to the accepted or traditional and established faith, especially in religion'. And the term *heterodox* means: 'Not in agreement with all accepted beliefs, especially in religious doctrine or dogma'. That is a good definition for what we mean by moderate Muslims. It's accurate and makes the distinction very clear. So in this document we use the term orthodox to describe someone who strictly follows the teachings in the Qur'an and the Sunnah, and who tries, as a good Muslim is supposed to do according to the doctrines, to follow Muhammad's example. A militant Muslim is an orthodox Muslim who is actually willing and capable of inflicting the full range of violence prescribed by the Islamic doctrines. A Jihadist is a militant Muslim engaged in the actual fight. Appendix B provides a table that shows the main differences between 7<sup>th</sup> century radical views of orthodox Islam and the progressive 21<sup>st</sup> century mindset.

Because Islam is so successful, its teachings are becoming more and more influential on the world stage, and some of its built-in aggressiveness should be curbed. But the only way it can be curbed is if enough people know about it. The way we understand Islam will determine what policies we collectively endorse or reject. This is the prime objective of this document.

Progressive Muslims have produced a considerable body of liberal thought within Islam. The methodology of reform can be classified into two groups, one depending on re-interpreting the traditional texts which constitutes Islamic law, and the other group considering only the meaning of the Qur'an as a divine inspiration, while the wording is believed to be from the prophet Muhammad intended by him to suit his time and situation, therefore interpreting the problematic verses in modern times allegorically or even not considering them. Some liberal, heterodox Muslims favor the idea of modern secular democracy with separation of church and state, and thus oppose Islam as a political movement. They view tolerance as a key tenet and are generally open to interfaith dialogue and conflict resolution with other communities such as Jews, Christians, Hindus, and the numerous factions within Islam. Outspoken liberal Muslims are tiny minority, because they fear the persecution by militant Muslims. Some of them had to go into hiding because of credible death threats. We will explore this subject in chapter 9.5.

Many Western governments, media, and others make the mistake of putting the dividing point between Muslims who are and aren't violent, rather than between real moderates and orthodox Muslims who, even if they don't favor or use violence at the moment, still seek to capture state power and create a theologically dominated society. To prove that the West can co-exist successfully with Muslim populations is an important way to undercut those who support orthodox Islam. In order to achieve this, however, the West has to win over its Muslims both for its own society and for a moderate approach. The orthodox Muslims create and control the main institutions in their community. Many liberals oppose acculturation or assimilation in favor of declaring these to be separate communities in which everyone must live according to the norms. The line is not set between moderate and radical, but rather those who use violence and those who don't, thus empowering radical Islamists who focus on organizing the indoctrination process.

For several decades, Wahhabists and Muslim Brotherhood groups have been courted by Western governments and treated by the media as representatives of a near-monolithic Muslim community. But an alternate narrative has emerged in the Muslim world, one that rejects the Islamist worldview as anti-democratic. The main problem has to do with the fact that unlike purely political totalitarian movements, Islamism has a profound and deeper appeal that derives from its claim to stem from the will of God.

Many officials in Western democracies mistakenly try to promote non-violent Islamist groups like the Muslim Brotherhood as alternatives to violent Islamists like Al-Qaeda. But the real differences between these organizations are tactical in nature. Both believe that Islam is superior to other religions and seek to impose Sharia law in order to regulate virtually every aspect of life. The West has lost sight of a fundamental truth: empowering orthodox Muslims, regardless of whether or not they are violent, sows the seeds for future radicalization that undermines our civilizational structures and breeds terrorism. It is difficult to understand that 'nice people' who may even share an outwardly secular lifestyle, still firmly believe that their lives should be governed according to a legal code of seventh-century Arabia.

An internal Muslim Brotherhood document reveals that the organization has a clear strategy that is hardly moderate: First, win over the individual. Second, ensure the spiritual education of the family. Third, Islamize the society. And finally, seize power. Western democratic governments and politicians lack coherent strategies of their own to deal with the danger. Instead, they take a lowest-common-denominator approach, which is engaging with virtually any Muslim organization that is willing to condemn terrorism, even if that organization ultimately seeks supremacy over non-Muslims. The strategy plays into the hands of Islamists who are prepared to use the rhetoric of nonviolence as a tactic to advance their political agenda.

This document is both about understanding and observing orthodox Muslims, as well as seeking alliances and building good relations with truly moderate Muslims through dialog. Islamization is now an almost worldwide phenomenon. It is the process by which an entity is transformed by one or more of the teachings of Islam to become a new entity with Islamic features and characteristics. Islamic values slowly gain the upper hand over all other value systems. Dogmatic Islam seems to spread like a virus. It radiates from Muslim countries that are too diseased to support it into healthy systems that are that way because they have had the luxury of developing apart from Islam. Once in the host system, the indoctrination virus uses the existing machinery to make replicas of itself. Over time, the host makes unilateral concessions to the religion, feeding and appeasing it in the vain hope that it can be pacified. Vital organs are co-opted and eventually shut down as supremacist Islam advances. In a matter of time, the entire system groans to an agonizing death and assumes the condition of the diseased nations from which Muslims originally fled. The virus then looks for new hosts to cannibalize. What this means is this: we are facing the dangers of a global indoctrination pandemic.

There are things that our societies cannot tolerate and expect to survive. Justice must take its rightful place above tolerance. Of course, tolerance is a good thing, but not when we allow it to be used cynically against us by those who have no use for it once they obtain power. We need to rediscover critical thinking. The truth is that Islam with its full set of doctrines is not a religion of peace and it is not like other religions. Islam does not reciprocate tolerance. Sometimes the truth isn't comfortable. Sometimes the truth offends. But it is far better that we offend others than lose our own freedom. So we need to act.



## Chapter 3: Getting a better understanding of Islam

### 3.1 A conversation with Phil and Stan

Here's a personal experience of an average, well-meaning American citizen discovering Islam. We'd like to share his story:

A friend of mine, Phil, was in town to promote his new book. We went out to lunch with another friend of ours from this area, Stan, a man who runs a multi-station radio conglomerate. We were talking about this and that when Phil mentioned an experience he had in a church in the Midwest. Phil goes to church every week. And for awhile the church had speakers from various religions come to speak to them. One week they had a Hindu teacher come speak to the congregation, and the next week it was a Buddhist priest (this is a very open-minded church), and the third week it was a Muslim imam. Phil said, 'I couldn't believe the imam. He scared the old ladies. Every other thing he said was about cutting off someone's head.' Phil looked surprised. Now I hadn't seen either of these guys for awhile and in the meantime I had learned a lot about Islam and I hadn't really talked to many people about what I was learning. I said, 'Awhile back I read the Qur'an because I wondered about Islam.'

'Wondered?' asked Stan. 'What do you mean?'

'Well, I've heard terrorists like Osama bin Laden quoting the Qur'an, talking about the obligation of all Muslims to subjugate the infidel and their responsibility to wage Jihad, and then I've heard people like George Bush quoting peaceful passages from the Qur'an and saying Islam is a religion of peace, and I just wanted to know what the real story was. So I read the Qur'an cover to cover. It's been a real eye-opener. First of all, the copy I first started reading jumped around and it was hard to follow. Then I found out that the traditional way to print the book, the traditional order of the chapters, is simply from the longest to the shortest chapter. So I found a book called "Simple Koran" by Bill Warner that prints it in the order it was actually written, in chronological order, and it is much easier to follow that way.' Stan looked puzzled. He has a curious, inquiring mind. 'I wonder why they printed it that way. That seems like an odd order to print a book.'

'Yes,' I said. 'A secretary for one of the caliphs, I think his name was Zayd, decided that's how to arrange the chapters. Even at the time, people criticized his strange arrangement. But he was the secretary and that's the way he wanted it. Now it's just traditional. But something is revealed by reading the book in chronological order that I don't think you would see in the traditional chapter order. You see a dramatic change in the kind of revelations the prophet Muhammad has over time. He originally lived in Mecca and Muslims were a minority. Obviously when he first started, he and his wife were the only Muslims on earth. Everyone else in the city of Mecca already had their own religions. Muhammad went around preaching his new religion and criticizing everyone else's. People didn't like that.'

My friends laughed. Of course people didn't like that. 'So after about thirteen years of preaching,' I went on, 'Muhammad had gained 150 converts, but they were still a minority, and the Muslims' relations with leaders of other religions had become increasingly hostile over the years. It was getting pretty hot around there, so Muhammad moved to Medina, where he had some friends. And that's when the revelations really started changing. For the first three-fourths of the book, the revelations were mostly about heaven and hell and how if you are a good Muslim and follow the rules you'll go to heaven and if you don't follow the rules or if

you doubt Muhammad is really the Prophet, you'll burn in hell and the only thing you'll have to drink is boiling water. But the last fourth of the book is very different. Once Muhammad gets to Medina, his group starts raiding caravans that are going to Mecca. Muhammad went on some raids himself, and sometimes he just sent some of his Muslim followers on raids. And they would sometimes kill the men and take the women as slaves, and of course take all the valuable goods in the caravan.'

Again, both of them looked shocked. Astonished. Surprised. And yet, it looked as if years of accumulated confusion vanished in an instant. Stan said, 'So that's where the terrorists got the idea.' Stan has a great sense of humor and he was making a joke, and we all laughed, but that's the light bulb I could see go on in these guys' heads. I went on. 'So they started doing pretty well, financially. Muhammad kept a fifth of the booty from the raids and the rest of the Muslim raiders split up the four-fifths. The Prophet started getting more recruits because this was a pretty sweet gig. He started growing an army. And the revelations changed accordingly. Up until this time, he had been trying to get the Christians and Jews to admit that in their own scriptures, Muhammad's coming had been foretold. His arrival was prophesied in their holy books. He was sure of this, and he wanted the Jews and Christians to say so. He wanted them to validate his legitimate prophethood as one of a long line of prophets (Abraham, Moses, Jesus, etc.) but the Christians and the Jews wouldn't validate him. So in the first three-fourths of the Qur'an, the revelations are relatively tolerant of Christians and Jews. He was trying to curry their favor. But once Muhammad had an army, and once he realized they would never acknowledge him as a prophet, his revelations became less and less tolerant, and then they became violent. When the nature of the revelations changed, the Qur'an started accumulating contradictions. It had these tolerant passages earlier and then less tolerant passages later. But the Qur'an itself, conveniently enough, has a passage that tells Muslims what to do about this. In the Qur'an, Allah says: "If something I say now contradicts something earlier in the Qur'an, the later revelation overwrites the earlier one." The earlier one is null and void, and the newer one is the better one. It's called abrogation. The bad news is the tolerant passages are earlier and the intolerant, violent passages are later. So finally I realized how it was possible to have peaceful quotes and violent quotes, both from the Qur'an. The Qur'an is not like the Christian Bible. It isn't written by different people at different times. There are no vague analogies or symbolic passages given to multiple interpretations. It is written by one man and is very direct, straightforward writing. So how could it contain contradictions? Now I know.'

'So, wait a minute.' Phil looked concerned. 'You're saying the peaceful passages don't count anymore?'

'Right. They don't count. At least officially. They have been overwritten by passages that say things like, "kill the unbelievers wherever you find them", which is a passage from the very last revelation of the Prophet. And not only that. You see, Muslims are supposed to follow Muhammad's example. It says in the Qur'an, and says it more than seventy times, that Muslims should follow their Prophet's example. He is the role model. He's the one to imitate.'

'That's not good,' said Stan.

'No, that's not good. Muhammad didn't think it was a good thing for devoted religious people to seclude themselves in a monastery. He didn't believe in asceticism. He thought that was the lazy coward's way out. According to Allah, you show your devotion and demonstrate your faith in the real world. You do this by fighting in Jihad, fighting for Allah, doing things you're afraid to do, fighting against the unbelievers, working to make sure all governments follow the law of Allah. Muhammad believed anyone could tell a good story

or say a good prayer, but Jihad is putting your money where your mouth is. Do you really believe? Well, prove it. Risk your life in combat. If you really believe everything the Qur'an says, then you know when you die in Jihad you will go straight to Paradise without judgment, and all your sins will be instantly forgiven. If you are afraid of fighting, war, or death, it proves your unbelief. Fighting Jihad is so highly valued by Allah that dying in Jihad is the only way to guarantee your passage to heaven. You may have a chance to get into heaven if you do good works and do not sin. But if you die fighting against unbelievers, you are guaranteed passage to heaven, even if you were a sinner before.'

'Wow,' said Stan. They both looked amazed. Stunned, really. These are grown men. They read a lot. Both of them are educated, well-informed, successful people. Both are very bright, intelligent men. And they didn't know any of this. These guys have known me for a long time, so they trusted what I said. They know I'm not a racist or a bigot, and they know I am not prone to fanaticism and I am not a hater. So they accepted what I said with open minds. And what I told them was accurate, as they assumed. But people who hear about it from someone they don't know well might easily dismiss this kind of information. So I recommend to everyone to just read the Qur'an themselves. That's really the only way to know for sure. I'm sure I don't have to remind you that this is deadly serious business. It makes a huge difference what people know about Islam. The Jihadists don't want non-Muslims to be made aware this information (they can go about their Jihadist business with less interference if most people remain ignorant of the political goals of Islam) and they now have an *Internet Jihad* going on, hacking in and trying to shut down sites that alert people to their plans and methods. Just the two pieces of information, that later passages overwrite earlier ones and that a good Jihadist will deliberately deceive non-Muslims, is enormously clarifying and damaging to their cause. But they can't hack into your one-on-one conversations, and that's really where the rubber meets the road. So read the Qur'an and share what you learn. Let's have an informed population so we can figure out how to peacefully and effectively protect ourselves from the fundamentalist Muslims without being jerks to the peaceful Muslims. Let's stop listening to everyone's opinions and read the Qur'an ourselves.

### **3.2 Twelve good reasons why you should learn more about Islam**

It is a sane, rational, sensible goal to know more about Islam. Why? you might ask. Why bother to learn about it when you have no intention of becoming a Muslim? Here's a personal view which lists twelve good reasons:

1. Your education will be more well-rounded. Most of us have some knowledge about Judaism and Christianity, perhaps even Buddhism, Taoism, and Confucianism. We've heard quotes by their founders, we know some of what they teach and we know a little of their history. But almost every Westerner is unfamiliar with the most basic teachings of Islam. Most people know about the extreme views of the Christian Right, but they are unfamiliar with the even more extreme views of orthodox Islam.
2. It is interesting. Do you know, for example, why Osama bin Laden chose September 11 as the day to attack America? Because the last high-water mark of Islam occurred in 1683 on September 11. Islam had expanded and conquered for centuries, and was finally stopped at the gates of Vienna when 40,000 soldiers arrived just in time to stop the Muslim siege of the city. Islam's spread has been repressed by superior military force ever since then. Their dominance has been receding since that day, and almost all Muslims know this, and many resent it. But the new resurgence has set out to finish the goal (worldwide Sharia law), so they chose September 11 to kick off the new era. Before I started learning about Islam, I didn't know about

the gates of Vienna. I didn't know why the Crusades happened. I didn't know why Middle Eastern countries have seemed so dead-set on destroying Israel. I didn't know what the hijacking of planes and the holding of hostages was all about when I was a kid. I have learned so much, and a lot of it has been very interesting.

3. Knowledge can immunize us. Have you ever gotten what looks like an official email from Amazon or PayPal or Gmail, asking you for account information? For those who don't know this kind of thing can happen, they are vulnerable to giving away their personal account information to a criminal. The email usually says something like, 'There has been a problem with your account and we need you to update your account information.' And they provide a link. When you follow the link, it looks every bit like the official website. If you give your information, you just gave it to a scam artist. If you've heard of the scam, you are immune to it. If you want to check it out just in case, you will not use their link. You will type in 'amazon.com' or 'paypal.com' into your browser and go check your account to see if anything is really wrong. With that little bit of knowledge, you avoided a potential catastrophe. Knowledge makes the difference. It is exactly the same with knowing about Islam. Once you have a pretty good grasp of what's going on, you are less afraid, less paranoid, and less vulnerable to what is called Taqiyya (religious deception, see chapter 6.1). If you don't know about Islam, you will not be able to tell the difference between orthodox and heterodox Muslims, so you will have to either distrust them all (which isn't cool) or trust them all (which would be stupid). Educate yourself and you won't have this dilemma.

4. You'll be ahead of your time. In the future, everyone will know about Islam. It is a quickly-growing faith with more and more influence on world affairs. By learning about it now, you will be among the vanguard of a new era.

5. You can help your fellow non-Muslims understand. This is a nice benefit of learning about Islam and Islamic doctrine. Your understanding can help you shed some light and help eliminate the confusion you see in the people you know. It is a valuable service you can provide your fellow citizens.

6. Confusing current events will become understandable. Once you learn what's really going on, the scary terrorist events that make you think, 'Why are they doing this?!' are suddenly illuminated, and you know exactly why they're doing it. Learning about Islam makes world events less upsetting. You will no longer feel as exasperated or wonder what is happening to this crazy world. You will finally understand. Of all the benefits of learning about Islam, this had the most impact on me. Political events that have been happening since I can remember, the hostage situations and hijacked planes and bombings, all seemed so unnecessary and confusing. And you can watch the news all day long and get no clarity whatsoever about why these things are happening and what they all have to do with each other. It's a relief to finally comprehend the bigger picture.

7. Orthodox Muslims are immigrating to Western democracies. From within those democracies, including the one you are living in, some of these super-devout Muslims are setting up terrorist cells right now. Their spokesmen are delivering fiery tirades at mosques in your own country, calling the faithful Muslims to rise up against the infidels (you and me), telling the Muslims in their congregation it is their holy duty to sabotage the government and establish Sharia law. The Sharia not only governs public life, but also many facets of one's personal life. It has laws covering Muslim interactions with non-Muslims, sexuality, food, rituals, leisure activities, dress, hygiene etc. This is due to Muhammad's pivotal role in both the practice of Islam and the formation of Islamic law. He is considered by all Muslims, in Islamic theology, as the Uswa Hasana

which means perfect example. As both are based on the same source, they are inseparable from one another. Orthodox Muslims are recruiting native-born Westerners into groups working toward these goals, as I'm sure you've seen on the news. And it is becoming more common. Not all Muslims follow these Islamic teachings. But some do, and they are in free countries now, preaching hatred. And most of our Western democracies allow radical Muslims enter our countries. Why? Because most Westerners don't know much about Islam and its dangerous potential.

8. Some of the orthodox Muslims will relentlessly try to change our laws, from within and from without. They have already done so in parts of Europe and the United States, because Islam is partly a political ideology. It is the duty of orthodox Muslims to work toward making every government on earth follow Allah's Sharia laws. If Westerners knew what was going on, we would surely find a peaceful way to prevent it. But our ignorance makes their job easy for now, and violence more likely in the future.

9. They are having more children than most of us. There are many ways to wage Jihad and establish Sharia law. One is through violence. Another is through sheer reproductive superiority. Orthodox, extremely devout Muslims are immigrating in large numbers into Western democracies, having as many children as they can, and teaching them to be devout Muslims. If they are strictly following Islam, Muslims will try to turn any country they live in into an Islamic state, no matter how long it takes. They have to. It is their religious duty to do so, whether they want to or not. The main method many are using in the West is to gain small concessions to Sharia law.

10. The teenage children of heterodox Muslims are vulnerable to being persuaded by terrorist recruiters. Even though many (probably most) of the Muslims who immigrate into Western democracies are heterodox and ignore many Islamic teachings, their children will be vulnerable as the recruiters help these young, idealistic Muslims see through the hypocrisy of their parents' incomplete worship. The children of Muslims have heard all their lives from everyone in authority that the Qur'an is a direct message from the Almighty Himself. As teens, if they hear a recruiter tell them what's actually in the Qur'an, they might be surprised. Being young and idealistic, they may become dedicated to the foundational principles of Islam. The Qur'an contains clear instructions to work toward the goal of creating a world that follows Sharia law. It is the primary goal of pure Islam. And it is the primary religious duty, the primary religious practice, of a devout Muslim to strive toward this goal with his money and his life. The teens will look at their parents and feel disgusted. Their parents, the ones who have told them repeatedly that the Qur'an is the perfect word of Allah, ignore much of the book. Plus, we cannot ignore the added benefit of dying while slaying infidels: You go straight to Paradise, and have 72 beautiful wives ready to do your bidding. Critics of Islam did not make that up. What 15-year-old boy wouldn't find a harem of beauties an attractive proposition? If he reads the Qur'an, he'll discover the recruiters are right: It says quite clearly he is supposed to fight non-Muslims. He will discover that mainstream Islamic scholars agree that if he dies while killing infidels he will go straight to Paradise without having to be judged. Nuking an American city would surely impress Allah. And because the Jihadist did such a fine thing, he will be empowered to bring family members to Paradise too.

11. Your vote on this issue is important. If you vote, you are helping to elect representatives and leaders who make legal and political decisions (like what kind of immigration policies we should employ, or whether an imam who encourages his followers to overthrow the government should be charged with sedition).

When you understand more about Islam, you will be able to know which leaders have a grasp on this subject and which do not, and vote accordingly.

12. Our survival as a free society is at stake. I know that sounds very dramatic and rabble-rousing, but it is quite literally true. All the different orthodox Islamic groups have a single goal in mind: The establishment of Sharia law in every country. They did not make this up. They did not interpret their holy book that way. They did not have to guess. That is what it says, directly and clearly. These people are not joking. This is not a casual hobby for them. They have dedicated their lives to it. And oil-rich Islamic governments are pouring money into the project. This struggle has gone on for 1,400 years, and as far as the devout ones are concerned, it will go on for another 1,400 years, or as long as it takes to win. They are acquiring the advantages of new technologies. And they are well-funded. I don't know how the West will ultimately deal with it, but I know this: Until enough of us face and understand what we're up against, we don't have a chance. Cheerful obliviousness will always be easily defeated by grim determination. Before 1933 most Germans, let alone people from the rest of the world, didn't know about the true goals of Adolf Hitler.

Most Westerners make the assumption that all religions are basically alike. And we have a deep-seated respect for other cultures and the right of everyone to believe what they want. We have a profound distrust of any hint of arrogance or any feelings of superiority of our own culture. It is almost at the level of a taboo. This distrust is almost entirely a good thing. It's one of the reasons we are able to have such a rich, diverse society with people of all kinds getting along with each other. But Islam is unique and it doesn't reciprocate tolerance. The *live and let live* principle is rejected by Islamic doctrine. That's the problem. Most of us feel that people can believe whatever they want, whether it's horoscopes or karma or prophets or animal spirits, as long as those beliefs do not contain instructions to harm other human beings. And that's the crucial point. For a more comprehensive overview of Islam's tenets and instructions, see appendix A.

Hate speech is a form of communication that vilifies a person or a group on the basis of color, disability, ethnicity, gender, nationality, race, religion, sexual orientation, or other characteristics. Orthodox Islam uses an interpretation of the Qur'an and Sunnah with parts qualifying as hate speech, because of the vilification of non-Muslims, disobedient Muslim women, Muslim apostates and homosexuals, see chapter 5.

### **3.3 Rational fear and the Islamophobia misnomer**

A phobia is a persistent, abnormal, and irrational fear of a specific thing or situation that compels one to avoid it, despite the awareness and reassurance that it is not dangerous. Islam is an ideology and likewise, the rejection of an ideology cannot be classified as phobia. To call the opponents of an ideology phobic is a fallacy. All ideologies have their critics and opponents, but we do not hear Christians calling the critics of Christianity Christianophobes or Hindus calling theirs Hinduphobes. The term Islamophobia is both technically and logically incorrect and misleading. According to the definition of phobia given above, the neologism Islamophobia implies that Islam is not dangerous and the fear of it is irrational. Yet the danger from political Islam exists and the fear is a consequence of rational thinking. This fear is shared by many liberals and conservatives who are familiar with Islamic teachings.

Islamophobia was invented as a supposedly politically correct buzzword used to stigmatize criticism of Islam. As is the way with such terms, it is often used interchangeably with others such as *racism* and *xenophobia* in order to silence opposition. While Muslims can indeed be victims of bigotry, this is distinct from

criticism of their religion, the depiction of their Prophet and so forth, which are matters of free expression. Islamophobia, like its opposing term Islamophilia, is not found in most major dictionaries. A good expression describing what is being meant would be *justified fear of supremacist Islam*. A few examples of real phobias are insectophobia (fear of all insects), isolophobia (fear of being alone), chiraptophobia (fear of being touched), and claustrophobia (fear of confined spaces).

### **3.4 The inability of devout Muslims to counter valid criticism**

Islamic law makes it a criminal offense to speak ill of Islam. If people have issues and disagree with some of the Prophet's behavior, many Muslims are outraged. What is behind this paranoia and fear of criticism? The answer is actually very simple: It is the inability of Muslims to counter the valid criticism of Islam. Failing that, they resort to ad hominem and try to discredit its critics by undermining their character. By classifying the criticism of Islam as a mental disorder, Muslims absolve themselves from responding to valid criticisms against their faith.

The term Islamophobia can therefore be seen as a symptom of intellectual bankruptcy, because orthodox Muslim scholars fail to come up with logical arguments to defend Islam against criticism in a rational way. The fact is that the more Westerners learn about Islam, the more afraid they become. The public attention has turned to Islam only after the great many attacks militant Muslims have made against their fellow human beings in the name of Allah and his cause. The more Westerners read the Qur'an, the more they discover the destructive evil hidden within its incoherent, repetitive, angry ramblings. The bits of good that can be found in the text can easily be derived from the earlier sacred scriptures of the Jews, Christians, Hindus, and Buddhists. Muslim organizations are attempting to pull the wool over the eyes of the West with such a ridiculous notion as the one that fear of Islam is unfounded. But this is not true. Islam has been linked to terror since its very beginning. Islam has been intolerant of other religious beliefs since its very beginning. Islam's values and practices are certainly not democratic which Ayaan A. explains well:

'Islam has certain characteristics that can co-exist with Western democracy. As a Muslim, I was taught to be generous, to be hospitable, to be kind to the elderly and to be kind to the poor. But the basic tenets of Islam and the basic tenets of Western liberal democracies are incompatible. Islam fails to recognize secularity or the separation of church and state. Women are subordinate. Life is not valued as much as in the Western liberal societies, where life and the freedom of the individual are separate ends in themselves. In Islam, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are things that you can pursue when you go to heaven, but you have to die first because life on earth is just a passage and you observe certain rules, and if you don't observe those rules you're not considered a Muslim. In liberal societies values are radically different from what Islam preaches. Islam certainly favors repression of freedom of expression, and it undermines human rights by sanctioning and institutionalizing slavery and denying equal protection under the law to ex-Muslims, non-Muslims, women, homosexuals, and children.'

For a detailed analysis of Islam's basic tenets violating human rights and democratic values, see chapter 5.

### **3.5 Liberté, égalité, fraternité**

Suppose an atheist robs a convenience store owned by a devout Muslim who gets shot in the process. According to our secular laws the atheist would have committed a crime. Suppose a devout Muslim robs a

convenience store owned by an atheist who gets shot in the process. According to the Qur'an the Muslim would have enforced Islamic law and deserves praise. He can even keep the store's inventory as booty.

The national motto of France is liberty, equality and fraternity, which finds its origins in the French Revolution. Liberty consists of being able to do anything that does not harm others. Judicial equality means that the law must be the same for all, whether it protects or punishes. All citizens, being equal in its eyes, shall be equally eligible to all high offices, public positions and employments, according to their ability, and without other distinctions than that of their virtues and talents. The interpretation of fraternity is a bit more difficult. In a traditional sense a fraternity is seen as an organized society of men associated together in an environment of companionship and brotherhood, and dedicated to the intellectual, physical, and social development of its members. A more modern understanding is solidarity between all of humanity, opposing the borders that divide us.

Orthodox Islam violates all three concepts. Democracy implies equality. But equality is unacceptable in Islam. The key tenet of Christianity is love. The key tenet of Islam is obedience. The translation of the Arabic word Islam is submission. The Christian god loves all people, not just Christians. Allah only loves devout Muslims and hates everybody else.

### **3.6 Why the majority of Muslims are peaceful citizens**

When people fully understand the disturbing nature of Islam, they often wonder why most Muslims are honest, friendly and peaceful people. There are many reasons for this. Here are the two most important ones. First, it's human nature. We are social creatures and most of us seek out companionship of all kinds. We are capable of empathy, kindness and compassion. According to Michael Shermer, the following characteristics are shared by humans and other social animals: attachment and bonding, cooperation and mutual aid, sympathy and empathy, direct and indirect reciprocity, altruism and reciprocal altruism, conflict resolution and peacemaking, deception and deception detection, community concern and caring about what others think about you, and the awareness of and response to the social rules of the group. Many dogmas and instructions of orthodox Islam go against these characteristics. So it's actually our human nature that gives us some immunity from ideologies of hatred.

The second important reason why most Muslims are peaceful citizens is their lack of exposure to the full set of Islam's doctrines. Like most Christians haven't read the Bible cover to cover, most Muslims haven't read all of the Qur'an either. But in theocracies based on Sharia law, peaceful Muslims find it harder and harder to escape the exposure to all of Islam's harsh teachings. Brainwashing of children begins in elementary school. That's the case in Saudi Arabia, for example, and it could soon happen in Egypt as well. Indoctrination can override natural human empathy. But for people who have not been educated in a madrasa (religious school) or who had liberal parents and no access to a mosque, and who have not read the Qur'an, none of that indoctrination took place and their natural human empathy and kindness is dominant.

Let us conclude this chapter with the following remark: Heterodox Muslims are not a problem. Even militant Muslims are not our main problem as long as they don't have access to weapons of mass destruction. Our main problem is the stubborn determination of several hundred million non-militant, devout Muslims, who want to replace human rights and democracy with a barbaric seventh-century ideology called orthodox Islam.



## **Chapter 4: Online resources used in this document**

This section presents various websites from which content was used for the compilation of this document. For each website we provide a short summary taken from its mission statement or 'about us' section.

### **4.1 CDHR Website**

The Coalition for the Defense of Human Rights (CDHR) is an organization that began in 1993 as a cooperative effort of ethnic and religious organizations pledged to share resources, information, and to work together for the promotion of human rights in countries where Islamic extremism is dominant. We represent minority religious and ethnic communities from around the world. These communities have borne the historical degradation of their cultures and still endure the ravaging effects of militant Islam, an ideological movement that is intolerant, discriminatory, racist and even genocidal. The address is [www.dhimmi.com](http://www.dhimmi.com)

### **4.2 Center for Inquiry ISIS Website**

The Institute for the Secularization of Islamic Society (ISIS) is an organization of writers that promotes the ideas of secularism, democracy and human rights within Islamic society. It is part of the Center for Inquiry and was founded in 1998 by former Muslims. The group aims to combat theologically driven fanaticism, violence and terrorism. The organization does not promote any belief system or religious dogma but rather it subscribes to the rule of secular law, freedom of speech and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We are secular Muslims and secular persons of Muslim societies. We are believers, doubters, and unbelievers, brought together by a great struggle, not between the West and Islam, but between the free and the unfree. We affirm the inviolable freedom of the individual conscience. We believe in the equality of all human persons. We insist upon the separation of religion from state and the observance of universal human rights. We find traditions of liberty, rationality, and tolerance in the rich histories of pre-Islamic and Islamic societies. These values do not belong to the West or the East; they are the common moral heritage of humankind. We see no colonialism, racism, or so-called Islamophobia in submitting Islamic practices to criticism or condemnation when they violate human reason or rights. We call on the governments of the world to reject Sharia law, fatwa courts, clerical rule, and state-sanctioned religion in all their forms. We oppose all penalties for blasphemy and apostasy, and aim to eliminate practices, such as female circumcision, honor killing, forced veiling, and forced marriage that further the oppression of women. We demand protection of sexual and gender minorities from persecution and violence. We reject sectarian education that teaches intolerance and bigotry toward non-Muslims. We need to foster an open public sphere in which all matters may be discussed without coercion or intimidation. We demand the release of Islam from its captivity to the totalitarian ambitions of power-hungry men and the rigid strictures of orthodoxy. We enjoin academics and thinkers everywhere to embark on a fearless examination of the origins and sources of Islam, and to promulgate the ideals of free scientific and spiritual inquiry through cross-cultural translation, publishing, and the mass media. We say to

- Muslim believers: there is a noble future for Islam as a personal faith, not a political doctrine
- Christians, Jews, Buddhists, Hindus, Bahais, and all members of non-Muslim faith communities: we stand with you as free and equal citizens
- Non-believers: we defend your liberty to question and dissent.

The address is [www.centerforinquiry.net/ISIS](http://www.centerforinquiry.net/ISIS)

#### **4.3 FFI Website**

"O ye who believe! Ask not questions about things which if made plain to you, may cause you trouble. Some people before you did ask such questions, and on that account lost their faith." [Qur'an 5:101-102]

Faithfreedom International (FFI) is a grassroots movement of ex-Muslims, those Muslims who asked prohibited questions and on that account lost their faith. We left Islam because we found it divisive. Our goal is to reveal the truth about Islam and promote secularization and human rights in Islamic countries. We want to help Muslims end their 'us versus them' ethos and embrace the human race in amity. Muslims are forced to believe that the world is their enemy, hence the Islamic threat. In reality it is they who are the enemy of the world. We strive for the unity of mankind through understanding and the elimination of hate. Humanity is one.

The truth about Islam is out. We are growing exponentially. The days of ignorance that promotes hate and disunity are over. Better days are ahead. Meanwhile, we may have to go through dreadful times. A storm is approaching. Unless Islam is not stopped and Islamic promoters like Iran and Saudi Arabia are not defeated, mankind may be facing an Armageddon. We invite you to be part of humanity instead and love all the people whether believers or non-believers. We are part of the human race, first and foremost. We want to bring humanity together, not by introducing yet another doctrine, which always ends up dividing mankind more, but by eliminating the doctrines that divide us. The address is [www.faithfreedom.org](http://www.faithfreedom.org)

#### **4.4 Former Muslims United U.S. Website**

Here's our mission statement: The Former Muslims United does not criticize any religion, in the sense that the religion is practiced as a personal relationship with God. But if a religion expands itself to become a one party totalitarian state, ruled by an elaborate legal system controlling every aspect of private and public life, and requiring the killing and incitement of violence against those who leave it, then that religion cannot be immune from criticism. It is no longer a private religion, but has become instead a totalitarian dictatorship. It is in this sense, since Islam's apostasy laws condemn former Muslims to death and allows vigilante violence against apostates, that Islam itself has opened itself to criticism. Therefore, Former Muslims United, welcoming all former Muslims including converts to all other religions, as well as atheists or agnostics, will pursue these goals:

- Develop a legal framework for and ensure the civil rights of American individuals and organizations to provide sanctuary for former Muslims without being subject to legal penalties or threats.
- Call on all Muslims and their spiritual leaders to reject, publicly and without reservation or exception, all Sharia doctrine that permits or calls for punishment or discrimination against former Muslims, including intimidation and threats against person or property. This rejection of violence applies to individuals, Sharia authorities, Muslim courts or other Sharia bodies, governments, and quasi-governmental bodies.
- Form a support group to empower and give comfort to former Muslims enabling them to stand up for their religious liberties under the U.S. Constitution.
- Keep former Muslims aware of matters related to apostasy both inside and outside the U.S.

- Publicize how former Muslims, both inside the United States and around the world, are treated by their Muslim counterparts, including threats to their lives, physical violence, humiliation, social ostracism, disinheritance, and familial abandonment.
- Demand Muslim leaders reject and denounce all Islamic literature which calls for death or other punishments for former Muslims.

The address is [formermuslimsunited.org](http://formermuslimsunited.org)

#### **4.5 The Religion of Peace Website**

This website offers a pluralistic, non-partisan content concerned with Islam's true political and religious teachings according to its own texts. We present the threat that dogmatic Islam poses to human dignity and freedom, and document the violence that ensues as a direct consequence of this religion's supremacist teachings. We are not associated with any organization. We do not promote any religion, but we are not hostile to religion. We generally support the rights of atheists, Christians, Hindus, Jews, homosexuals, woman, Muslims and anyone else on the planet to live as they wish without violating the rights of others. We strongly condemn any attempt to harm or harass any Muslim anywhere in the world because of their religion. Every human being is entitled to be treated as an individual and judged only by his or her own words and deeds.

We also denounce any act of vandalism against mosques or other property, including juvenile attempts to offend Muslims by desecrating copies of the Qur'an. The best way of discrediting the Qur'an is to tell non-Muslims what it actually says about them. At the same time, we see no use in pretending that Islam is just another religion, which always seems to be the assumption of those who prefer not to look too closely. The divine charter of Islam is to impose itself and thus prevent the individual from discovering a different meaning for their own lives. Islam breeds arrogance and self-absorption, which accounts for the collective petulance and perpetual grievance characterizing Muslim populations in general - along with the astonishing unwillingness to extend equal moral consideration to those outside the religion. This disregard for others is rooted in the supremacist ideology of the Qur'an and Islamic law, which unashamedly draws the sharpest distinction between those within the group of believers and those without - toward whom arbitrary denigration is cast and hatred, harsh treatment and eternal punishment is prescribed. The address is [www.thereligionofpeace.com](http://www.thereligionofpeace.com)

#### **4.6 Inquiry into Islam Website**

The site offers an unbigoted inquiry into the core teachings of Islam and what it all means for non-Muslims. We have become disgusted by people whose criticisms of Islam are motivated by bigotry and racism. And we've also become frustrated by people who know nothing about Islam, but are so vehemently against the racist bigots that they said and believed foolish things about Islam. Islam is an active and vital religion, and it is growing. It is having an increasingly powerful influence on world affairs. And most people in the free world do not even know the most basic facts about it, and yet make the assumption that Islam must be similar to other religions they are familiar with. This widespread assumption could have unexpected consequences because Islam is different than all other religions in many important ways. The purpose of this site is to begin the education process for non-Muslims who don't know much about Islam, but are curious about it. The address is [www.inquiryintoislam.com](http://www.inquiryintoislam.com)

#### **4.7 Islam Watch Website**

Islam Watch is a non-theistic website focusing its criticism on Islam, but may also include general criticisms of other religions. It was founded by former Muslims hailing mainly from South Asia and, according to the site, was launched to expose the *real Islam* which is the Islam that is determined to replace the modern civilization with the 7<sup>th</sup> century Arab Bedouin barbarism, peddled as the true Islamic civilization. Founders and members include Abul K., Ali S., Sher K., Syed M. and Mumin S. Here are the reasons why they created the website:

We are a group of Muslim apostates, who have left Islam out of our own conviction when we discovered that Islam is not a religion at all. Most of us took a prolong period of time to study, evaluate, and contemplate on, this religion of our birth. Having meticulously scrutinized Islam, we concluded that it is not a religion of peace at all, as touted by smooth-talking, self-serving Muslims and their apologists from non-Muslim backgrounds. The core of Islam, that is, the Qur'an, Hadith and Sharia, is filled with unbounded hatred for the unbelievers, unbelievably intolerant toward them and extremely cruel and merciless to Muslims, who dare to deviate from its doctrine.

We also realized that Islam is beyond alteration, because Muslims, who attempt to modernize and reform its unremitting bigotry, irrational rituals and its cruel and draconian punitive measures, are targeted for annihilation. Our verdict was that the only way to escape from the tyranny of Islam is to leave it altogether. We have, therefore, discarded Islam from our lives so that we can be free to enjoy a normal, pleasant and humane life in complete harmony with all peoples on earth, irrespective of their religion, race or creed. The address is [islam-watch.org](http://islam-watch.org)

#### **4.8 Political Islam Website**

Political Islam is Islam's ideology about unbelievers. Most of the Islamic doctrine is political, not religious. Islam's success comes primarily from its politics. The Qur'an is devoted to the division between those who believe Muhammad and those who do not. Our website is devoted to making absolutely sure that no implementation of any aspect of political Sharia is allowed in our government or organizations. All citizens must know the fundamental principles of political Sharia and resist its progress in every way. The address is [www.politicalislam.com](http://www.politicalislam.com)

#### **4.9 Citizen Warrior and Jihad Watch Website**

Because non-Muslims in the West, as well as in India, China, Russia, and the world over, are facing a concerted effort by Islamic Jihadists, the motives and goals of whom are largely ignored by the Western media, to destroy their societies and bring them forcibly into the Islamic world, and to commit violence to that end even while their overall goal remains out of reach. That effort goes under the general rubric of Jihad, which is seen as a central duty of every Muslim. Modern Muslim theologians have spoken of many things as Jihads: the struggle within the soul, defending the faith from critics, supporting its growth and defense financially, even migrating to non-Muslim lands for the purpose of spreading Islam. But violent Jihad is a constant of Islamic history. Many passages of the Qur'an and sayings of the prophet Muhammad are used by Jihad warriors today to justify their actions and gain new recruits. No major Muslim group has ever repudiated the doctrines of armed Jihad. The theology of Jihad, which denies unbelievers equality of human rights

and dignity, is available today for anyone with the will and means to bring it to life. Jihad Watch opposes any form of neo-fascism and is dedicated to bringing public attention to the role that Jihad theology and ideology plays in the modern world, and to correcting popular misconceptions about the role of Jihad and religion in modern-day conflicts. We hope to alert people of good will to the true nature of the present global conflict. The addresses are [www.citizenwarrior.com](http://www.citizenwarrior.com) and [www.jihadwatch.org](http://www.jihadwatch.org)

#### **4.10 Wikipedia Website**

Wikipedia is a free, collaboratively edited and multilingual Internet encyclopedia supported by the non-profit Wikimedia Foundation. Although the policies of Wikipedia strongly espouse verifiability and a neutral point of view, criticisms leveled at Wikipedia include allegations about quality of writing, inaccurate or inconsistent information, and explicit content. These allegations are addressed by various Wikipedia policies.

Wikipedia defines Islam as a monotheistic and Abrahamic religion articulated by the Qur'an, a text considered by its adherents to be the verbatim word of God, and by the teachings and normative example of Muhammad, considered by them to be the last prophet of God. The address is [en.wikipedia.org](http://en.wikipedia.org)

#### **4.11 WikIslam Website**

WikIslam is a community-edited website which focuses on the critique of Islam, whilst also allowing pro-Islamic responses in separate articles. It is run on the same software that Wikipedia and other similar sites use. WikIslam's goal is to become the one-stop source of information critical of Islam. This information is based primarily on its own sources, the Qur'an, Hadith and Islamic scholars. It accepts the theory of evolution as a scientific fact and is notable for dealing extensively with false propaganda and Islamic pseudo-science. However, the site aims to remain neutral toward other religions, world-views, and issues of a political nature, such as immigration, multiculturalism, and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and also to stay away from extremist, sensationalist or emotional commentary by simply letting the facts speak for themselves. Contrary to what is sometimes claimed, the site exhorts editors to use non-polemic and scholarly secondary sources, and to attribute statements wherever possible. It makes copious use of authoritative primary and secondary pro-Islamic sources, such as the Compendium of Muslim Texts, The History of al-Tabari and fatwas from some of the most popular mainstream Islamic sites on the net.

WikIslam's primary focus is on the religion of Islam, while Wikipedia is a compendium of general knowledge. These differing goals have led to different policies and guidelines. Wikipedia discourages the use of primary and what they term as 'non-notable/reliable' sources. WikIslam, on the other hand, encourages the use of authentic primary religious text and the rulings of authoritative Muslim scholars who may not be notable to people outside of the Muslim world but who are giants from within. Wikipedia focuses on verifiability, not truth.

The so-called *Jagged-85 Incident* is a prime example of the problems constantly faced by Wikipedia with respect to Islam-related articles. Jagged-85 was an editor who contributed to 8,115 separate articles with over 67,000 edits made over a period of 5 years until they were caught in 2010. Focusing efforts on improving the image of Islam and downplaying the achievements of the Western world, for 5 years he (or she) was left largely unhindered, misrepresenting sources in all kinds of ways, misrepresentations which were then reproduced all over the net by other sites which use Wikipedia as a source.

This means accepting what notable and reliable Western commentators say about Islam's religious text and Muslims over what the religious text and Muslims actually say themselves. Conversely, WikiIslam accepts what the religious text and Muslims say over the opinions and interpretations of third-party Western commentators. The primary goal of WikiIslam is to collect facts relating to the criticism of Islam from valid Islamic sources without the effects of censorship. Intelligent critics of Islamic supremacism challenge Islam as an ideology, not Muslims as a people. The address is [wikiislam.net](http://wikiislam.net)

#### **4.12 Human Rights Watch Website**

Human Rights Watch is one of the world's leading independent organizations dedicated to defending and protecting human rights. By focusing international attention where human rights are violated, we give voice to the oppressed and hold oppressors accountable for their crimes. Our rigorous, objective investigations and strategic, targeted advocacy build intense pressure for action and raise the cost of human rights abuse. We are dedicated to protecting the human rights of people around the world. We stand with victims and activists to prevent discrimination, to uphold political freedom, to protect people from inhumane conduct in wartime, and to bring offenders to justice. We investigate and expose human rights violations and hold abusers accountable. We challenge governments and those who hold power to end abusive practices and respect international human rights law. We enlist the public and the international community to support the cause of human rights for all. The address is [www.hrw.org](http://www.hrw.org)

#### **4.13 The Skeptics Society Website**

We are a scientific and educational organization of leading scientists, scholars, investigative journalists, historians, professors and teachers. Our mission is to investigate and provide a sound scientific viewpoint on claims of the paranormal, pseudoscience, fringe groups and cults. It is our hope that our efforts go a long way in promoting critical thinking and lifelong inquisitiveness in all individuals. Modern skepticism is embodied in the scientific method, which involves gathering data to formulate and test naturalistic explanations for natural phenomena. A claim becomes factual when it is confirmed to such an extent it would be reasonable to offer temporary agreement. The address is [www.skeptic.com](http://www.skeptic.com)

#### **4.14. The Global Ethic Foundation Website**

A global ethic is the vision of a global transformation of ethical awareness: whether at a worldwide, national or local level, men and women are dependent on shared basic ethical values, criteria and attitudes for peaceful co-existence. Such values can be found in all the great religious and philosophical traditions of humankind. They need not be invented anew, but people need to be made aware of them again; they must be lived out and handed on. So there is a need for a dialog of religions and cultures, especially knowledge of common features in ethics. There is no peace between the nations without peace between the religions. There is a need for an education in values which transcends cultures. Children need to learn that peaceful co-existence at all levels depends on observing elementary rules. No society can function without a foundation of values which binds it together. The global ethic program goes back to the Swiss theologian Hans Kueng. The address is [www.weltethos.org/index-en.php](http://www.weltethos.org/index-en.php), see also Appendix K.

#### **4.15 The Network of Spiritual Progressives Website**

We recognize that our well-being depends on the well-being of everyone else on the planet and the well-being of the Earth. We seek a world in which all of life is shaped by peace, fairness, environmental sanity, love, care for one another, care for the Earth, generosity, compassion, respect for diversity and differences, and celebration of the miraculous universe shape. The Network of Spiritual Progressives welcomes secular humanists, atheists and people who are spiritual but not religious, as well as people from every religious community who share the values of love, generosity, creativity, wonder and a commitment to respect one another. Spirituality is personal but not a private matter; it is about how we treat each other and how we live our lives. The address is [spiritualprogressives.org](http://spiritualprogressives.org)

#### **4.16 The Charter for Compassion Website**

Our Charter is based on principles embraced by every faith, and by every moral code. It is often referred to as *The Golden Rule*. The Council of Conscience, a multi-faith, multi-national group of religious thinkers and leaders, reviewed and sorted through all the world's contributions to craft the final Charter. They continue to be vigorous supporters and advocates for the Charter and its message. Karen Armstrong won the TED Prize and made her wish to have the TED community help her create, launch, and propagate a Charter for Compassion. TED is a global set of conferences, formed to disseminate ideas worth spreading. The Charter for Compassion is a document that transcends religious, ideological, and national difference. Supported by leading thinkers from many traditions, the Charter activates the Golden Rule around the world. The address is [charterforcompassion.org](http://charterforcompassion.org)

#### **4.17 The Qantara Website**

Qantara is an Internet portal in German, English, Arabic and Turkish, designed to promote intercultural dialog between the Western and the Islamic world. The platform is jointly run by the German Federal Agency for Civic Education, Deutsche Welle, the Goethe-Institut and the German Institute for Foreign Cultural Relations. The editorial team works to publish writing by Western and Islamic authors who seek open and respectful discussion of both commonalities and controversial subjects. These have included such diverse contributors as the Egyptian literary scholar Nasr H. Abu Zayd and the physicist E. von Weizsaecker. Qantara has been selected by Britannica's editors as a Web's 'Best-Site'. The address is [en.qantara.de](http://en.qantara.de)

#### **4.18 Other websites**

Here is a list of websites in alphabetical order that were used to corroborate the evidence presented in this document: The Aha Foundation, American Islamic Forum for Democracy, Amil Imani Site, Apostates of Islam, Australian Islamist Monitor, British Muslims for Secular Democracy, Canadian Muslim Union, Christian Solidarity International, Christian-Muslim Debate Site, Compass Direct News, Council of ex-Muslims, Defend Democracy Organization, Dhimmi Coalition, Former Muslim United, Freedom Bulwark, Ibn Q. al-Rassooli, Ibn Zura Site, Inquiry Into Islam, Interfaith Encounter Association, Int. Institute for Religious Freedom, Investigate Islam, Islam Expose, Islam Review Site, Islamic Scriptures Unveiled, Khalas Abdul Quddus Site, Liberated Now Blog, Liberty and Tolerance Worldwide, Muslim Canadian Congress, Muslim Hope Site, Nabeel Jabbour, Nonie Darwish Blog, Political Islam Site, Q-Society of Australia, Release International, Sheik Yermami Site, Taslima Nasreen Site, Ummat-al-Kuffar, Universal Peace Federation, Unofficial Ibn Warraq Site.

## **Chapter 5: The incompatibility of Islamic doctrines with fundamental values of free societies**

This section focuses on particular concepts of Islam's core belief system that are in direct violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as well as common laws, principles and values of secular countries around the world.

Wikipedia defines fascism as a radical authoritarian nationalist right-wing political ideology. Individuals are united together as one people in national identity by supra-personal connections of ancestry and culture through a totalitarian state that seeks the mass mobilization of a nation through discipline and indoctrination. Fascism exercises state control over every aspect of national life. Fascism seeks to eradicate perceived foreign influences that are deemed to be causing degeneration of the nation or of not fitting into the national culture. Fascists commonly utilize paramilitary organizations to commit or threaten violence against their opponents. It is a sad reality that fascism and political Islam share similar values and interests. Like fascism, political Islam disdains reason, encourages absolute loyalty and glorifies war. Christopher Hitchens described Islamist attributes which are similar to fascism. Malise Ruthven, who focuses his work on religion and Islamic affairs, opposes redefining Islamism as Islamofascism, but also finds the resemblances between the two ideologies compelling.

We will now examine several of Islam's religious and political teachings in more detail and show that are incompatible with our laws and values, and why they pose a serious threat to world peace.

### **5.1 Apostasy in Islam**

Apostasy is the rejection of faith. It has been, and still is, a serious offense in Islam. The punishment for apostasy as prescribed by Muhammad is death. An apostate who hides his apostasy is referred to as a munfiq (hypocrite). The rejection in part (of any of the pillars, or individual principles of Islam), or discarding the faith as a whole, amounts to apostasy. It is not a quick or easy affair for an apostate or heterodox believer of Islam, as the punishment for apostasy in the Islamic faith is death. Though it may be argued that this is not clear through the Qur'an alone, scholars have found justification for the penalty from within its pages, and there are also numerous authentic (Sahih) Hadiths confirming this punishment as attested by Muhammad: "Whoever changed his Islamic religion, do kill him." It was also one of only three reasons given by him where killing a Muslim is permitted. The categorization of Hadiths is based on their reliability:

1. Sahih (authentic): transmitted through an unbroken chain of narrators all of whom are of sound character and memory. Such a Hadith should not clash with a more reliable report and must not suffer from any other hidden defect.
2. Hasan (good): transmitted through an unbroken chain of narrators all of whom are of sound character but weak memory. This Hadith should not clash with a more reliable report and must not suffer from any other hidden defect.
3. Daif (weak): cannot gain the status of Hasan because it lacks one or more elements, for example, if the narrator is not of sound memory and sound character, or if there is a hidden fault in the narrative or if the chain of narrators is broken.



Since there are numerous Sahih Hadiths, there are no doubts about the applicability of the death penalty for apostasy. A Muslim cannot convert to another religion. There is no freedom of religion in Islam.

An evaluation of Islam's attitude to apostasy would not be complete without expounding on the political makeup of the religion. Islam is essentially a tribal system that once was the social composition of Arabia in the north. Society, in its absolute sense, had never been in existence in the north prior to Islam. All that existed there were certain assemblages that never flourished or evolved into a fully fledged society for several reasons, one being, that most at that time were nomads wandering throughout the desert. Religion was not a personal but communal affair in pre-Islamic Arabia. Deserting religion thus amounted to treason and so was punishable by death. The death penalty being incorporated into Islam for apostasy is better understood when viewed through this tribal prism. Muhammad once belonged to this way of life, but reshuffled society and he did so by organizing certain tribes under one roof without sacrificing much of the already existing norms. Muhammad was successful and, thus, did not venture to get rid of the pre-existing tribal prescripts; instead, he assimilated them into his new religion.

We do not know of any apostates being killed during the lifetime of Muhammad for the specific crime of apostasy. This is largely due to the lack of individuals apostatizing during Muhammad's life. However in one reliable Bukhari Hadith, Muhammad is seen deporting a Bedouin who desired to discard his religion. This incident alone does not indicate Muhammad viewing apostasy as anything less than treason or a crime worthy of death. This alleged incident occurred during the early stages of Islam in Medina where Muhammad's Islam and its revelations were incomplete and a far cry from the all encompassing way of life it was to become by the time of his death. After the death of Muhammad and under the Caliphate of Abu Bakr, many apostates were killed during the lengthy Riddah apostasy wars. This attests to the fact that apostasy had already become a serious crime within Islam and was not some later innovation. Abu Bakr took up arms against them in a bloody war which lasted for over a year (632 - 633 CE). The Caliph did not put down his arms until all rejecters were either killed or had reverted back into the fold of Islam. There are also many narrations which record Muhammad's command being followed by his companions, with atheists, Christians, and Jews being put to death for leaving Islam.

Islam is the only religion in the world which does not allow its followers the freedom to change faith. According to Sharia laws apostates of Islam must be sentenced to death, even today. This has led to ex-Muslims often being persecuted, abused and killed. This treatment of apostates is not simply down to the issue of state-enforced religion as some may suggest. The violence or threats of violence against apostates in the Muslim world usually derives not from government authorities but from family members and individuals from the Islamic communities themselves, who operate very often with impunity from the government. This point is further emphasized by the persecution and murder of ex-Muslims, which has now become evident in many Western non-Muslim societies.

Islamic jurisdiction on apostasy is derived from the words of Muhammad and the aforementioned actions of the Caliph and other companions. If rejecting one of the pillars of Islam is considered to be a crime warranting war against such people, it is only logical for the prescribed punishment for apostasy in Islam to be death. All four schools of Islamic jurisprudence are in agreement with this ruling, with only slight variations on whether to allow a grace period. The Hanafi School of Islamic jurisprudence believe female apostates are an exception to the rule and are not to be killed, but beaten and put under confinement until death or

repentance, while the remaining Shafi, Maliki, and Hanbali schools all agree the verdict for the female apostate is the same as for the male. So with all points considered, we can rightly conclude that the ruling of Islam is to put apostates to death if they refuse to revert back to their Islamic faith.

Fundamentalist Muslims are fighting modernizing Muslims all over the world, thereby keeping many rebellious, modernizing Muslims from speaking up for fear of death. Every time a group of Muslims decides that maybe Islam should be updated for the 21<sup>st</sup> century and maybe women should have some rights and maybe the government should be more democratic, the devout Muslims call them apostates and discredit them or even try to kill them. In this and in many other ways, Islam protects its own fidelity.

## 5.2 Intolerance and incitement to hatred

In the Qur'an and Hadith, the term *People of the Book* is used to refer to followers of certain monotheistic faiths which pre-date the advent of Islam. In particular, it refers to the Christian, Jewish, and Sabian faiths. Revelation is the medium by which Allah claims to have communicated his words to his prophets so that they may inform the people of his will, what he wants from them and what they must do for him in order to be saved from eternal damnation. The Qur'an talks of the Taurat or Tawrah referring to the Torah (first five books of the Jewish Bible) which is also found in the Old Testament of the Christian Bible. The Zabur mentioned in the Qur'an refers to the Psalms of the Old Testament. The Qur'an also talks of the Injil referring to the New Testament of the Bible (usually the four Gospels), which it claims was given to Jesus, rather than being written by his followers.

It is a common belief among Muslims that the Qur'an states that the previous scriptures (the Taurat and Injil) have been physically corrupted by those who were charged with safeguarding it (the Jews and Christians). Thus, the Qur'an is the 'return' to the true message of the God of the Bible. When asked to provide evidence that the Qur'an says the previous scriptures have been corrupted, pious Muslims will proudly present the following verse as evidence: "Woe, then, to those who write the book with their hands and then say: This is from Allah, so that they may take for it a small price; therefore woe to them for what their hands have written and woe to them for what they earn." [Qur'an 2:79].

Isa al-Masih (Jesus Christ) is not believed to be the Son of God, but simply a messenger, inferior in status to Muhammad. While most Muslims will claim they love Jesus, it is evident that they love the Islamic Isa who, when studied, shares little in common with the founder of Christianity. The Qur'an tells us the Trinity consists of three separate gods, which are the Father (God), the Mother (Virgin Mary) and the Son (Jesus), and due to this abysmal ignorance, orthodox Muslims consider all Trinitarian Christians to be polytheists.

Atheists, agnostics and followers of other religions (Hindus, Buddhists, etc.) are called idolaters. They are hated by Allah. Non-Muslims, i.e. people of the book and idolaters are viewed as infidels (also called disbelievers, unbelievers or kafirs). Their beliefs or world-views are not tolerated in Islam and the Qur'an gives clear instructions how non-Muslims should be treated: "Wipe out the infidels to the root. Make war on the infidels living in your neighborhood. Kill them wherever you find them, and expel them from where they expelled you, and know that persecution is worse than being killed. Do not fight them at the restricted temple unless they fight you in it; if they fight you then kill them. Thus is the reward of those who do not appreciate." [Qur'an 8:7, 9:123, 2:191]

The people of the book are offered a second option, though. Under certain conditions they can choose to keep their religion while also avoiding the death sentence.

### 5.3 Second-class citizens in Islamic societies

The term Dhimmitude is derived from Dhimmi, which means a non-Muslim living in an Islamic country. It can be seen as the status that the Sharia mandates for non-Muslims such as Jews and Christians. Those who are qualified for the second-class Dhimmi status within the Muslim society are the free (i.e. non-slave) Christians, Jews, and Zoroastrians, who agree to pay the Jizyah (tribute tax). Adherents of other religions, as well as those without religion, are asked to convert to Islam. If these idolaters refuse, they are forced to convert. If they still refuse, they are to be killed.

The Jizyah is paid as a sign of submission and gives Dhimmis some legal protection in return. Dhimmis usually are not allowed to carry arms to protect themselves, serve in the army or government, display symbols of their faith, or build or repair places of worship. If the conquered do not wish to pay or convert, their fate may either be slavery (under which rape is permitted) or death.

"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." [Qur'an 9:29]

Throughout history, zealous Muslims have destroyed worship places (churches, synagogues, temples) of other religions or converted them into mosques. In fact, the Ka'aba (the holiest shrine in Islam) was originally a pagan place of worship, used by the polytheist Arabs before Muhammad subsequently removed and destroyed everything considered idolatrous.

The Qur'an strictly prohibits friendship with disbelievers of Islam, including the people of the book. The Qur'an and other Islamic texts are very clear in teaching that there's no equality between Muslims and non-Muslims, and hence no basis for a relationship of peers. Muhammad himself describes unbelievers as 'perverted transgressors', the 'worst of creatures', 'unloved by Allah' destined for eternal torture in hell. The Qur'an specifically prohibits the friendship with Jews and Christians and there are several verses that instruct Muslims to keep to themselves:

"O ye who believe! Take not the Jews and the Christians for your friends and protectors: They are but friends and protectors to each other. And he amongst you that turns to them (for friendship) is of them. Verily Allah guideth not a people unjust." [Qur'an 5:51]

"Let not the believers take the unbelievers for friends rather than believers; and whoever does this, he shall have nothing of the guardianship of Allah, but you should guard yourselves against them, guarding carefully; and Allah makes you cautious of retribution from Himself; and to Allah is the eventual coming." [Qur'an 3:28]

"Believers, do not seek the friendship of the infidels and those who were given the Book before you, who have made of your religion a jest and a pastime." [Qur'an 5:57]

Muslim apologists, who are often embarrassed by these verses, provide an interpretation that deviates substantially from the literal meaning. The Arabic word awliy (friend) is legitimately also translated as

'protector' or 'guardian'. Therefore, apologists claim that the verses refer to a Muslim's allegiance to an unbelieving government. Yet modern day Islamic governments are often dependent on the alliances of predominantly non-Muslim nations, ensuring that this interpretation provides little more convenience. Furthermore, the verse itself appears to distinguish between friend and protector, commanding Muslims to exclude unbelievers as both.

Love for the sake of Allah and hate for the sake of Allah is a requirement for every Muslim. This Islamic concept is known as *Al Wala Wal Bara* which means loyalty and disavowal: "Indeed there has been an excellent example for you Muslims in Ibrahim and those with him, when they said to their people: Verily we are free from you and whatever you worship besides Allah: we rejected you, and there has started between us and you, hostility and hatred forever until you believe in Allah alone." [Qur'an 60:4]

Many non-Muslims in the West argue that critics of Islam deliberately select bad verses, because they wish to portray Islam as something horrendous. It is absolutely true that there are good verses in the Qur'an as well. If you make the effort of counting the verses which are positive for non-Muslims, you will find out there are around 250 of them, adding up to about 4,000 words. The total number of words in the Qur'an is 78,000, give or take a few hundred (definitions of what exactly is a word vary). Now, 5% of good verses doesn't sound so bad, but here's the catch. As we've already seen in chapter 3.1, abrogation comes into play. Every positive verse about non-Muslims is followed by another verse that contradicts the positive ones. Furthermore, except for seven verses, every good verse is abrogated later in the same Surah (chapter of the Qur'an). Those seven exceptions are abrogated in later Surahs. In other words, every single one of the verses in the Qur'an with a positive message for non-Muslims is abrogated, leaving nothing positive for non-Muslims. Not one verse.

#### 5.4 Islamic anti-Semitism

Anti-Semitism is rampant among followers of Islam. This intense hatred of Jews is deeply rooted within Islamic scripture, and upon reading these texts, there is little wonder why *Mein Kampf*, written by Adolf Hitler, is a bestseller in the Arab and Muslim World including Egypt, Palestine, 'moderate' Turkey, and is selling well in London areas with a large Arab population. It is often sold alongside religious literature and strangely enough the title 'Mein Kampf' can be translated as 'My Jihad' in Arabic. Muhammad's personal hatred for Jews led him to declare that the Final Hour will not come until Muslims slaughter Jews, and even the rocks and trees will betray the Jews hiding behind them. Abu Huraira reported Allah's Messenger saying: "The last hour would not come unless the Muslims will fight against the Jews and the Muslims would kill them until the Jews would hide themselves behind a stone or a tree and a stone or a tree would say: Muslim, or the servant of Allah, there is a Jew behind me; come and kill him; but the tree Gharqad would not say, for it is the tree of the Jews."

In the Qur'an we also find the following verse: "God has cursed the Jews, transforming them into apes and swine and those who serve the devil." [Qur'an 5:60]

Many Muslims suffer from an irrational fear of the Jews. Some Muslim children are taught that the Jews are evil, that they eat Muslim children and make pastries with their blood. Jews are caricatured in derogatory and demonized ways, depicted as bloodsucking monsters. In a television show aired in Palestine a three-year-old child was interviewed and asked what she hates most, and when she responded 'the Jews', the

journalists praised Allah upon hearing this stupid remark. The irrational fear of Jews is inculcated in Muslims since childhood.

If children anywhere were deliberately taught to fear Muslims, the way many Muslim children are taught to fear Jews, then the neologism Muslimophobia would make sense. But that is not the case. Those who defend Islam constantly attempt to blur the line between the criticism of Islam and the criticism of Muslims. But Islam is only a belief system, and it is a human right to disagree with any belief. Calling that disagreement a phobia is an act of intellectual dishonesty. Islam is the only ideology whose devout followers try to discredit their opponents by effectively diagnosing them with a mental illness, see chapter 3.3.

## **5.5 Islam and freedom of expression**

Western ideas of pluralism, individualism, liberalism, constitutionalism, human rights, equality, liberty, the rule of law, democracy, free markets, and the separation of church and state often have little resonance in the Islamic belief system. In our societies we believe that human beings are born free. Freedom of the individual therefore is a fundamental human right. An individual must be allowed to enjoy his life, his freedom as long as it does not temper with another individual's freedom and rights. Freedom includes the freedom of thoughts and their expression in speeches or any other form. One has the right to reason, to explore and to seek the truth of any question. One must be able to think and reason without fear of persecution or prosecution. No one has the right to threaten, coerce, intimidate anyone with torture, prison or death for free expression of views that they do not agree with, no matter how abhorrent those views are to them.

We have the right to challenge any ideology, government, leaders of any state, heads of any organizations, the tenets and beliefs of any ideology, religious or otherwise. We have the right to write down our thoughts, read any book, pursue any intellectual enterprise in the arts, literature, science, paint any picture, draw any caricature, no matter how offensive they are. Human rights also include the right to change one's religion without fear, the right to freely preach and practice one's religion without coercion or intimidation but with liberty and tolerance in any country. It entails the right to explore the truth of any religious question, including the truth as to the origins, sources, and teachings of any religion. One has unqualified liberty to question any religion and its teachings, and the right to condemn all religious practices that violate human rights. Our universal human rights demand a complete rejection of religious teachings of extermination, genocide, murder, terror, violence, hate, torture, cruelty, intolerance and bigotry.

The concept of freedom of speech is derived from the ideology that is based on the belief that God and religion should be separated from life's affairs (a basic principle of secularism). Human beings define how to live their lives free of the constraints of religion which is why freedom of individual, ownership, religion and speech are essential cornerstones of Western societies. Yet according to Islamic law, it is a criminal offense to speak ill of Islam, its Prophet, and its Holy Scriptures. Blasphemy is punishable by death.

Our secular society has a contract with religion. It says that the state will not interfere with religious practice so long as it is within the law and the state will extend benefits in the form of tax breaks and other considerations so that religious institutions can flourish freely within our boundaries. In exchange, religion has strengthened the family, produced honest hard working citizens with a high degree of personal self-control so that people behave ethically and charitably toward each other and can function with a minimum of external social control. Religion as we have known it can be good for society. It has nurtured morality,

strengthened the family, fostered public service and encouraged social harmony. The divine charter of Islam, on the other hand, is self-segregating and fosters ideas of Muslim supremacy and thereby sows seeds of social discord. This kind of religion is creed that takes liberty in violating freedom and human rights of others as divine legal rights. What in liberal democracy is a right to freedom of expression of every individual, brings punishment of barbaric proportion in Islam:

"The punishment of those who pit themselves against Allah and His Messenger and strive to make mischief in the land is only this, that they should be murdered or crucified or their hands and their feet should be cut off on opposite sides or they should be imprisoned; this shall be as a disgrace for them in this world, and in the hereafter they shall have a grievous chastisement, except those who repent before you have them in your power." [Qur'an 5:33-34]

Western emphasis upon freedom from restraint is alien to Islam. Personal freedom lies in surrendering to the divine will of Allah. It cannot be realized through liberation from external sources of restraint. Individual freedom ends where the freedom of the community begins. Human rights exist only in relation to human obligations to Allah. Those individuals who do not accept these obligations have no rights. The notion of the infallibility of a strict religious framework is an impediment to moral, political and scientific progress.

We need to expose Islam's intolerance and incitement to hatred and violence. We need to expose Islam's hatred of freedom, liberty and human rights in its own writings. A good example of passages in the Qur'an and Hadith are these: "Disbelievers are evil and will dwell in hell forever. Wretchedness and baseness were stamped on the Jews and they were visited with wrath from Allah. Jews are the greediest of all humankind. They'd like to live 1000 years. But they are going to hell. For the wrongdoing Jews, Allah has prepared a painful doom. For the evildoing of the Jews, we have forbidden them from some good things that were previously permitted them. God has cursed the Jews, transforming them into apes and swine and those who serve the devil. Fight against those who have been given the Scriptures, Jews and Christians, as they believe neither in Allah nor the last Day. Many of the rabbis and the monks devour the wealth of mankind and wantonly debar men from the way of Allah. So fight them until there is no more Fitnah (disbelief of non-Muslims) and all submit to the religion of Allah alone."

Robert R. pointed out the following: Modernity offers a new approach for humanity. At its core, it celebrates the values of individual liberty and independence. Thus, the contradiction between modernity and Islam is not an unimportant matter; it is a necessary result of its internal logic. Islam and modernity by definition are in conflict, because there is no way modernity can compete with Sharia laws in the mind and daily existence of a true, but highly conflicted, Muslim.

In history it took a mighty struggle to contain and to roll back Islam. The context is the fundamental antagonism between the values of Islam and Christianity's offshoot, the Enlightenment, focusing on the concern for the individual and promoting critical thinking and freedom of expression. If Muslim culture has been unable to take part in the great political progress of humankind, it is primarily because the Qur'an forbids it on principle. Political progress is the consequence of Christianity, its native soil, its humus. Born of Christianity, the Western world is an oasis in history, as precious as it is fragile: never have men and women been so free, so esteemed, so educated, so protected against violence and injustice, disease and death, arbitrary treatment and hunger as in Western Europe and the modern Anglo-Saxon countries. Never have women and children known such respect. Never has civilization reached such a zenith. Western civilization, the

paradise that the West has constructed, was not invented in the Muslim world. It is no coincidence. The ideological universe shaped by the Qur'an is not fertile turf for the development of a free humanity striving for gentleness and justice for all. The Islamic Golden Age had little chance for survival. The Qur'an is from the outset a political book. It is a collection of political laws describing precisely how society should be organized and governed. Islam is a matrix that has given rise to societies made in its own image. These are societies in which theology and politics have been intimately fused together, forming a jumble that makes it impossible to distinguish between that which is essentially political and that which is essentially religious. Nothing is more obvious than the incompatibility between Islam and Western pluralistic societies. These societies are wary of Islam, and rightly so. Islam is a dogmatism that forbids doubt. And doubt is at the core of Western civilization. Doubt alone guarantees the tolerance which makes democracy possible. Doubt starts scientific inquiry, demands experiment and exploration, see chapter 6.7.

## **5.6 The rights of women**

One of the most hotly debated issues in regards to Islam is its views and laws concerning women. To hear groups like the Council of American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) or the Islamic Society of North America (ISNA), one might be given the impression that Islam holds women in high regard. Indeed, Souad Saleh, a female professor at Al-Ahzar University in Cairo and a vocal proponent of women's rights in Egypt, recently stated that Islam is pure and simple, and it holds women in high esteem. If women are to be treated equally in Islam, is there justification for it in the sacred writings of Islam? Unfortunately, this is not the case. Usama bin Zaid quotes the Prophet saying: "After me I have not left any affliction more harmful to men than women." Muhammad's dislike for women caused him to declare that the majority of the inhabitants of hell are women. When asked why he said it, this was because they are deficient in intelligence and religion and because they are ungrateful to their husbands. Although Muslim apologists and female Muslims use a lot of creative arguments to explain away the Prophet's declarations about women, they don't stand up to scrutiny. The reality today is gender apartheid in numerous Islamic countries. It is somewhat ironic that girls outperform boys at school not only in most Western countries, but also in many Islamic countries such as Pakistan, Malaysia, Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria, Jordan, Qatar and other Gulf countries. Deficient intelligence?

If you ask a Muslim why Muslim females wear the Hijab (veil), the reason given is usually one of two (or a mixture of both):

- 1) They are showing their obeying a command from Allah, so it is a matter of piety.
- 2) They are protecting their modesty instead of showing off their body for everyone to see.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The real reason that Muslim women wear the Hijab today is not a spiritual one, nor a matter of piety. Covering the hair or even the face cannot be considered an act of modesty because Muslim men are not required to cover theirs. The sole reason they do it is because Umar bin Al-Khattab, a companion of Muhammad, wished that Muhammad would reveal verses from Allah requiring women to wear it. When Muhammad did not oblige, Umar did not bother praying to Allah for assistance. Umar knew he had to make it personal for Muhammad himself in order to bring the revelation down. He followed Muhammad's wives out when they went to go to the toilet and made his presence known. When Muhammad heard of this, the revelation that Umar had so wanted was sent down from Allah. Umar knew where these revelations were really coming from, which is why he pestered Muhammad and bothered his wives instead of asking Allah.

The majority of female Muslims worldwide, following the Islamic requirement of observing Hijab, wear some form of Islamic dress. It ranges anywhere from wearing a simple head covering, to the burqa, which is a form of full Hijab covering almost all exposed skin. There is concern among the medical community about some of the health effects of the extreme styles of Islamic dress, with the main issues arising from vitamin D deficiency due to lack skin exposed to UV light. It has been established by credible scientific evidence that almost all women who observe the full Hijab are chronically deficient in vitamin D. Vitamin D is a vital nutrient and deficiency of this kind can lead to osteomalacia in adults and rickets in children. There is also a strong association between deficiency in vitamin D and an increased risk of developing several deadly cancers, including breast cancer. For Islam as a religion, the implications are troublesome. Islam is considered by its adherents to be the perfect way of life for humankind. If Islam was mandated by Allah, and if he wanted women to observe Hijab, then logically he would not have created humans with the need to get vitamin D from exposing their skin to the sun.

There is no term for rape in the Qur'an. Likewise, there is not a single verse in the Qur'an which even remotely discourages forced sex. In fact, there are several verses allowing sexual crimes against women: "Also forbidden are women already married, except slave girls (those whom your right hands possess). Thus has Allah ordained for you. All others are lawful, provided you seek them from your property, desiring chastity, not fornication. So with those among them whom you have enjoyed, give them their required due, but if you agree mutually after the requirement has been determined, there is no sin on you." [Qur'an 4:24]

Wife-beating in the Muslim world comes from the teachings of the Qur'an and the Hadith. It has been an accepted part of Islam since its inception. The sacred texts advise men to take a green branch and beat their wives, because a green branch is more flexible and inflicts greater pain. Women are warned that they will go to hell, if they are disobedient to their husbands. But even if they are, a reminder of who is in charge can make sense. Muhammad himself declared: "A man will not be asked as to why he beats his wife." And his favorite wife Aisha is quoted to have said: "I have not seen any woman suffering as much as the believing women. Look! Her skin is greener than her clothes!"

Domestic violence has been used as a tool to maintain control and dominance over Muslim women. This has created an intensely patriarchal society where men rule women and women must submit to men. The Qur'an is very clear on this: "And those wives whose refractoriness you fear, exhort them, and avoid them in beds, and beat them; but if they obey you, seek not a way against them; verily Allah is ever Lofty and Grand." [Qur'an 4:34].

Many Muslims claim that this verse does not mean to *beat them*, but rather to *separate from them* or to *evict them from the house*.

Honor-related violence is physical violence that is inflicted on an individual by perpetrators who believe the victim has brought dishonor upon the family, clan, or community by engaging in any conduct that is perceived as immoral or unacceptable by religious, social or cultural standards. This violence almost always happens in Muslim families. Muslim women are killed for many honor-related reasons, including being raped, associating with non-related males, getting pregnant outside of marriage, and for the belief they might have done something else immoral. In the eyes of their family this is a capital crime which demands death in order to restore the family's honor. The entire family may all collaborate on this, and in some cases the whole community may participate and even celebrate the occasion.



Burqas and niqabs symbolize to Westerners the outward manifestation of repression for tens of millions of Muslim Women living in what amounts to Islamic bondage. These all-encompassing garments, looking almost like a mobile prison, separates women from all but close relations. They may not speak to others, travel alone or in the company of non-relatives, hold leadership positions, vote, drive, attend school, or speak freely. Some societies are less limiting, with women only confined to wearing a hair-covering veil and other restrictions are less pronounced. But even in these societies, women's rights and opportunities cannot be compared to Western standards. All women in Islamic lands based on the Sharia are subject to horrific punishments for promiscuity or adultery. Even in Saudi Arabia, one of the more advanced, wealthy, and educated Arab Islamic lands, it is a common ploy for husbands to end arguments with their wives by raising their finger and proclaiming 'I divorce you, I divorce you...'. Usually at about the second invoking of the official *three strikes and you are out* Islamic method of divorce, women are on their knees begging the angry man for forgiveness and imploring them not to repeat the fateful third 'I divorce you'. These poor women degrade themselves because they know full well how utterly alone they are in Islamic society without the benefits of property, rights, and substance that they enjoy only through their continued association with their husband.

Muhammad was a polygamist, and Islam allows a man to marry up to four wives at any one time: "And if you fear that you cannot act equitably toward orphans, then marry such women as seem good to you, two and three and four; but if you fear that you will not do justice between them, then marry only one and have female slaves (what your right hands possess); this is more proper, that you may not deviate from the right course." [Qur'an 4:3]

It is also interesting to note that a Muslim male does not require the permission of his first wife before marrying a second. A common Muslim explanation for verse 4:3 is to give a partial quote of the verse and explain that a Muslim man may marry up to four women. However, if he cannot deal justly with each of the wives then he is forbidden to marry that many. He can marry only one wife, to prevent treating women unfairly. Muslims explain that the use of the word *justice* refers to the man's ability to treat each of his wives exactly the same in every regard: not just materially (food, clothing, shelter, time, money, etc.) but also that he must be able to love them all exactly the same. He must be able to feel the same amount of affection and love for each of his wives. If he cannot do this, then, according to the Qur'an, he cannot marry more than one wife. In reality, Qur'an 4:3 has nothing to do with treating your wives equally. It's about the orphans and their bride price.

The Qur'anic Paradise is sensual in nature, promising Muslim men voluptuous virgins but does not specify their exact number. The Hadith literature compliment the Qur'anic text by specifying the exact number of virgins as 72 and providing us with detailed descriptions of their characteristics. These narrations are not weak but vary in reliability from good to authentic. We are also given details on the physical attributes given to men to sustain 72 virgins, namely, ever-erect penises that never soften and the sexual strength to satisfy 100. Although it does say they will receive a *great reward* and there are also Hasan Hadiths which refer to 72 virgins as one of the 'seven blessings from Allah' to the martyr, the Qur'an does not specify these virgins are a reward for Jihadists/martyrs, but rather for any Muslim male who gains admittance to Paradise.

Orthodox Islam requires sex segregation, which means it prohibits free-mixing between men and women. It is argued that direct references for this prohibition cannot be found in either the Qur'an or the Sunnah of

the Prophet; but this cannot mean that such conduct is permissible in Islam. As a complete way of life, Islam has not failed to address the matter. Various scholars of Islam have formulated their opinions on this matter and acknowledged the practice of free-mixing as a crime punishable under Sharia laws. All of the jurists have sourced their views from the Qur'an and the Sunnah of the Prophet, using these as the basis of their argument. So under Islamic law, it is not permissible for women to socialize with non-Mahram men (Mahram men are those whom marriage is prohibited in Islam, include fathers, uncles, brothers and close blood relatives) under any circumstances. Islamic scholars are unanimous on this matter. In Islamic societies gender segregation is a common practice to avoid any form of adultery. Thus men and women are not advised to stay in the same room if they are alone, and any adult woman is required to wear a veil in public.

Forced marriages are sanctioned in Islam despite what many Muslim apologists claim to the contrary. The Sharia fails to protect the most vulnerable, namely children. A father's consent is all that is required to marry a young girl to an adult man, and the burden is upon her (once she reaches puberty) to seek an annulment or a divorce. In the meantime, the girl is vulnerable to spousal abuse and childhood pregnancy which greatly jeopardizes her health and future. Child marriages occur all over the world, especially in Muslim countries that practice Sharia. According to multiple sources, Muhammad had many wives and concubines. He consummated his marriages with thirteen women and divorced another six. He also used to visit all his wives in one night.

Aisha (sometimes spelt Ayesha) was the nine-year-old child-bride of Muhammad. She was engaged to him at the age of six. She was also the daughter of Abu Bakr, a close friend of the Prophet. Her age has only in recent times become an actively contested issue, with many Muslims (through embarrassment) falsely claiming that she was in fact older than nine when married or when the marriage was consummated. It has also been recorded in authentic Islamic sources that Muhammad struck Aisha and also allowed Abu Bakr to do the same. Contrary to what Muslims often claim, Aisha was not 'offered' to Muhammad by her father. It was the Prophet who approached Abu Bakr, and Abu Bakr originally protested. However, Muhammad justified his wish with a 'divine' vision from Allah, which also happens to destroy the apologists appeal to cultural relativism.

Safiya bint Huyayy was the bride of Kinana and the chief mistress of the Jewish tribes of Quraiza and An-Nadir. When the Muslims invaded and conquered Khaibar, the fighting men were killed and Safiya was taken captive (along with the rest of the women and children) and allotted as booty to Dihya Al-Kalbi, a Muslim. Kinana was tortured and executed by the Muslims in order to discover the hiding places of treasure, and one source relates that he and Safiya had been married only one day. She was so beautiful, that the Muslims began praising her in the presence of Muhammad, and so he commanded that Dihya be brought before him along with Safiya. Upon seeing her, he said, "Take any slave girl other than her from the captives" and he selected her for himself. From the information provided in the Hadith, we can reasonably conclude that Safiya did not have a choice in this marriage. She was held captive up until the marriage, when Muhammad decided that she would be a wife rather than a slave. But whether wife or female slave, women are considered possessions of men.

For this reason many pious Muslims have a very different notion of high esteem for women compared to modern people in free countries. Women are seen as precious gems. The jewels of Islam. Something to be treasured and owned by men. Perhaps a shiny sports car is a more appropriate comparison. Something

proud owners like to take for a ride. Now imagine the Lamborghini deciding to explore the countryside on its own with the owner finding his garage empty. The car owner would not be amused. This illustrates what is wrong with comparing human beings to precious objects. People who hold women in high esteem should realize that women are fully human, have a mind of their own, and were born free.

## **5.7 Barbaric punishments**

The Qur'an orders the cutting of hands of a thief. This instruction is a gruesome irreversible punishment for thieves, robbing them of a chance to rehabilitate, improve as human beings and become a productive member of society later on: "As for the thief, both male and female, cut off their hands. It is the reward of their own deeds, an exemplary punishment from Allah. Allah is Mighty and Wise." [Qur'an 5:38]

There are many examples of juvenile offenders who are able to change their lives. Let us take the case of a teenager who got arrested on his 16<sup>th</sup> birthday for stealing cars. That resulted in him getting out of gangs and into college to study criminal justice at the University of Central Missouri. If the young man's hands and feet had been cut off according to Islamic laws, none of this would have been possible.

For unmarried men and women, the punishment for having sex prescribed in the Qur'an and Hadith is 100 lashes. Because of the high unemployment rates of young men in the Arab world, many can't afford to marry until they are 25 or 30 years old. Imagine the sexual frustration of young, orthodox Muslim men. They are not even allowed to masturbate. No wonder this leads to aggressive and irresponsible behavior.

Stoning is the Islamic punishment for married adulterers. It is a form of capital punishment whereby a group throws stones at a person until the person dies. No individual among the group can be identified as the one who kills the subject, yet everyone involved plainly bears some degree of moral culpability. Slower than other forms of execution, stoning is a form of execution by torture. There are cases of women who were raped, but because of the lack of male witnesses confirming this, these women were stoned to death for their alleged seductive appearance and behavior. In some cases raped women get 'lucky' and only end up in prison.

Men who enforce the full spectrum of Sharia law in Islamic states are called devout Muslims. In our societies we call them brutal, misogynistic thugs.

## **5.8 Homosexuality**

The Islamic views on homosexuality are formed from the writings of the Qur'an and various Hadith narrations. It is not only a sin, but a crime under Islamic law. How it is dealt with differs between the four main-line schools of Sunni jurisprudence today, but what they all agree upon is that homosexuality is worthy of a severe penalty. In the Hanafi school of thought, the homosexual is first punished through harsh beating, and if he or she repeats the act, the death penalty is to be applied. As for the Shafi school of thought, the homosexual receives the same punishment as adultery (if married) or fornication (if not married). This means, that if the homosexual is married, he or she is stoned to death, while if single, he or she is whipped 100 times. Hence, the Shafi compares the punishment applied in the case of homosexuality with that of adultery and fornication. While many Christian fundamentalists also claim homosexuality to be a 'detestable though curable sin', there are no demands to apply the death penalty.

This treatment of homosexuals under Sharia law may seem barbaric to some, and many apologists have attempted to shift the blame for this hostility toward homosexuality onto 'the adoption of European Victorian attitudes by the new Westernized elite.' However, this explanation falls short. Within the context of Islamic thought, this attitude originated from the Islamic prophet Muhammad, and since he is considered by all Muslims to be the perfect example, we find that the majority of Muslims in the East still consider this harsh treatment of homosexuals to be perfectly justified.

Even among the Western moderate Muslims, homosexuality is seen as something that is vile and unacceptable. For example, a Gallup survey carried out in early 2009 found that British Muslims have zero tolerance for homosexuality. Not even a single British Muslim interviewed believed that homosexual acts were morally acceptable. Another worrying statistic to be found among Muslims in the UK is that although they comprise just 2% of the total British population, they commit 25% of all anti-homosexual crimes. With the rise of Islam in the Western world we also see the inadvertent return to the morality of seventh-century Arabia, with Muslim gangs on the streets of England carrying out violent attacks on gays and mosques labeled as moderate calling for the murder of homosexuals at the hands of their congregation. If we look to secular Indonesia, we see that due to pressure from the growing orthodox Islamic communities, some local authorities have now been given the right to use Islamic laws, which have successfully criminalized homosexuality.

## **5.9 Pedophilia**

Pedophilia is the paraphilia of being sexually attracted to prepubescent or peripubescent children. A person with this attraction is called a pedophile. Some pedophiles are sexually attracted to children only (exclusive pedophiles) whilst others are sexually attracted to both children and adults. In contrast to the generally accepted medical definition, the term pedophile is also used colloquially to denote significantly older adults who are sexually attracted to adolescents below the local age of consent, as well as those who have sexually abused a child. In contemporary law enforcement definitions, the term pedophile is generally used to describe those accused or convicted of the sexual abuse of a minor. Pedophilia is considered a taboo and is illegal in most societies, cultures and religions, except in the Islamic world with regards to Islam.

The Qur'an permits pedophilia. The following verse allows sex with prepubescent girls who have not yet menstruated: "And as for those of your women who have despaired of menstruation, if you have a doubt, their prescribed time shall be three months, and of those too who have not had their courses; and as for the pregnant women, their prescribed time is that they lay down their burden; and whoever is careful of his duty to Allah, He will make easy for him his affair." [Qur'an 65:4]

What is being discussed is the Iddat, which is a waiting period a female must observe before she can re-marry. According to this verse, the stipulated waiting period for a divorced girl who has not yet menstruated is three months. This concept, along with all the others presented in this chapter, does violate fundamental human rights.

Islamic indoctrination also generates numerous other problems that are not directly related to human rights violations, such as trust in international relations, health of the population in Islamic countries, education of children, scientific progress, the development of national economies, and the integration of immigrants into Western societies. We will cover these topics in the next chapter.

## **Chapter 6: Major concerns related to the indoctrination pandemic**

### **6.1 The intentional use of religious deception**

In the course of propagating Islam, many Muslims, Islam-preaching websites, blogs and forums resort to distorting truths, and even outright lies. Islam is the only world religion which allows, encourages, and even demands lying by its followers. Lying for Islam is generally referred to as Taqiyya. Many Muslims will claim that this is not an Islamic, but a Shia practice. Unfortunately, this is a lie as well. There are many verses in the Qur'an which condone lying and deception, and several classical and contemporary Sunni scholars have validated its place within mainstream Islam.

Qur'an 77:38 and Qur'an 9:5, for example, allow Muslims to use any stratagem including the use of lies. A common Muslim defense for this is that this applies only in war. However, truly orthodox Muslims are always at war as long as there are people who refuse to accept the Sharia.

Religiously, Muslims are permitted to lie or use deception, because it can help further the cause of Islam. It is most often used to distort Islamic teachings, and also in the attempt to deceive people into believing that they are being persecuted for their faith in the West. This is particularly important to some Muslims, hoping to paint the persecutor as the persecuted and shifting focus away from the millions who face real persecution at the hands of Islam. It is also useful in creating an atmosphere of fear among the general Muslim population, gaining the sympathy of the West, and shaming vocal critics of Islam into silence.

The phenomenon of lying for a cause is not exclusive to Muslims and there are many people who consider themselves to be Muslims who are honest and who just want to live their lives in peace. But it is important that non-Muslims are aware of the fact that the Islamic faith itself allows, encourages, and even demands dishonesty from its followers who very often comply. When we engage in a dialog, we need to learn to be able to distinguish between truly moderate Muslims and 'moderate' Muslims practicing Taqiyya (who are orthodox Muslims in disguise). Fake moderate Muslims are sometimes also called Stealth Jihadist or Gentle Jihadist.

### **6.2 Widespread support for violence and terror**

Between the years 2001 and 2011 about 18,000 deadly terror attacks were committed explicitly in the name of Islam. In contrast, all other religions combined amount to about a dozen. The abortion doctor George R. Tiller was shot and killed by Scott Roeder in 2009 as Tiller served as an usher at his church in Wichita, Kansas. The murder was done in the name of Christianity. There are also a few cases of religious violence committed by militant Hindus against Muslims in India. But that's about it. Why is this so?

In the meantime it is not just Americans and Europeans who have become afraid of Islam. Australians, Koreans, Japanese and other nations that have almost no previous history with Muslims are also starting to fear Islam as it proves to continue to be consistent in its dealings with its ever expanding borders. As already pointed out in chapter 3.3, this is not a phobia or an unreasonable fear based on an unreasonable thought process, but a fear that is very real, justifiable, and firmly based on the clear instruction written in the Qur'an:

"Instill terror in the hearts of the unbelievers". [Qur'an 8:12]

Pure Islam has been a violent religion from its very beginning. After Muhammad died, the people who lived with him and knew his religion best immediately fell into war with each other. Fatima, Muhammad's favorite daughter, survived the early years among the unbelievers at Mecca safe and sound, yet died of stress from the persecution of fellow Muslims only six months after her father died. She even miscarried Muhammad's grandchild after having her ribs broken by the man who became the second caliph. Fatima's husband Ali, who was the second convert to Islam and was raised like a son to Muhammad, fought a civil war against an army raised by Aisha. About 10,000 Muslims were killed in a single battle waged less than 25 years after Muhammad's death. Three of the first four Muslim caliphs were murdered. All of them were among Muhammad's closest companions. The third caliph was killed by allies of the son of the first (who was murdered by the fifth caliph a few years later, then wrapped in the skin of a dead donkey and burned). The fourth caliph, called Ali, was stabbed to death after a bitter dispute with the fifth.

The fifth caliph went on to poison one of Muhammad's two favorite grandsons. The other grandson was later beheaded by the sixth caliph. The infighting and power struggles between Muhammad's family members, closest companions and their children only intensified with time. Within 50 short years of Muhammad's death, even the Ka'aba, which had stood for centuries under pagan religion, lay in ruins from internal Muslim war. And that's just the fate of those within the house of Islam. Compare this with the Christian apostles and the supporters they gained after the death of Jesus. Although there was some disagreement, this didn't lead to infighting with thousands of early Christians killing each other in the name of Christianity.

The early Muslims were waging war on other religions and bring them under submission to Islam. Within the first few decades following the Prophet's death, his Arabian companions invaded and conquered Christian, Jewish, Hindu, Buddhist and Zoroastrian lands. A mere 25 years after Muhammad's death, Muslim armies had captured land and people within the borders of over 28 modern countries outside of Saudi Arabia. Muslims continued their Jihad against other religions for 1,400 years, checked only by the ability of non-Muslims to defend themselves. To this day, not a week goes by that Islamic fundamentalists do not attempt to kill Christians, Jews, Hindus and Buddhists explicitly in the name of Allah. None of these other religions are at war with each other. Modern Muslims have religious conflict with Hindus in Kashmir; with Christians in Nigeria and Egypt; with atheists in Chechnya; with Bahais in Iran; with Animists in Darfur; with Buddhists in Thailand; with each other in Iraq, Pakistan, Somalia, and Yemen; with Jews in Israel. Why is Islam involved in more sectarian and religious conflicts than any other religion today? In fact, why is Islam the only religion in conflict with every single one of today's major world religions?

The Qur'an never once speaks of Allah's love for non-Muslims, but it speaks of Allah's cruelty toward and hatred of non-Muslims more than 500 times. Allah severed the friendship between Muslims and infidels. Militant Muslims continue their Jihad against us, pushing their young men to commit acts of inhumane brutality in the name of Allah. News and images invade our living rooms on an almost daily basis. The most atrocious crimes were committed by the 9/11 hijackers, the London bombers, the Beslan child killers, the Chechen terrorists, the Algerian terrorists, the Hamas terrorists, the Madrid terrorists, the Darfur killers, and many others. The common linkage is that the perpetrators are all devout Muslims. Consider this:

'Allahu Akbar! Allahu Akbar! Allahu Akbar!' These were the last words from the cockpit of Flight 93.

Whereas most religionists leave their places of worship more docile, reflective, and less likely to do harm to others, in Islam there are worshipers who leave their mosques on Friday and go on murderous riots to

avenge some perceived slight. Various mental malformations are usually at play when an individual kills randomly. Mental and emotional forces can lead to large groups becoming brainwashed to a single cause. Such examples can also be of a gang, tribal, or nationalistic nature. It is no accident that many rituals practiced in Islam are centered on violent or war-like activities.

Eid al-Adha, the Feast of Sacrifice, is one of Islam's most important annual holidays where every family participates in the ritualistic slaughter of animals by slicing the creature's throat. While Western men might help a son with the distasteful task of cleaning a fish, Muslim fathers involve their young sons in the bloody gruesome practice of slaughtering a large animal. Such a spectacle desensitizes its participants to the sight of pain, blood and death, serving to prepare young Muslims to carry out the very nasty work of Jihad against human beings. The 10-day festival called Ashura also appears designed to prepare Shia for martyrdom. In it, participants of all ages slash their foreheads with swords, beat their breasts in penance, and flagellate themselves with chains and whips until the streets are stained with their blood. An attempt to describe other factors that induce a true believer to kill in the cause of Jihad will be further outlined in this chapter.

The victim dehumanization factor plays a key role. The principals governing Muslim relationships with others is vital to militant Islam because in all genocidal activities to date, grooming killers to first dehumanize victims in their minds is an important prerequisite. The indoctrination in sacred script and official publications and media creates the erroneous belief that Americans, Jews, Hindus, and other non-Muslims are not human beings in the same sense as Muslims, and can and should be slaughtered with impunity. As we have already seen, the concept of equality is unacceptable to orthodox Islam. For in all forms of Islamic thought and practice, the non-believer cannot be the equal of the believer.

Objects of disdain are much easier to kill than real live, feeling human beings. This is not in line with their oft repeated claim that 'Allah is most merciful, most forgiving, most loving and charitable'. For some reason the contradiction does not seem to register. Certainly any personal dilemma resulting from such contradictions are easily dismissed once fully immersed in the blood-lust and lynch-mob mentality of Islamic militants. Apparently 'most-merciful' in their minds only applies to fellow pious Muslims.

The divine charter of Islam holds that humanity is divided according to a strict hierarchy of worth. At the top of this hierarchy are free Muslim males, the super-race and cream of humanity. Below them, in descending order of humanity, are: Muslim male slaves, free Muslim women, Muslim female slaves, then Christian and Jewish males and females. Finally, the rest of humanity comes in dead last, because they lack a soul they are regarded as worthless having no rights whatsoever. This unfortunate final grouping includes Buddhists, Hindus, atheists, agnostics, and others. The al-Qaeda organization certainly considers non-Muslim life unworthy. Does only a tiny minority have this view? Does only a tiny minority endorse violence and terror? The answer is no, and this should be reason for serious concern.

In a 2004 poll conducted by Zogby International, 18% of United Arab Emirates citizens chose Osama bin Laden as their most admired world leader. Approximately 48 million Muslims support Al-Qaeda in Indonesia. In Egypt there are 17 million supporters. An Al-Jazeera Arabic poll involving 41260 participants in September 2006 found that about half of all Arab Muslims supported bin Laden. He was officially supported by the Supreme Authority of Senior Scholars in Saudi Arabia. In 2007, the Ulema Council of Pakistan with more than 2,000 Islamic scholars awarded Osama bin Laden the title Saifullah (sword of Allah), their highest

honor. Bin Laden was killed in his million-dollar, three-story mansion by a team of Americans in a covert operation in Abbottabad, Pakistan. Following his death, a 2011 Gallup survey found that the majority of Pakistanis were grieved by his passing.

We already mentioned that indoctrination can override human empathy. As indoctrination efforts continue to spread, we can expect increasing numbers of supporters in future surveys.

### **6.3 Violence in the Bible versus the Qur'an**

Some scholars claim that the Bible contains far more verses praising or urging bloodshed than does the Qur'an, and that biblical violence is often far more extreme and marked by more indiscriminate savagery. If the founding text shapes the whole religion, then Judaism and Christianity would deserve the utmost condemnation as religions of savagery. Several anecdotes from the Bible as well as from Judeo-Christian history illustrate the point, but two in particular, one supposedly representative of Judaism, the other of Christianity, are regularly mentioned and therefore deserve closer examination.

The military conquest of the land of Canaan by the Hebrews around 1200 BCE is often characterized as genocide and has all but become emblematic of biblical violence and intolerance. God told Moses: "But of the cities of these peoples which the Lord your God gives you as an inheritance, you shall let nothing that breathes remain alive, but you shall utterly destroy them, the Hittite, Amorite, Canaanite, Perizzite, Hivite, and Jebusite, just as the Lord your God has commanded you, lest they teach you to do according to all their abominations which they have done for their gods, and you sin against the Lord your God." [Deuteronomy 20:16-18]

And Joshua conquered all the land, the mountain country and the South, and the lowland and the wilderness slopes, and all their kings. He left none remaining, but utterly destroyed all that breathed, as the Lord, God of Israel had commanded. As for Christianity, since it is impossible to find New Testament verses inciting violence, those who espouse the view that Christianity is as violent as Islam, rely on historical events such as the Crusader wars waged by European Christians between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries. The Crusades were in fact violent and led to atrocities by the modern world's standards under the banner of the cross and in the name of Christianity. After breaching the walls of Jerusalem in 1099, for example, the Crusaders reportedly slaughtered almost every inhabitant of the Holy City. According to the medieval chronicle, the *Gesta Danorum*, 'the slaughter was so great that our men waded in blood up to their ankles.'

So why should Jews and Christians point to the Qur'an as evidence of Islam's violence while ignoring their own scriptures and history? The answer lies in the fact that such observations confuse history and theology by conflating the temporal actions of men with what are understood to be the immutable words of God. The fundamental error is that Judeo-Christian history, which is violent, is being conflated with Islamic theology, which commands violence. Of course, the three major monotheistic religions have all had their share of violence and intolerance toward the 'other'. Whether this violence is ordained by God or whether warlike men merely wished it thus is the key question.

Old Testament violence is an interesting case in point. God clearly ordered the Hebrews to annihilate the Canaanites and surrounding peoples. Such violence is therefore an expression of God's will, for good or ill. Regardless, all the historic violence committed by the Hebrews and recorded in the Old Testament is just



that, history. It happened; God commanded it. But it revolved around a specific time and place and was directed against a specific people. At no time did such violence go on to become standardized or codified into Jewish law. In short, biblical accounts of violence are descriptive, not prescriptive. This is where Islamic violence is unique. Though similar to the violence of the Old Testament, commanded by God and manifested in history, certain aspects of Islamic violence and intolerance have become standardized in Islamic law and apply at all times. Thus, while the violence found in the Qur'an has a historical context too, its ultimate significance is theological. Consider the following Qur'anic verse, better known as one of the sword verses: "Then, when the sacred months are drawn away, slay the idolaters wherever you find them, and take them, and confine them, and lie in wait for them at every place of ambush. But if they repent, and perform the prayer, and pay the alms, then let them go their way." [Qur'an 9:5]

As with Old Testament verses where God commanded the Hebrews to attack and slay their neighbors, the sword verses have a historical context. God first issued these commandments after the Muslims under Muhammad's leadership had grown sufficiently strong to invade their Christian and pagan neighbors. But unlike the bellicose verses and anecdotes of the Old Testament, the sword verses became fundamental to Islam's subsequent relationship to both Jews and Christians, and idolaters such as Hindus and Buddhists. In fact, the verses set off the Islamic conquests, which changed the face of the world forever. Islamic law mandates that idolaters and polytheists must either convert to Islam or be killed. The Qur'an is also the primary source of Islam's well-known discriminatory practices against conquered Christians and Jews living under Islamic rule, see chapter 5.3.

Using the sword verses as well as countless other Qur'anic verses and oral traditions attributed to Muhammad, Islam's learned officials, sheikhs, muftis, and imams throughout the ages have all reached consensus, binding on the entire Muslim community, that Islam is to be at perpetual war with the non-Muslim world until the former subsumes the latter. Indeed, it is widely held by Muslim scholars that since the sword verses are among the final revelations on the topic of Islam's relationship to non-Muslims, that they alone have abrogated some 200 of the Qur'an's earlier and more tolerant verses, such as 'no compulsion in religion'. Famous Muslim scholar Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406) admired in the West for his progressive insights, also puts to rest the notion that Jihad is defensive warfare: In the Muslim community, the Holy Jihad is a religious duty, because of the universalism of the Muslim mission and the obligation to convert everybody to Islam either by persuasion or by force. The other religious groups did not have a universal mission, and the Holy War was not a religious duty for them, save only for purposes of defense. They are merely required to establish their religion among their own people. That is why the Israelites after Moses and Joshua remained unconcerned with royal authority. Their only concern was to establish their religion. But Islam is under obligation to gain power over other nations. And this is still valid today.

The two Arabic conjunctions *until* (hata) and *wherever* (haythu) demonstrate the perpetual and ubiquitous nature of these commandments: There are still people of the book who have yet to be utterly humbled (especially in the Americas, Europe, and Israel) and idolaters to be slain wherever one looks (especially Asia and sub-Saharan Africa). In fact, the salient feature of almost all of the violent commandments in Islamic scriptures is their open-ended and generic nature:

"Fight them until there is no persecution and the religion is God's entirely." [Qur'an 2:193, 8:39]

Also, in a well-attested tradition that appears in the Hadith collections, Muhammad proclaims: "I have been commanded to wage war against mankind until they testify that there is no god but God and that Muhammad is the Messenger of God; and that they establish prostration prayer, and pay the alms-tax. If they do so, their blood and property are protected."

Whereas first-century Christianity spread via the blood of martyrs, first-century Islam spread through violent conquest and bloodshed. Indeed, from day one to the present, whenever it could, Islam with its supremacist mandate spread through conquest, as evidenced by the fact that the majority of what is now known as the Islamic world, or *Dar al-Islam*, was conquered by the sword of Islam. This is a historic fact, attested to by the most authoritative Islamic historians. Even the Arabian peninsula, the 'home' of Islam, was subdued by great force and bloodshed, as evidenced by the Ridda wars following Muhammad's death when tens of thousands of Arabs were put to the sword by the first caliph Abu Bakr for abandoning Islam.

Moreover, concerning the current default position which purports to explain away Islamic violence that the latter is a product of Muslim frustration because political or economic oppression, one must ask: What about all the oppressed Christians and Jews, not to mention Hindus and Buddhists, of the world today? Where is their religiously-garbed violence? So the fact remains: Even though the Islamic world has the lion's share of dramatic headlines, of violence, terrorism, suicide-attacks, decapitations, it is certainly not the only region in the world suffering under both internal and external pressures. For instance, even though practically all of sub-Saharan Africa is riddled with political corruption, oppression and poverty, when it comes to violence, terrorism, and sheer chaos, Somalia, which also happens to be the only sub-Saharan country that is entirely Muslim, leads the pack. Moreover, those most responsible for Somali violence and the enforcement of intolerant, draconian, legal measures, the members of the Jihadist group Al-Shabab (the youth), articulate and justify all their actions through an Islamist paradigm.

In Sudan, too, a Jihadi-genocide against the Christian and polytheistic peoples is being waged by Khartoum's Islamist government and has left nearly a million infidels and apostates dead. That the Organization of Islamic Conference has come to the defense of Sudanese president Hassan Ahmad al-Bashir, who is wanted by the International Criminal Court, is further telling of the Islamic body's approval of violence toward both non-Muslims and those deemed not Muslim enough. Latin American and non-Muslim Asian countries also have their fair share of oppressive, authoritarian regimes, poverty, and all the rest that the Muslim world suffers. Yet, unlike the near daily headlines emanating from the Islamic world, there are no records of practicing Buddhists, Hindus, or Christians crashing explosives-laden vehicles into the buildings of oppressive regimes, all the while waving their scriptures in hand and screaming: 'Jesus is great!'

There is one final aspect that is often overlooked, either from ignorance or disingenuousness, by those who insist that violence and intolerance is equivalent across the board for all religions. Aside from the divine words of the Qur'an, Muhammad's pattern of behavior (his Sunnah), is an extremely important source of legislation in Islam. Muslims are exhorted to emulate Muhammad in all walks of life: "You have had a good example in God's Messenger."

The Prophet's pattern of conduct toward non-Muslims is quite explicit. Sarcastically arguing against the concept of moderate Islam, for example, terrorist Osama bin Laden, who enjoys half the Arab-Islamic world's support per an Al-Jazeera poll, portrayed the Sunnah thusly: "Moderation is demonstrated by our Prophet who did not remain more than three months in Medina without raiding or sending a raiding party

into the lands of the infidels to beat down their strongholds and seize their possessions, their lives, and their women."

In fact, based on both the Qur'an and Sunnah, pillaging and plundering infidels, enslaving their children, and placing their women in concubinage is well founded. And the concept of Sunnah, which is what 90 percent of the billion-plus Muslims, the Sunnis, are named after, essentially asserts that anything performed or approved by Muhammad, humanity's most perfect example, is applicable for Muslims today no less than yesterday. This, of course, does not mean that Muslims in mass live only to plunder and rape. But it does mean that persons naturally inclined to such activities, and who also happen to be Muslim, can, and do, quite easily justify their actions by referring to the Sunnah of the Prophet, the way Al-Qaeda, for example, justified its attacks on 9/11 where innocents including women and children were killed. Muhammad authorized his followers to use catapults during their siege of the town of Ta'if in 630 CE, when townspeople had refused to submit, though he was aware that women and children were sheltered there. When asked if it was permissible to launch night raids or set fire to the fortifications of the infidels if women and children were among them, the Prophet is said to have responded: "They are from among them."

Though law-centric and possibly legalistic, Judaism has no such equivalent to the Sunnah; the words and deeds of the patriarchs, though described in the Old Testament, never went on to prescribe Jewish law. Neither Abraham's white lies, nor Jacob's perfidy, nor Moses' short-fuse, nor David's adultery, nor Solomon's philandering ever went on to instruct Jews or Christians. They were understood as historical acts perpetrated by fallible men who were more often than not punished by God for their less than ideal behavior. As for Christianity, much of the Old Testament law was abrogated or fulfilled, depending on one's perspective, by Jesus. *Eye for an eye* gave way to *turn the other cheek*. Totally loving God and one's neighbor became supreme law. Furthermore, Jesus' Sunnah, as in 'What would Jesus do?', is characterized by passivity and altruism.

The New Testament contains absolutely no exhortations to violence. Still, there are those who attempt to portray Jesus as having a similarly militant ethos as Muhammad by quoting the verse: "I come not to bring peace but a sword." Yet based on the context of this statement, it is clear that Jesus was not commanding violence against non-Christians but rather predicting that strife will exist between Christians and their environment, a prediction that was only too true as early Christians, far from taking up the sword, passively perished by the sword in martyrdom as too often they still do in the Muslim world. Others point to the violence predicted in the Book of Revelation while, again, failing to discern that the entire account is descriptive, not to mention clearly symbolic, and thus hardly prescriptive for Christians. At any rate, how can one compare this handful of New Testament verses that metaphorically mention the word sword to the literally hundreds of Qur'anic injunctions and statements by Muhammad that clearly command Muslims to take up a very real sword against non-Muslims?

#### **6.4 Islam and the silent majority**

A man, whose family was German aristocracy prior to World War II, owned a number of large industries and estates. When asked how many German people were true Nazis, the answer he gave can guide our attitude toward fanaticism. 'Very few people were true Nazis,' he said, 'but many enjoyed the return of German pride, and many more were too busy to care. I was one of those who just thought the Nazis were a bunch of fools. So, the majority just sat back and let it all happen. Then, before we knew it, they owned us, and we

had lost control, and the end of the world had come. My family lost everything. I ended up in a concentration camp and the Allies destroyed my factories.'

We are told again and again by experts that Islam is the religion of peace and that the vast majority of Muslims just want to live in peace. Although the latter statement may be true, it is practically irrelevant. It is meant to make us feel better, and meant to somehow diminish the specter of fanatics rampaging across the globe in the name of Islam. The fact is that the fanatics rule Islam at this moment in history; it is the fanatics who march; it is them who wage any one of 50 shooting wars worldwide. It is the fanatics who systematically slaughter Christian or tribal groups throughout Africa and are gradually taking over the entire continent in an Islamic wave. It is the fanatics who bomb, behead, murder, or honor-kill. It is the fanatics who take over mosque after mosque. It is the fanatics who zealously spread the stoning and hanging of rape victims and homosexuals. It is the fanatics who teach their young to kill and to become suicide bombers.

The hard, quantifiable fact is that the peaceful, silent majority is cowed and extraneous. Communist Russia was comprised of Russians who just wanted to live in peace, yet the Russian Communists were responsible for the murder of at least 20 million people. The peaceful majority were irrelevant. China's huge population was peaceful as well, but Chinese Communists managed to kill a staggering 70 million people. The average Japanese individual prior to World War II was not a warmongering sadist. Yet, Japan murdered and slaughtered its way across Southeast Asia in an orgy of killing that included the systematic murder of 12 million Chinese civilians; most killed by sword, shovel, and bayonet. History lessons are often incredibly simple and blunt, yet for all our powers of reason, we often miss the most basic and uncomplicated of points. Peace-loving Muslims have been made irrelevant by their silence. Peace-loving Muslims might become our enemy if they don't speak up, because like the aristocrat from Germany, they will awaken one day and find that the fanatics own them and can order them to wage war.

Peace-loving Germans, Japanese, Chinese, Russians, Rwandans, Serbs, Afghans, Iraqis, Palestinians, Somalis, Nigerians, Algerians, and many others have died because the peaceful majority did not speak up until it was too late. As for us who watch it all unfold, we must pay attention to the group that matters most, the fanatics who threaten our way of life. Anyone who doubts that the issue is serious and does not spread this warning is contributing to the passiveness that allows the problems to expand. So, extend yourself a bit and send this document on. Make a difference. Help protect our human rights.

We need both liberals and conservatives to join our cause. Ideologies of totalitarianism are rejected by people across a broad political spectrum. We are in this together. Unfortunately, many liberals are reluctant to speak out against orthodox Islam, because they think that this might look like they are supporting the ideas of right-wing political movements or the Christian Right. But this conclusion is wrong. Communists are against killing children who forget to brush their teeth. Republicans are against killing children who forget to brush their teeth. Does this mean Republicans are communists? Of course not.

Criticizing the Westboro Baptist Church with their obsessive hate of homosexuals, but sparing the people who spread orthodox Islam is a bigoted position. It is usually based on the assumption that Muslims are too uncivilized, or too immature, to handle criticism. It's actually more respectful to treat them as adults, like everyone else, and expect them to deal with criticism without reacting violently, just like everyone else. See also Appendix E.

## 6.5 Why some don't consider Islam to be a religion

Rebecca B. is an American writer, political analyst and researcher. She currently serves as Secretary of the World Encounter Institute, which serves the working poor in the developing world through faith-based, holistic community development, and strives to nurture personal and community transformation, economic and social development, and peace filled relationships with family and neighbors. Here is an excerpt of a talk she gave in 2011.

I'm here to talk about a subject no one wants to discuss: religion. Many people in our post-Christian society, especially journalists, are afraid of it, misinformed about it and ignorant of the most basic theological concepts. And our theologians are often too specialized in their work to be able to discuss religion in its broadest outlines or our churchmen are often so concerned with finding common ground that they gloss over and ignore the theology of Islam. Our greatest Islam critics confine their attack to the non-religious aspects of Islam, either its political side or its judicial side. But when we discuss political Islam or Sharia law alone, we imply that there is a religious Islam that is perfectly fine, that we don't have to worry about. And we leave the major problems of Islamization, Muslim immigration, mosque building, the proselytizing in our prisons and military and the infiltration of our governmental institutions completely untouched and indeed untouchable.

So I think we need to take a few steps back to examine Islam as a whole and to broadly define the outlines of Islam, what it is and what it isn't. One thing we can definitely say about Islam is that it is not solely confined to a belief system. Islam is a total system of life and contains within itself a particular social system, judicial system, and political system which includes geo-political aspirations - the conquest and administration of territory. I often liken Islam to a duck-billed platypus which superficially resembles an otter. Upon closer examination, one finds this animal has a duck-like bill, lays eggs, and has many other characteristics which are not otter-like. So it cannot therefore remain in the biological category containing otters. It is simply too different and has to have its own category. I believe the same thing is true of Islam. As it is much too different from the other religions to remain in the religion category, it should be uniquely classified in its own category.

Secondly, I think it is obvious to Christians that Islam is its polar opposite and I believe nihilism lies between Christianity and Islam and that the morality of Islam is inverted. Let me explain: religion supplies our basic world-view concerning the nature of reality. If we were to plot belief systems on a graph, on one side are religions which view God as good and the universe as a benevolent place, in the middle we have the view that there is no God and the universe is a pitiless and indifferent place, the view of material determinism which is the direction toward which our society is tending. On the other side is the view of God as malevolent. His universe is a vicious and unpredictable place and he enjoys our suffering. The reason we can assert that the morality of Islam is inverted is that Islam consistently elevates material over spiritual considerations. That is, it elevates the material obedience to the dictates of the Islamic doctrine above all consideration of truth or goodness. Morality, conformity and even legality are all one and the same in Islam. Here's an example of the father of a failed female suicide bomber who said: 'If I had known what she was planning I would have told the Jews. I would have stopped her.' This makes sense. Here's what he said next: 'In our religion it is forbidden for a girl's body to be uncovered even at home. How could a girl allow her body to be smashed to pieces and then collected up by Jews? This is absolutely forbidden.'

Though this is an extreme circumstance, we see this pattern play out over and over again. Women are treated as if they were property because that is how they are defined by Islam. For example, if a young girl runs away from home to marry her true love, she has in effect stolen the property that is herself from her family and the family will often try to kill her to negate the theft and to assuage the shame and humiliation suffered by the family for not being in full control of their daughter's body as is required by Islam. In this way, Islamic doctrine is utterly materialistic and control of the body is everything. And the devout Muslim mind is focused fully on the material world.

I further contend that Islam has become a substitute God for most Muslims. Worship is defined as obedience to Islam and Islam represents the entire will of God for all people through all time. God's will is also every single thing that happens. So even if one disobeys Islam, it is still God's will that he did so. If there is no difference between man's will and God's will, there is no God to seek. In Islam God is unknowable, he is completely transcendent and his will is all things. Theologically this can be seen as the equivalent to saying there is no God.

Furthermore, when a religion becomes completely reduced to a doctrine and only a doctrine, it is no longer a living faith. It is dead. Islam may be complex and it may be logical, but it is logic in the absence of living truth. Islam cannot evolve. Religion in its broadest sense must be about the pursuit of higher value, of truth beauty and goodness. As we learned in philosophy class, the thinking used to be that these values stand apart from the world and evaluate the world. Truth is the measure of man; man is not the measure of truth. That is the essence of religious thought. And the interesting thing is that when we pursue value, as all true religions encourage, we incorporate those values into our selves, as we pursue goodness, we become good, as we pursue truth we reflect truth in ourselves and we appreciate the beauty of God's creation more and more, this is commonly called spiritual growth. All religion as we have known it facilitates this process, its goal is to lead men and women to God and lead them to experience God's love.

Islam on the other hand, subordinates everything to itself. Islam is the highest value and the spiritual values we just mentioned are thought to be entirely contained within Islam, even to be entirely contained within the Qur'an. Which is why after a rumor about Qur'an copies being flushed down the toilet at Guantanamo was started by Newsweek in May 2005, scores were killed and hundreds injured in rioting all over the Muslim world. Lives were sacrificed over paper and ink. We saw the same pattern play out with the Muhammad cartoons over a supposed religious principle which concerns only the material world. There is no higher truth than Islam, no higher good than Islam and nothing more beautiful than Islam. Islam has replaced God and its ultimate goal is not to lead men and women to seek those higher values. Islam exists simply to perpetuate itself.

Let's take three simple religious concepts and look at how they are subordinated under Islam. The first one is faith. When we use the word faith, we mean a growing trust in a loving, fatherly God, a God who can be known, and a God who can be approached. In Islam, God cannot be known, and there is no bridge to him. What Muslims mean by faith is faith in the truth and rightness of Islam itself. Intellectual assent to a doctrine has replaced living faith, man's relationship with a higher reality.

The second is prayer. When we pray we open our inner life to God, it is an intimate and personal communication and is often a petition for God to strengthen us in virtue so we will be better prepared to meet the problems of our lives. There is nothing personal or intimate about Muslim prayer. It is communal and a rote

formula. Everyone prays the same prayers at the same time facing the same direction, while performing the same muscular movements. Just like military drills, these so-called prayers have the effect of cementing communal solidarity, but not of increasing intimate contact with God. There is no intimacy between man and God in Islamic prayer because there cannot be.

The third is worship by which we mean love, adoration, awe and gratitude all being expressed to God. Often this is done in the form of song. In Islam, worship is defined as obedience to Islam and since God is transcendent and we cannot know him, loving him is beside the point and is certainly not essential. Obedience is everything. This concept is also a major stumbling block to democracy because to obey man's law in Islamic thought is equivalent to the worship of man. Now, while I would agree that the worship of man is broadly a characteristic of the modern world, especially if we look at the rise of science and its promise of omniscience and even omnipotence, that all things can be known and done through the agency of science. I vehemently disagree that the Islamic total belief system and total regulation of life is the answer to anything. It is certainly not a way to grow closer to God. It leads men away from God and focuses the mind on the material world alone from morning till night, day in and day out.

So in my opinion, Islam is not the answer. Islam is the problem. Now for those who still insist that Islam remain in the religion category, they will eventually have to concede that Islam is either a false religion or an evil religion because it leads men to evil action, even toward their own families. With the Arab spring we can clearly see that when the governing police state is suddenly removed, Muslim societies across the board descend into violence and chaos, religious sects fight other sects, tribes fight other tribes, looting is rampant and men are reduced to defending their families against their neighbors. Needless to say, this is not what we expect from religion. We expect religion to uphold morality and civilizational standards. It is clear Islam doesn't do that (at least not in its current form).

Therefore, I believe it would be wise to reconsider Islam's inclusion as a religion at least as far as the First Amendment in the United States is concerned. I understand the difficulties with this approach, and I know many have and will reject it, but I also think it is necessary to raise the question about what Islam really is and what it isn't. When you consider the effort that went into arguing whether Pluto should be considered a planet or not, or how a newly discovered insect should be classified, or what constitutes organic produce, I really don't think the ability to classify belief systems is beyond us.

## **6.6 The adverse effects of Ramadan fasting**

Medical fasting is different from Islamic fasting (Sawm), and contrary to popular Muslim beliefs, Islamic fasting, unlike Medical fasting, has numerous adverse effects that have been observed using scientific studies and news sources. The main features of Islamic fasting are for 30 days every lunar year (during the month of Ramadan): waking up before dawn and eating and drinking to prepare for the fast (binge eating is a common habit), refraining from consuming any food or water from dawn to sunset, and breaking the fast at sunset and again eating and drinking to prepare for the day ahead. Intermittent and prolonged fasting is generally not conducive to a healthy lifestyle. Depriving the body of water and essential nutrients by dividing and postponing meals to irregular intervals does nothing to limit consumption. Islamic fasting has significant harmful effects on health, national economy and productivity, crime rate, public safety and social behavior. Health effects include heat stress, dehydration, migraines and mood disorders. In a recent study done on the Arab world, diseases linked to cholesterol and diabetes increased by about 27% because of

overeating. So the question to the Muslim world are: What benefit does the Muslim world get for more than 1 billion people staying hungry throughout the day for one full month every year? Did Allah actually want Muslims to suffer physically, economically and socially for one month every year? Also, if fasting is beneficial as devout Muslims claim, why do Muslims not fast the entire year instead of just one month?

## **6.7 Islam and modern science**

It is paradoxical that pious Muslims often wish to point out the influence of Islam in the making of modern Europe. They seem to be proud of the contribution toward the very civilization they profess to despise. The Americans would not have walked on the moon, we are told, if it had not been for the 'Arab contributions to the exact sciences'. At the same time, the West is denounced as being shallow, materialistic, decadent, irreligious and too scientific. This scientific materialism is contrasted with the orthodox Muslim's own putative superior spirituality and profundity.

The achievements of Golden Age Muslim scientists need to be put in the proper perspective by neither denigrating their achievements nor inflating them. All scientific and technological progress is accomplished in progression; Muslim achievements are but links in the chain. Few of the great Muslim scientific achievements stood alone, but were derived by Muslim scientists standing on the shoulders of those who came before them. This analysis also highlights the fatal flaw of the Islamic Golden Age. There were few follow-up breakthroughs on the backs of the works of the great Muslim scientists. In effect, the Ummah (all Muslims in the world) allowed or encouraged these works to wither on the vine or die stillborn, even before the rise of mysticism at the expense of rational thinking, an event often attributed to al-Ghazzali around the turn of the 12th century. Indeed, it would seem that orthodox Islam utterly stifles intellectual reasoning. Therefore, Islam is not the cause of scientific progress during the Golden Age. Many people would say that the Golden Age's scientific progress was made in spite of Islam, not because of it. A prime example is the great philosopher-physician Ibn Sina also known as Avicenna. It is true that Avicenna was one of the most influential medieval philosophers, but he was also one of the most frequently attacked by Muslims. Today, the majority of Muslims would consider Ibn Sina, and many of the other great Islamic scientists, as heretical apostates for their beliefs, and therefore non-Muslim disbelievers.

There are many inventions falsely claimed and attributed to Islamic inventors, which in fact either existed in pre-Islamic eras, were invented by other cultures, or both. However, this detail has not halted Muslim, and non-Muslim apologists alike, from perpetuating these false claims. But it doesn't stop there. Here is the origin of a claim that is both totally absurd and detrimental to scientific inquiry:

Maurice Bucaille was a French medical doctor and member of the French Society of Egyptology. In 1973, Bucaille was appointed family physician to King Faisal of Saudi Arabia. After embracing Islam in 1976, he published a book in which he argued that the Qur'an contains no statements contradicting established scientific facts. Bucaille argued that the Qur'an is in agreement with scientific facts, while the Bible is not. He claims that there are monumental errors of science in the Bible and not a single error in the Qur'an. His belief was that the Qur'an's descriptions of natural phenomena make it compatible with modern science. Bucaille concluded that the Qur'an must be the words of God. His book started a movement called Bucailleism, attracting thousands, if not millions of orthodox Muslims.



This has led to the widespread belief that the Qur'an prophesied the big bang theory, space travel and other contemporary scientific breakthroughs. In fact, there are more than 1200 verses which can be interpreted in the light of modern science, the followers of the movement sincerely believe. The search for Qur'anic references to and prophecies of modern scientific discoveries has become a popular trend in some Muslim societies. Thousands of zealous people are wasting their time with this kind of pseudoscientific nonsense.

The belief of scientific foreknowledge in sacred texts also exists in orthodox Judaism and Christian fundamentalism. A good example is young-earth Creationism. Wikipedia defines pseudoscience as a claim, belief, or practice which is presented as scientific, but does not adhere to a valid scientific method, lacks supporting evidence or plausibility, cannot be reliably tested, or otherwise lacks scientific status. Pseudoscience is often characterized by the use of vague, exaggerated or unprovable claims, an over-reliance on confirmation rather than rigorous attempts at refutation, a lack of openness to evaluation by other experts, and a general absence of systematic processes to rationally develop theories. Both Bucaillism and Creationism fall into the category of pseudoscience. Other examples can be found at [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_topics\\_characterized\\_as\\_pseudoscience](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_topics_characterized_as_pseudoscience) and [www.skeptic.com](http://www.skeptic.com).

According to Michael Shermer myths are about the human struggle to deal with the great passages of time and life such as birth, death, marriage, and the transitions from childhood to adulthood to old age. They meet a need in the psychological or spiritual nature of humans that has absolutely nothing to do with science. To try to turn a myth into a science, or a science into a myth, is an insult to myths, an insult to religion, and an insult to science. In attempting to do this, religious scholars have missed the significance, meaning, and sublime nature of myths.

Here's a good example: Many deeply religious Muslims believe that while Muhammad was in Mecca, Allah split the moon as a miracle for Muhammad to the Meccans. To back up this claim, some use close-up pictures of the moon taken by NASA as evidence. The 'split' we see is in fact a lunar rille, which is a long and deep gorge resembling a canyon. A rille is typically several kilometers wide and hundreds of kilometers in length. Similar formations are found on a number of planets in the solar system, including Mars, Venus, and on a number of moons.

Authoritative Islamic sources provide an accurate picture of what Islam teaches of the creation of the universe and its human inhabitants. The creation myth is consistent throughout. It began six thousand years before the advent of Islam. The first thing to be created was the planet Earth, which took two days to complete, from Sunday to Monday. Then it took another two days to create the mountains, trees, and everything else. The final two days, Thursday and Friday, were spent creating the heavens, the sun, moon, other planets, and a ninety feet tall Adam. Eve (called Hawwa in Islam) was created from Adam's left rib, whilst he was asleep in the Garden. She is blamed by Adam for persuading him to eat from the forbidden tree. As a result, they are both cast out from the garden in Paradise and sent down to the planet Earth, where their decedents continue to decrease in size. As punishment for her transgression in particular, Allah makes Eve menstruate, suffer pregnancy and become stupid. Therefore, according to Islamic beliefs, today all women menstruate (are deficient in religion) and are created stupid (deficient in intelligence).

The Qur'an's understanding of the universe matches that of the mythical cosmos believed by 7<sup>th</sup> century Arabians rather than an accurate description of the real universe. As in the Bible, the entire universe is very small. The earth is flat as a pancake. Paradise exists between seven heavens and hell exists between seven

earths. All of this is submerged in a cosmic sea, above which is the throne of Allah. Like Christian Creationists, orthodox Muslims are unable to distinguish between myths and modern science. Sometimes this can have quite dramatic consequences. Traditional Islamic medicine, healthcare and biology rely on superstitions, general beliefs among the people during the Prophet's time and borrowings from the practices and beliefs of other civilizations. Today you will find small-minded Muslims who champion the self-alleged health benefits of drinking camel urine (as instructed by Muhammad), but those who are actually willing to practice such things are far less forthcoming. Muhammad prescribed camel urine as medicine to the followers from Uraynah. Because Muhammad is a prophet, Muslims believe he received a divine revelation from God. As a result they continue to study and prescribe camel urine as medicine despite the lack of evidence proving there is any medicinal value in camel urine and that there is some evidence that drinking urine is actually harmful.

Progress is built into one of the core tenets of Christianity. People are seen as sinners who are imperfect and should therefore search ways to get closer to God. Christianity therefore encourages autonomy and curiosity and creativity. Enlightenment and humanism are Christianity's offspring. Islam was considered the best and most perfect religion 1,400 years ago. Obedience doesn't require much creativity.

## **6.8 The steady decline of the Islamic world and spread of Islamic fundamentalism**

Some critics of Islam predict the eventual downfall of the Islamic world. At first this might seem contradictory in light of the growing number of Muslims in the world with their higher than average birth-rates and consequent population growths of Muslim countries and communities. One progressive European Muslim of Arabic origin put it like this:

The numbers don't tell us very much. There are more than 1.5 billion Muslims. So what? The important thing is that in almost all countries with a Muslim majority, we see the decline of civilization and a stagnation of all forms of life. Islam has no convincing answers to the challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. It is in intellectual, moral and cultural decline, and therefore a doomed religion, without self-awareness and without any options to act. The decisive element is the general lack of direction and backwardness, which often lead to an aggressive fundamentalism. This sets the general tone.

There are differences between Islamic countries, of course. But whenever Muslims seek to introduce Islamic studies into European schools or try to obtain nonprofit status for an Islamic organization, there is always talk of one Islam. The minute someone attacks the faith, they resort to a trick to stifle the criticism and disingenuously ask: Which Islam are you talking about?

Why is this so? In a sense, Islam is like a drug, like alcohol. A small amount can have a healing and inspiring effect, but when the believer reaches for the bottle of dogmatic faith in every situation, it gets dangerous. This high-proof form of Islam is what I'm talking about. It harms the individual and damages society. It inhibits integration, because this Islam divides the world into friends and enemies, into the faithful and the infidels.

Therefore I advocate a milder form of Islam. My dream, in fact, is an enlightened Islam, without Sharia law and without Jihad, without gender apartheid, proselytizing and the mentality of entitlement. A religion that is open to criticism and questions. A religion that can evolve. As far as I'm concerned, I converted from faith

to knowledge some time ago. At the same time I still perceive myself as a Muslim. It's my cultural community. For me, Islam is also my homeland and my language, and my Arabic can't be separated from all of that. Believing in God can also mean being at odds with him. You can distance yourself from Islam but remain within the heart of Islam. I don't want to yield to the fundamentalists who preach violence. They are on the rise. They are not a tiny minority. Their hatred of the West hasn't gone away.

There is a causal relationship between terrorism and Islam. We cannot attribute it to the miserable living conditions and lack of opportunities. Poverty is not the cause of terror. The real reason is that the terrorists invoke religion. Violence has allied itself with the culture. The perpetrators invoke the Qur'an more often than not. That's why we urgently need heretics who, ignoring taboos, question everything about this religion called Islam. The reformers do exist. One of them is the Iranian thinker Abdolkarim Soroush, who recognizes many paths to the true faith. Another is the recently deceased Egyptian theologian Nasr Hamid Abu Zayd. But when he still lived, radical judges declared him to be divorced from his wife because of his liberal views. He had to flee Egypt and go to the Netherlands. So these kinds of thinkers remain the exception. Most so-called reformers of Islam remind me of the band on the Titanic, which kept on playing even as the ship was sinking, so as to give the passengers the illusion of normalcy. The underlying problems are not addressed. And they can only be addressed if this includes questioning the Qur'an itself. Islam needs a major update to be compatible with the 21<sup>st</sup> century. We need a New Islam based on kindness and compassion for the entire human family. Although debates are now being initiated, they are never brought to a conclusion. Reformers and conservatives alike continue to be obsessed by the holy book. Sometimes I ask myself who needs the Qur'an today. Could it be that our faith has a birth defect? Did it become successful too soon, and is that why government and military responsibilities became intermingled with religion? How could Islam have reached such heights in the Middle Ages, and why did almost everything go wrong after that?

## **6.9 The social, political and intellectual state of contemporary Arab countries**

The renowned scholar Bernard Lewis tells us that Arabia was once, by middle-age standards, a great civilization. For reasons to be explored here, the hard facts on the ground today are that economies in predominantly Islamic lands have been in steady decline for at least the last four centuries, see Appendix C. It is common knowledge that the economic performances of Islamic lands are pathetic when compared to Western industrialized nations. The July 2002 *U.N. Arab Human Development Report*, written by Arab intellectuals, painted a surprisingly accurate picture of Arabic societies. With a collective population roughly that of the United States, the 22 Arab states have

- a total GDP less than Spain's, with exports (without oil) less than Norway's, and per capita income less than one-sixth that of Western democracies
- fewer Internet connections per person than even Sub-Saharan Africa, and fewer books translated into Arabic over the past 100 years than even Spain translates in an average year
- no visible presence in main arenas of human excellence today, Nobel-prize winners, World Cup finalists, Olympic medal-winners, breakthrough scientists, leading historians, international business successes, internationally recognized leaders like Gandhi or Martin Luther King

- no democratic civil or political rights, sub-standard human rights for her own peoples, virtually none for women or infidels. Almost no political visionaries of any kind. Instead what we see produced are more dictators and despots
- a dismal standard of living, few legitimate business or economic opportunities, poor health care, and education systems that churn out religious fanaticism and little else.

These sad facts are the hallmarks of a civilization devoid of legitimate, truly democratic government and free-market economies. Despite all the claims otherwise, neither quality nor longevity of life are by-products of orthodox Islam. The reasons for this poor performance is obvious to everyone except the poor inhabitants of these areas. Numerous human social experiments in communism and pure socialism have shown convincingly that when you remove freedom and economic incentive, productivity and innovation languish. If it were not for the oil in the ground, the productive output of Arab lands would be at the bottom of undeveloped third-world countries. Except for a handful of fortunate countries with massive natural resources, mostly oil and gas, almost all majority Muslim countries fall into the category of economically *less developed nations*. But the reasons for this go beyond the lack of free-market opportunities and mechanisms. The continuing lack of Muslim economic success is a direct result of a culture and practices dictated by oppressive Islamic principles. The lack of innovation and growth is a direct result of incompetence, corruption, or over-regulation on the part of religious governments. Once adopted and put into place with all its enforcement methodologies, Islam becomes the major cause of a people's backwardness, and all the subsequent evils that spring from that 7<sup>th</sup> century mindset. Islam destroys people's rational and inventive faculties, leading to the degradation of their national cultures and economies.

Their backwards condition is obvious, even to Muslims, but the root causes are not so easy for otherwise intelligent Muslims to identify. The usual reaction is both typical and predictable: the West must be at fault, nothing bad could possibly come from the world's best religion. Within this construct, the only solution which can be proffered is to return to more pure Islamic values, and to attack Western hegemony with Jihad. As such, the erroneous diagnosis and prescription guarantees a continuation of the patient's predicament. This culture of blame can neither produce introspection nor reform. Indeed, in terms of achievement, Arab leaders lack standing to criticize any country, culture, or society. Without excellence in any endeavors today, Arabs look silly as they continue to disparage others and export misery and terrorism. This destructive cycle continues endlessly, ensuring only the continuing economic disadvantage, frustration, and misery of its participants, see also Appendix G.

By contributing to learning, discipline, faith, work, honesty, and fairness, a progressive religion can be a great asset to the economic well-being of citizens. But when a religion propagates ignorance, inefficiency, Jihad, and prejudice it becomes a liability to host societies producing much higher rates of poverty. Like other totalitarianism systems, orthodox Islam acts as an economic hindrance, placing barriers to ambition, prosperity, and fulfillment of human potential. With Islamic education focused (as a political necessary) on indoctrination, and with other Islamic control mechanisms in society, the kind of education which might lead to significant economic reform is not offered. Only a tiny minority of the most privileged escape to Western institutions, and then usually choose to stay in the open societies who host them. But even there, and this should worry us, the immigrants and their children are increasingly targeted for Islamic indoctrination by fundamentalist preachers.

## **Chapter 7: The unrestricted export of Islamic doctrine to the free world**

The following speech was given by Nonie D. at an event at UC Berkeley. She is an Arab Muslim from Egypt. Her father was a terrorist martyred in the cause of Islam. Here are excerpts of her speech:

As an American woman of Muslim Arab origin, I cherish the freedoms America has given me; a right all too scarce in the Middle East where speaking for human rights, women's rights, democracy and even peace with Israel, is a taboo with serious consequences. In America, I learned that no ideology or religion is beyond questioning. Ideologies that don't answer the hard questions will face intellectual bankruptcy. I would like to stress that this is not a discussion about the good and peace-loving Muslims, but about an ideology of violence and hatred that has brought oppression, unrest, violence and terror to the Middle East and has now spread to the rest of the world.

Radicals have made the slightest criticism, critical thinking and free inquiry an insult to Islam. Arab feminists, reformers and intellectuals are intimidated, threatened or killed. Even the late Egyptian novelist Naguib Mahfouz, winner of the Nobel Prize in Literature, was stabbed in Cairo in 1994 by a radical Muslim who claimed he insulted Islam. That is why we all must welcome an open discussion.

I'd like to start with my background. I was born and raised as a Muslim in Cairo, Egypt and the Gaza Strip; a time when President Nasser was committed to unifying the Arab world and destroying Israel. In the 1950s, my father headed the Egyptian military intelligence in Gaza and started the Fedayeen, which means 'armed resistance and self sacrifice. They made cross-border attacks into Israel and caused death, damage and destruction. There were assassination attempts on my father in response to the terror. One night Israel sent commandos to our heavily guarded home, but my father was not home. All the Israeli soldiers found were us, women and children. The Israeli soldiers left us unharmed.

I attended Gaza elementary schools. It is there that we learned hatred, vengeance, and retaliation; peace was never an option. It was a sign of defeat and weakness. Jews were portrayed as less than human. I was told not to take candy or fruit from a stranger, because it could be a Jew trying to poison you. They filled our ears with fear of Jews. That made hatred come easy and terrorism acceptable, even honorable. After two years of intense Fedayeen operations, my father was killed in the first targeted assassination in Gaza in 1956. I was 8 years old. In Nasser's famous speech to nationalize the Suez Canal, he hailed my father as a national hero, a Shahid. President Nasser vowed that all of Egypt would take revenge and made no mention of the heavy toll of death and destruction brought upon Israel by the Fedayeen. My siblings and I were asked by top government officials: Which one of you will avenge your father's blood by killing Jews? I felt very uncomfortable with the question. We were speechless.

After my father's death, my mother had to face life alone with five children in a culture that gave respect only to families headed by a man. In the 1950s few women drove cars and she was criticized and called names for buying a car to take us to school. Arab women are expected to sacrifice their family by giving up their husbands and sons to martyrdom, but are given little respect to live their life with freedom and dignity. I lived for 30 years in oppressive dictatorships and police states. I witnessed honor killings of girls (our maid), oppression of women, and female genital mutilation. We regularly heard non-Muslims cursed from the pulpits of mosques. As a young woman, I visited a Christian friend in Cairo during the Friday prayers, and we both heard the verbal attacks on Christians and Jews from the loudspeakers: 'May God destroy the

infidels and the Jews, the enemies of God. We are not to befriend them or make treaties with them.' We also heard the worshipers respond with *Ameen* (which in Islam means *please accept* or *do not disappoint our hope*).

The so-called Islamic revival movement, also called Islamic Resurgence, began in the 1970s and manifested itself in greater religious piety and in a growing adoption of conservative Islamic culture, dress, terminology, separation of the sexes, speech and media censorship. Its goal was to create feelings of a growing universalistic Islamic identity.

I heard cursing prayers all my life from the pulpits of mosques, and believe it or not, if you grow up with cursing prayers, it can feel and sound normal. My Christian friend looked scared, and I was ashamed. That was when I first realized that something was very wrong in the way my religion was taught and practiced. I moved to the U.S. in 1978. On my first visit to a mosque in America, we were told not to assimilate in America and that Islam is here to become the dominant religion. I was told to cover up in Islamic clothes. But how could I do that when I never wore Islamic clothes in Egypt? Women in Egypt until the 1980s did not wear Islamic clothes.

In August 2001, I visited my birthplace, Cairo, Egypt. I was stunned to see that radical Islam had taken over. The level of anger and hate speech was alarming. I saw extreme poverty, pollution, hazardous material and garbage along the Nile. There was high unemployment, inflation and widespread corruption. But when I read Arab media, all I saw was Israel and America bashing. Citizens were unaware of Muslim-against-Muslim atrocities in Iraq, Algeria, Sudan, etc. As a matter of fact, the term Islamofascism was coined by Algerian Muslims and ex-Muslims to describe the Islamic fanatics who slaughtered 150,000 fellow Algerian Muslims in the 1990s. Arab media have failed to address the human rights of the ordinary Arab citizens and Western media are also underreporting the threat.

I was happy to return to the U.S. on the evening of Sept. 10<sup>th</sup> 2001. The next morning when I saw the second airplane hit the twin towers, I knew that Jihad has come to America. Muhammad Attah was from Cairo, the same city I came from. I called several friends in Cairo. They were all in denial and said: 'How dare you say that Arabs did this? Don't you know this is a Jewish conspiracy?' These were not radicals, but ordinary Egyptians who otherwise are very nice people. I hung up the phone and felt alone and disconnected from my culture of origin. Once again, my people are accusing the Jewish people of something we know very well, we Arabs have done ourselves. In every religion this is considered a sin, but in the eyes of radical Islam, Jews do not deserve the truth, justice or mercy. The Jews that we describe in our mosques, Arab textbooks and media don't exist. We, Arabs are fighting an imaginary Jew of our own creation. Israel is not perfect; no society is; but the way the Jews and minorities are treated by my people is tragic and a disgrace.

Amazingly, the majority of Muslim countries don't practice criminal Sharia because they cannot stomach it. I lived under the so-called Family Sharia for 30 years of my life. This is practiced in almost all Muslim countries; it allows only men the right to an easy divorce, having up to 4 wives, allows wife beating, half the inheritance of a man to a woman and her testimony in court is only half valid. She is respected only when she shields her body, face, and even her identity. As many as 75% of women in Pakistani prison are behind bars for the crime of having been raped. Polygamy has a devastating effect on family dynamics, husband/wife relationships, and women relationships. Many Muslim men only have one wife, but the damage to the wife-husband relationship has already been done in the Muslim marriage contract itself, where a man does

not pledge loyalty to his wife and the wife cannot expect his loyalty. The marriage contract has 3 more spaces to be filled out by other women if the man wishes. A good Muslim woman must accept her destiny under Sharia Law for one simple reason: challenging Allah's Law is like challenging Allah himself.

Islamists are pushing Wahhabi Saudi values in America, values that I have never even seen in Egypt. I have not come to America to become a Wahhabi Saudi. On Arab TV, I once saw a Muslim preacher telling little children that lying is not allowed except under the following three conditions: Lying to non-Muslims when it is in the best interest of Islam, lying to Muslims if it will end conflict between them, and lying to one's wife to improve the relationship.

Lying thus has become an obligation in international relationships, Muslim relationships and family relationships. Any wonder why Muslims were silent after 9/11? Those who expose the lying game are considered traitors. By allowing lying, Muslims have created a culture unable to distinguish between lies from truth; truth has become a convoluted game of saving face for the best interest of Islam. The Times of London reported that Muslim students in Britain are being taught to despise non-Muslims as filth. The Arabic word for this is *nagas*. That is why many Arabs believe that the existence of non-Muslims on Muslim land is a desecration or occupation. U.S. soldiers, at the request of Saudi Arabia, sacrificed their lives to protect it from Saddam Hussein. Under normal conditions that could have been met with appreciation, but instead, the Arab street reaction was, how dare the infidels desecrate Muslim land.

This is a proud culture that is easily shamed by feelings of dependency on the non-Muslims. This is the psychology of the Arab Street. That is how the West is perceived. In the Judeo-Christian culture they say: we are all sinners. But in the Muslim culture it is: they are all sinners, but we are Muslims.

Muslim clergy are constantly looking for the ideal Muslim State and cannot find it. They have failed miserably in stabilizing their society. Instead of being a source of comfort, stability and wisdom, they have become a source of hate, rage, and subversion. Every Muslim country is suffering from underground radical Muslim groups who are trying to overturn the government and the constitution, in their pursuit for the perfect Muslim State. That is why the Muslim world is in a constant turmoil, stagnation and conflict.

And now Islamists have caught the West in a time of political correctness and multiculturalism. By tolerating hatred and violence, the West is not doing Muslims or Islam a favor. Tolerating intolerance is not a sign of compassion. Instead it is gross negligence.

## **Chapter 8: Why conservative Islam critics need to welcome liberals into the movement**

When we count the number of supporters of various liberal parties in North America and Europe, we will probably end up with a number in the neighborhood of 350-400 million people. Most of them support progressive platforms and social market economies, and stress the importance of civil rights, environmental sanity, equal opportunities and community solidarity.

As of today, the vast majority of people who want to stop Islamic indoctrination are supporters of conservative and ultra-conservative parties and movements. Their key activity is convincing other conservatives who are not yet aware of the seriousness of the threat. Many have the opinion that most liberals cannot be convinced anyway, so any effort in that direction is seen as a waste of time. Sophisticated websites are being created that most conservative people find very appealing. Some of the websites listed in chapter 4 fall into this category. They create strong online communities of like-minded people reinforcing each other's beliefs. Unfortunately, this approach is not good enough. The real target group should be the hundreds of millions of liberals. Orthodox Muslims in the West will only start to feel real pressure, if the vast majority of both conservative and liberal people reject their totalitarian ideology. As long as the fake moderate Muslims who complain about some alleged discrimination are protected by millions of liberals, orthodox Islam will continue to spread in our Western democracies. So the real target of the anti-Islam movement should be the 350-400 million people who hold liberal convictions. It would be a huge mistake to assume that they can't be convinced. We can certainly conclude that none of the existing approaches have been very effective.

Another common mistake is to equate people left of the center with supporters of the extreme left. The vast majority of liberals in the US and Europe do not hold extreme views. Like their conservative fellow citizens, they are against strict forms of socialism, which require disowning all private business owners. Millions of liberal voters actually own businesses and have no intention of handing them over to some government. Practically all liberals are against all forms of totalitarianism, whether it's fascist or communist or based on seventh-century Islamic doctrine. While almost all know about the first two, very few know about the nature of the third.

An anti-Islam movement that wastes precious time on battling the extreme left, claiming that all liberals fall into this category, is a foolish undertaking. Conservatives can't be effective at stopping Islamic indoctrination without the liberals. Above all, liberals need to stop protecting orthodox Muslims after they learn about the true goals of pure Islam. Conservatives and liberals need to become allies. Right now this doesn't work. When curious liberals, who are still fairly new to the subject of Islam, decide to visit an anti-Islam website, they often leave almost immediately. Why? Because after two or three hyperlinks they run into messages like 'Obama is an idiot' or 'all liberals are idiots' or even 'global warming and evolution are a hoax'. Well, if that's the way to fight orthodox Islam, then it's the ultra-conservative folks who are the idiots. They also need to do a better job at keeping real xenophobic people out of the anti-Islam movement. When liberals join the movement they want to make sure that everyone opposes racists and neo-fascists.

Robert Spencer has repeatedly pointed out that the primary task that must be done is raising awareness, and that Jews, Christians, Hindus, Buddhists, secular Muslims, atheists, and whoever else, have to join together to defend universal human rights. There are many things about which we all might disagree, but at this point we need to unite so our freedom can prevail. We can't afford to fight each other. We can sort out



our disagreements later. This also means that any Muslim who renounces violent Jihad and Dhimmitude is welcome to join our anti-Jihadist efforts.

Many progressives have become so passive and irresolute that they are just not much good in a fight. We seem to have convinced ourselves that in our advanced third-millennium society, the warrior spirit is no longer necessary, or even desirable. But Thomas Jefferson rightly noted that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. This is still very true today. The ability to defend our society never goes out of fashion. Because of this tendency to passivity, we are not mentally well-equipped to deal with our Islamist adversaries, in whom the warrior spirit is still very much alive. Islam is a religion that keeps making the news around the world, day after day. It's especially important that liberals explain to their fellow citizens why Islam keeps making the news, and why that news is almost never pretty. We need to develop a good plan of what we can do to protect our more enlightened, life-embracing culture from the advancing shadow of grim, aggressive Islamic indoctrination. As we have seen, orthodox Islam is an ideology that is inherently hostile to democracy, free speech, women's rights and other fundamental human rights. The brutal subjugation of women should be reason enough to make all liberals unite in heated opposition to it. The fact that this has not happened indicates that something very strange and unlikely is going on here, between Islam and the political left. The idea that Muslims should somehow be exempt from having their ideology criticized in a way that the Vatican or the Christian Creationists are not, is unacceptable. We should not make the assumption that Muslims are too uncivilized, or too immature, to handle it. It's actually more respectful to treat them as adults, like everyone else, and expect them to deal with criticism without reacting violently, just like everyone else.

Some cultures are clearly far more enlightened and humane than others. A brief look at what goes on in Saudi Arabia and Afghanistan makes this fact obvious. Cultural relativism serves no purpose, except to prevent backward cultures from engaging in the kind of honest self-criticism that leads to the development of happier, healthier, more progressive societies. Political correctness in the context of orthodox Islam is totally counter to the spirit of free speech, and prevents the discussion of important truths. It might make superficial people feel more comfortable, but it has serious, real-life consequences. Political correctness can be an unacceptable hindrance for serious people who want to see the world become a better place.

No other religion in the 21<sup>st</sup> century continues to promote medieval barbarism on such an epic scale as Muhammad's spiritual legacy. Supremacist Islam is religion taken to its most diabolic extreme. All democrats need to shine a bright light on this lethal ideology, so that not only conservatives, but also well-meaning, misinformed progressives can finally see it in all of its bloody, benighted glory. Reason and 21<sup>st</sup> century morality is based on empathy, compassion, and a desire to serve the greater good. Apparently some Muslims believe it's just impossible to say anything stupid, as long as your heartfelt convictions are inspired by Islam. In spite of all the assurances from Muslim apologists that Islam is a religion of peace, the number of people left of the center who find this hard to believe is growing. They realize that something smells not quite right in the world of burqas and beheadings. Yet most of our Western media keep insisting that the violence, misogyny, and mayhem are not inherent to the religion itself, but are the results of unrelated cultural quirks. We are told that the suicide bombings, the honor killings, the stonings, the female genital mutilations, the acid attacks, the forced marriages of underage girls, the slavery in royal households, the judicial amputations, the murderous rioting over cartoons, the virulent anti-Semitism, the hostility towards outsiders, the Sunni-Shia massacres, the public hangings of homosexuals, the beheadings of blasphemers and apostates, and the murder of outspoken infidels in Western cities are all the results of some-

thing else. Maybe it's poverty. A lack of education. A cultural hangover from a barbaric past. Tribal traditions. Political oppression. European and American imperialism. The political correctness types have all sorts of theories. The only thing they seem to agree on is that it has nothing to do with Islam.

But in reality, pure orthodox Islam is a nightmare religion, if it's being done properly. In fact, the more we study it, the more horrifying it becomes. And the more obvious it becomes that the radicals, extremists and fundamentalists are practicing Islam exactly the way the prophet Muhammad intended. It is about the way he himself practiced it, only without the aid of modern weaponry or fuel-laden jetliners. It's time for all of us to start being brutally honest regarding this brutal ideology. We're in for a fight, whether we want it or not, and whether it's to be fought with words or bullets. So we might as well get busy trying to neutralize our enemy's perverted program with vocal, determined opposition. We should do it with an informed public that values basic freedoms more than platitudes and political correctness. And with governments that vigorously defend free speech and freedom of the press against hostile, intolerant, would-be theocrats. With a sensible program of foreign policy, based on a realistic appraisal of traditional dogmatic Islam and the threat it poses to our pluralistic societies.

This has nothing to do with racism. This is about a hostile ideology, not skin color, language, or preferences in food or fashion. This is easily proven by the fact that former Muslims are warmly welcomed by anti-Islam activists in the West, even though their skin is still brown and they still have the funny accent. Secular Muslims are also welcome. They share our goals. So it's not about bigotry or prejudice. It's about the survival of the most enlightened cultures the world has ever produced. Cultures that some very clever people went to a lot of trouble to develop and foster over the last few centuries. It's about defending the progressive ideals we supposedly stand for, against a threat that's very real. Against enemies who are very, very determined. And well-funded thanks to our gas-guzzling cars and airplanes. And willing to kill, and die, for the most retrograde ideology on earth.

We need to do everything in our power to ensure that democracy, liberty, critical thinking, human rights, and basic human decency will dominate the world, instead of barbarism, misogyny, ignorance, and superstition. If ever there was a good fight, this is one. The end goals of the Islamists are as despicable as those of the Nazis and the Japanese of WWII. Their vision of a pure society is even more hellish than anything dreamt up by the fevered brains of Hitler or Goebbels. People who believe in progressive ideals, and support progressive agendas, need to get involved before the essential tools of free speech and freedom of the press are sacrificed. For the concerned citizen in the Western world, the first order of business is reversing the indoctrination program. We need to halt the steady erosion of our essential liberties, and vigorously reassert our right to speak plainly and openly about important issues, even if this means offending our ideological adversaries. We have no problem offending neo-Nazis. Therefore we should not have a problem offending people who try to spread supremacist Islam. This life-sucking ideology has survived for fourteen centuries because it's been sheltered from criticism by the combined forces of violence (on their part) and political correctness (on our part), and because its devotees have been insulated from the ideas of skeptics, who tend to be far more adept at critical thinking. It's time to change all of that. It's time for all progressives to join their conservative fellow citizens to do what we can to help eradicate this deadly mind virus called orthodox Islam, by resisting its spread in the West, and by undermining its central truth-claims, via honest conversations in all available venues. Let's make that happen on a global scale and stop the indoctrination pandemic. How this can be done is the topic of the next chapter.

## Chapter 9: Developing strategies to counter Islamic indoctrination and protect human rights

### 9.1 The main challenges to developing successful strategies

Traditional Islamic theology prejudices and corrupts the minds and spirits of her victims, and the dangerous doctrine has infected almost the whole body of Islam. The patient is in a very bad state, and many have little hope for any degree of recovery. But resignation is not the answer. We need to refine our ability to identify the malady and apply the necessary medicine to insure self-preservation, security, and prosperity for all. Though the future looks strewn with trial and sacrifice, and until the day the struggle begins on a large scale, opportunities abound to put our arms around clear-thinking, good-hearted Muslims to bring them out from the frenzy. There are many very intelligent families in the Arab and Asian world with good values that can recognize and reject political Islam when presented with the facts and given alternate opportunities to escape and exist peacefully. Education is the key. There will always be pockets of extremists, just as today there are still skin-heads who still worship Nazi philosophy, but they will eventually be isolated, marginalized, sanctioned, and censured, finally recognized by all for who and what they really are. So how do we proceed?

First of all, we need to realize that Islam's nature will always prevent it from accepting criticism or suggestions from outsiders. Reform will only occur from within, but then you have the problem that in Islamic societies men of Gandhi, Lincoln, Martin Luther's stature are killed as soon as they open their mouths. And as for non-Muslims in the West, the moment anyone mentions anything remotely critical of Islam, the first response you get hit with is 'you are an Islamophobe' or even 'you are a racist'. Zealous Muslims have correctly surmised that the *race card* carries much more weight in our super-sensitive society. Thin-skinned Muslims worldwide regard every criticism of Islamic culture or practice as Islamophobic and sacrilegious. Instead of invoking thoughtful reflection or introspection of any kind, any question or critique results in even more vitriolic anti-Western invectives. Intelligent debate or discussion is impossible, as in the end all debates are resolved as they are in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade play yard: through tantrums and name-calling. It appears that critical self-analysis of any kind is impossible for the world's best religion. The inability of the religion to engage in critical self-scrutiny continues to prevent any possibility of meaningful discussion with outsiders, which otherwise might assist in Islam's peaceful co-existence with other peoples and religions. What we need is a world in which spiritual truths can co-exist. Whether rabbi or son of god or prophet, in the realm of spiritual beliefs, truth must be an individual choice. What feels true to you might not feel true to me. If we want to look for common truths, science is a good candidate. Science can unite humanity and make people overcome their petty differences. There is no Christian science. There is no Islamic science. There is only one science. Yet we know that not everyone understands this message.

So the real issue here is what the West can do to inspire and help Muslims choose moderation over extremism. Since the West is locked out of the internal debate, and suggestions or criticisms from inferior infidels cannot be permitted, the role we can play is this: We can provide an example of the advantages of democracy, freedom, and respect for human rights, and we can (and must) demonstrate to Muslims the futility and error of choosing fundamentalist, expansionist Islam by soundly defeating every attack. Demonstrating the whole range of the advantages that we enjoy (and often take for granted) is easier when we know about Islam's underlying problems and disadvantages.

We should definitely promote interfaith dialog and discussions with truly moderate Muslims, because they are the key to changing the Islamic world. We also should engage in debate with orthodox Muslims, for example in the numerous online forums, not with the goal to change their mind (which, as we have seen, is practically impossible), but with the goal of understanding their way of thinking and the goal of exposing the intolerance, rigidity, and ignorance of pure Islam. Keep in mind that there are thousands of young Muslims who frequent these forums. In the Internet age many of them have not made up their mind. Many have doubts about Islam (which they keep to themselves) and find the ideas of democracy, human rights, progress, individual freedom and the pursuit of happiness quite appealing. They will respect non-Muslims who possess substantial knowledge about Islam. Many will appreciate our analytical skills and the quality and depth of our debates based on logical consistency and factual accuracy. We can hope that more and more Muslims realize the difference between free and totalitarian societies, like the East Germans did. It was them who tore down the Berlin Wall, not the West Germans. The silent majority in the East realized it was time to break the silence. Likewise it has to be the Muslims themselves who have to tear down the walls of their 7<sup>th</sup> century mindset prison. This is by no means guaranteed, and right now, too many fanatics continue to threaten our way of life.

## **9.2 Educating yourself and educating others**

The fact that you are reading this document right now means that you have already taken the first important step. In order to counter Islamic indoctrination and the threat that it poses to our values, we need to take the next step which is equally important: educating others. The most important task we have to accomplish is to educate our fellow citizens about Islam's prime directive, which is Allah dominating and ruling the world. For your personal friends and family members who remain ignorant about the disturbing nature of Islamic doctrine, it's up to you to try change their minds. Speaking truthfully about Islam is the best start. Islam is its own worst enemy in that the more that is known about it, the less attractive it becomes to everyone. Some Westerners, particularly those with children (and an investment in the future), are far-sighted enough to trace the eventual end game of current trends that clearly indicate increasing Islamization both in Islamic and Western countries. Even the recent democratic elections in Egypt produced an Islamist president and an Islamist parliamentary majority.

We should also go over what shouldn't be done about the problem. Unfortunately, a few of our freedom-loving fellow citizens engage in acts that are unacceptable and in clear violation of the Golden Rule. The rule states in its positive form that one should treat others as one would like others to treat oneself. The negative form says that one should not treat others in ways that one would not like to be treated. Therefore, when you want to promote freedom, equal opportunity and universal secular values, do

- not hurt Muslims. Westerners generally don't have a problem with this anyway, and have shown remarkable restraint in the wake of horrendous terror attacks. Bottom line: You don't know any terrorists. The Muslims that you know in your private life are not terrorists. They might not even be orthodox Muslims. Don't harm them or protect anyone who does. They're our fellow human beings.
- not harass Muslims. The Muslims that you know personally are probably not much different than you are. They have the same concerns for their children's future and the same interests in getting ahead in life. They do not deserve to be harassed on account of a religion that they probably either don't understand all that well or may not even believe too sincerely anyway.

- not publicly abuse copies of the Qur'an. It doesn't accomplish anything other than giving radicals another reason to play the victim, get angry, and perhaps hurt someone. It's also juvenile and offensive. Treat the Qur'an the way that you would prefer Muslims treat whatever book that you consider sacred, even if you strongly disagree with the Qur'an's content.

If you want to confront Islam, then you must be honest and objective, rather than rude and slanderous. Don't exaggerate or use absolutes. Even moderate Muslims will find disparaging insults of the prophet Muhammad difficult to handle. Don't make general judgments and rather talk about Muhammad's behavior the way you understand it. Sometimes it can be useful to begin critical remarks with 'It seems to me...' or 'I was told that...'. This gives the other person the chance to object or clarify some aspects without directing his or her anger at you.

Don't say that all Muslims are bad people, because they aren't, or that everything about Islam is bad, because it isn't. The key to stopping Islamic indoctrination is education, because the more that is known about this 7<sup>th</sup> century religion, the less appeal it will have in today's world. Muslim defenders know this, which is why they hide behind censorship and book banning in the Islamic world and desperate appeals to political correctness and multiculturalism in the West. Muslim organizations, such as CAIR, often rely on outright falsehood to deceive others into dropping their defenses. Non-Muslim Westerners should understand that there is no reason to place Islam above criticism or Muslims above offense merely on that basis. In fact, there is every reason not to do this, as we have seen in chapters 5 and 6. Islamic law poses a threat to nearly every liberal value that the West holds dear. Learn as much as you can about why orthodox Islam is dangerous. Understand its history. Learn how thousands of people can do brutal things each year explicitly in the name of Islam and Allah, while a billion others never seem to be terribly bothered about it.

In short, educate yourself properly. Only then can you educate others. And they can educate others as well. Remember, Islam is not just a religion, but also a political system. Write to political leaders. Inform them. Make them accountable for each compromised standard and every freedom lost in the name of appeasement to Islam. Expose the lies and double-standards. Denounce the hypocrisy of Muslim nations. Speak truthfully. Speak tactfully. But keep in mind that telling your friends the disturbing truth about Islam's supremacist nature is difficult for many reasons. People often have a strong emotional reaction at the mere mention of the subject. If you talk to people about Islam, you will get a variety of responses from people. You might have a willing listener who learns from you, or one who listens skeptically, or one who outright rejects everything you say or who won't let you even finish. They will argue with you. Some will defend Islam, even when they don't know anything about it, see also Appendix I.

As mentioned earlier, not many Muslims have read the Qur'an or understand it, partly because it has been made difficult to understand, and sometimes because many Muslims are only Muslim in name only, or simply Muslim by birth, and they haven't taken the time to learn what they're supposed to do, and if they have, they're not interested in pursuing it. Many Muslims are secretly heterodox, but still somewhat vulnerable to recruitment. Their children are more vulnerable to recruitment, which explains why a new study in Britain found that second generation British Muslims are more radical than their immigrant parents.

### 9.3 Multiculturalism based on tolerance and mutual respect

Tolerance and mutual respect for different cultures and religions is great, as long as it is mutual. When it's not mutual, then tolerance becomes a self-destructive doctrine. When it is not mutual, one side gives and the other side takes. In normal parlance, it is called being a doormat. Islamic supremacism is religiously sanctioned intolerance, and many in the West tolerate the intolerance out of a blind multiculturalism. But multiculturalism (respect for other cultures) need not be blind. The addition of one simple distinction is all that is needed. Here's a proposal published on the Citizen Warrior website:

When I was younger, I lacked the distinction in my own personal life. I had read the book, *How to Win Friends & Influence People* by Dale Carnegie, when I was very young, and it had a profound effect on the way I treated people. And for the most part, the effect was good. The basic approach to Carnegie's book is to give to people, to trust them, to see the best in them, etc. When you do this, people will respond positively, and they'll give back to you and trust you and they'll want to fulfill your trust, etc. This approach has worked great for almost everybody I've ever met, because most people reciprocate. It becomes a mutual thing. But several times in my life I ran into people who only took advantage of my kindness or generosity. They took, and sometimes not only did they not reciprocate, but sometimes they've even responded to my kindness by stabbing me in the back. They weren't interested in cooperating. They didn't care about good long-term relations. With those people, I had to figure out a different way of dealing with them. I had to make an extra distinction. My tolerance and goodwill were blind. I did it with everyone indiscriminately, and that's just stupid. A few years ago, a biography of Dale Carnegie came out, and I found out that Carnegie left out a chapter in his book. He didn't get the chapter to the publisher on time so the book was published without it.

The missing chapter was about what to do with uncooperative, selfish, self-serving people. A small percentage of the population doesn't have normal human empathy. The way you deal with these people must be different or you're just being foolish. A very similar thing is happening with orthodox Islam and multiculturalism. There is nothing wrong with the multicultural doctrine as such. Nothing at all. It's wonderful, in fact. One of the reasons democracies are so much more enjoyable countries to live in than non-democratic countries is because we are so tolerant of each other.

But the multiculturalism doctrine is incomplete. It is a great strategy for most people and most cultures and most religions. But it is disastrous when you stick with it blindly. All that's missing is the added distinction of mutuality. We can simply amend the doctrine to something like this: We respect all religions and cultures that do us the honor of respecting ours as well. All others will be treated with less generosity. Another characteristic of both selfish people and Islamic supremacists is the use of deception. They pretend to be thoughtful and kind. They pretend to be peaceful, tolerant, and cooperative. They try to fool their victims into keeping their guard down. They pretend in order to gain an advantage. Over time, most of us have learned to pay attention to what people do and see if it matches what moderate Muslims say. Most of us who have lived long enough do not automatically trust everyone. We give people a chance to earn our trust. That's a sensible way to live.

Orthodox Muslims often try to fool non-Muslims in the same way selfish people do. They mimic peaceful religious people. They try to act as if they believe what we believe (see the principle of religious deception), and this makes it more difficult to determine whether or not these are co-operators or back-stabbers. But

we can apply the same principles we use in our personal lives. We can watch what they do and see if it matches what they say. We don't have to automatically trust. Let them earn our trust.

If we didn't automatically trust, we could see that some are intolerant, uncooperative, and even blood-thirsty, and not the cooperative people they pretend to be. If we pay attention, we will see some Muslims are not mutually respectful. In fact, they actively exploit our well-ingrained respect for other cultures, and use it against us, considering it a weakness they can exploit. For years, the Wahhabi Muslims in Saudi Arabia have been spending their oil-enriched billions building mosques all over the Western democracies. They then preach hatred of the West in those mosques, and we have been allowing this. In poorer Islamic countries such as Pakistan they build madrassas whose goal is the brainwashing of young boys.

Our strategy to counter such blatant indoctrination must include shutting down the mosques and madrassas where hatred is being preached.

#### **9.4 Energy independence and boycotts**

There is so much to be gained from developing clean, renewable energy sources that we would really have to be insane not to make this a top priority. If we stop buying crude oil, the Saudis and others like them will have less money for funding madrassas in Muslim countries and radical mosques in the West. Eliminating our dependence on foreign oil would also mean that the U.S. and other NATO countries supporting them could stop wasting trillions of dollars on bone-headed military invasions of oil-rich Muslim nations. We need to convince our political leaders that it's time to get serious about developing solar energy, wind power, geothermal, and hydrogen fuel cell technology. Some very smart people believe that this should be our generation's Manhattan Project. Only this time, the enemies aren't fascist thugs, but our own addictions to fossil fuels. Without dramatic change, we are chugging our way straight into an environmental nightmare by overusing our atmosphere. To make matters worse, peak oil will be reached in the near future, and will have disastrous economic effects if we are not ready to transition to alternative fuels.

Making the switch to clean, safe, renewable energy sources in the next two decades is entirely doable. The only thing holding us back is a lack of robust leadership, and the right-wingers who keep hitting the brakes by telling us that mainstream adoption of those technologies is still a long way off. In the United States we should turn the American Southwest into a giant solar energy generating plant. In Europe something similar can be done in the southern parts of Spain, Portugal, Italy and Greece, all countries most affected by the euro crisis and in need of new economic opportunities. In the rest of North America and Europe we should build vast wind farms. Of course, while we are developing the renewable energy infrastructure, we can already stop driving gas-guzzling vehicles and switch to fuel-efficient ones that get triple or quadruple the gas mileage. All of this would disrupt the Islamists' program, making them less capable of carrying out terrorist plots, or funding madrassas in the Muslim world that promote Jihad and hatred of infidels.

The reason the world was relatively Jihad-free for nearly three hundred years (from the late 1600s to the late 1900s) is that, for the most part, Muslims were very poor and powerless. Devout Muslims were unable to engage in Jihad, because their outdated weaponry would not get the job done against Europeans armed with more modern muskets and artillery, and later on rifles, machine guns, and warplanes. The underlying cause of this shift in military might was that during this period, Western civilization had begun to shake off its abject slavery to superstition and embrace reason, science, and technology. True believers couldn't

afford to buy these shiny new instruments of death and destruction, let alone produce those high-tech weapons themselves, because they had spent the last thousand years wallowing in superstition and ignorance, and thinking about how great it was to be part of the world's best religion.

It is time to make the Islamists feel helpless again. It is time to pull the plug on the money machine that funds them, by putting an end to our oil addiction. Anyone concerned about the threat of orthodox Islam should jump on this bandwagon, and start promoting clean, safe, locally-produced energy. This way we will both save our free societies and the whole planet.

A second method to strike where it hurts most, which is in the pocketbook, makes use of specifically targeted boycotts. They are aimed towards those companies that support orthodox Islam, either because it's profitable for them or because they wish to be portrayed in a positive light and be seen as supporters of the blind multicultural ideology. This isn't about small-scale boycotts, which will only have a miniscule effect on those on the receiving end, but massive international boycotts, which will have severe repercussion for those companies that are being targeted.

What if a group of resourceful individuals got together and created a professionally run website that would focus solely on targeting those who profit on aiding the Islamists and seek to downplay the consequences of this dangerous ideology. What if this website eventually managed to be linked to by all the major Islam-critical internet sites in Europe and America. The effect could be enormous as this website begins to grow and become one of the bigger sites on the Internet, with tens of thousands, perhaps even hundreds of thousands of hits every day. The purpose of this website would be to single out corporations, newspapers, universities and so forth, which are supporting orthodox Islam, by either caving in to the true believers' demands or by offering Muslim-only services.

The Islamic world was quick to boycott Danish products after Jyllands-Posten published the Muhammad cartoons. Now it's time that the free people boycott companies that profit from business with countries run by Islamists. Consumer power shouldn't be underestimated and money is what makes the wheels go around. If a company is faced with the very real possibility of having to close down, due to intense economic sanctions, it would do everything in its power to try and reverse the situation. In such an environment companies would re-evaluate their strategy. It's not that hard, through a well-organized campaign, to inflict a substantial amount of pain and misery by applying this tactic. It gives average people an opportunity to make his and her voice heard.

The website could be the springboard from which to launch massive boycott campaigns, for example against banks that offer Sharia-compliant financial products. There is a list of all the products to boycott, along with an explanation as to why this boycott is necessary, and a message to the companies affected by these boycotts about what they need to do to put an end to the boycotts. There should also be letters and emails published on this site, which the readers then could send off to the heads of these companies, expressing their concern about these companies support of undemocratic Islamic interest groups.

The third powerful measure concerns tourism. People should refuse to spend their vacation in countries run by Islamist governments or countries that do not support the separation of state and religion. People should also make the threat to stop spending their vacation in moderate Islamic countries that fail to deal with Islamists properly. A good example is Indonesia. Human Rights Watch observed that in 2011 incidents



of religious violence got more deadly and more frequent, as Islamist militants mobilized mobs to attack religious minorities with impunity. The government failed to overturn several decrees that discriminate between religions and foster intolerance, see also Appendix H.

In the year 2010 about 15 million tourists visited Egypt. After the successful Arab Spring revolution, as mentioned before, the recent democratic elections in Egypt produced an Islamist president and an Islamist parliamentary majority. In July 2012, Dr. Yassir al-Burhami, a prominent figure in Egypt's Salafi movement, issued a fatwa, published in the *Voice of the Righteous Salaf*, in which he forbids Muslim taxi-drivers and bus-drivers from transporting Coptic priests to their churches. He depicted such an act as more forbidden than taking someone to a bar that serves alcohol. This analogy comes from early Islamic scholars who saw the building of churches as being worse than building bars or brothels, because churches symbolize infidelity, whereas bars and brothels only represent immorality. Al-Burhami is known to advocate the killing of apostates as an example to other Muslims. Few people in Egypt seem terribly bothered about this. Shouldn't this be reason enough for tourists to boycott this country?

### **9.5 Seeking alliances and building good relations with truly moderate Muslims**

People in our societies who are worried about the spread of orthodox Islam should not make the mistake to ignore the more liberal schools of thought in Islam. Any Muslim individual or group who works for genuine reform of the Islamic doctrines, theological tenets and laws that Islamic Jihadists use to justify violence, is to be commended. But this reform must be undertaken honestly and thoroughly, confronting the texts of the Qur'an and Sunnah that are used to justify violence against unbelievers, and decisively rejecting Qur'anic literalism.

The most vocal anti-Jihadists keep repeating the message that Islam cannot be reformed. They point out that all efforts in this direction have failed for the past 1,400 years. That's a pretty convincing argument. Nonetheless, we cannot conclude that because of this, reform can never happen. There are many spiritually-inclined secular Muslims who refuse to accept that orthodox Muslims hold a monopoly on interpreting the Qur'an and Hadith. Whether their new efforts succeed or not, there is still the fact that secular Muslims who come up with reform proposals strongly oppose orthodox Islam. They are our allies and we should build good relations with them. It's only fair that we look at their proposals, no matter how visionary or impractical they might seem at the moment (see also Appendix D, F and J).

The reformist Islamic thinker Muhammad Shahrur's work is a comprehensive attempt to reconcile the religion of Islam with modern philosophy as well as the rational worldview of the natural sciences. According to him, jurisprudence in the name of God is a farce benefiting only those wanting to maintain political power. For Shahrur, the Syrian engineer and interpreter of the Qur'an, the key recognition is that there is only one God, but many paths to reach him. And since the very beginning of his reformist work about two decades ago, he has clearly and vehemently pleaded for Muslims to turn to the revealed text themselves as the true criteria of divine truth instead of being subservient to the authority of Islamic law. Within the macropolitical context, Shahrur goes a step further and calls for a fundamental critique of Islamic culture and religion on the basis of a diagnosis of contemporary circumstances. According to him, there can be no real political reform in Islamic countries without far-reaching religious reforms, because Islam is for all intents and purposes the sole dominating normative force in the Arab world. Cultural and religious reforms are more important than political ones, as they are the preconditions for any secular reforms.

Although Shahrur has explicitly stressed that his reform work is primarily a contemporary reading of revealed texts with the declared goal of formulating an Islamic theory of divinity that is at once both human and universal, the orthodox Islamic community has reacted to his reformist approach with massive campaign of defamation. As expected, more than a few commentators in the Arab mass media have called for him to be taken to court for disparaging the person of the Prophet. At least 19 books have since been published as refutations of Shahrur's provocative views, not to mention countless articles and media reports. Yet he still holds the position that everything said or written about the text of the Qur'an, including comments by the Prophet Muhammad, as being historically limited.

Corresponding to his historically dependent interpretation of the Qur'an, Shahrur does not regard the Sunnah of the Prophet as a sacred source of Islamic moral law. Muhammad did indeed enjoy an especially close relationship to God, but was nonetheless a normal human being, who was shaped by the Arabic culture of the seventh century and its level of knowledge. This approach has inevitably led Shahrur into fierce conflict with Islamic legal scholars, who view the Sunnah of the Prophet including the Hadith as the second authoritative source of Islamic law. Shahrur steadfastly maintains the thesis that all traditionally accepted normative statements in the Qur'an must be seen as historically conditional. On the basis of this premise, he formulates a so-called 'theory of limits' as a universal solution to address divinely prescribed norms of behavior. He frames the Sharia so that it is compatible with the universal understanding of democracy and human rights. Penal legislation that finds itself between the two boundaries lies within the decision-making powers of a democratically elected parliament. Through his understanding of God's commandments as limits, Shahrur sees numerous possibilities now open to legislation. In addition, he demands the complete depoliticization of Islam, insofar as he stresses the necessity of the division of state and religion. He expressed some of his central ideas in an interview with Ahmad H.:

'I have often written that religious-cultural reforms must come before political reforms. The Islamic legal theory that applies today dates from an era when Islam was a great power and the Islamic state was the strongest state in the world. The cultural reform that we so urgently need today must be a fundamental religious reform. It must include all those ideas on which the people who perpetrated the September 11 attacks based their interpretations of sources. I think that the average Muslim knows that suicide is forbidden by Islam. But there are still people who kill either themselves or an entire group of people. These terrorists have to have a watertight argument based on Islamic law for carrying out these acts. To date, the legally watertight arguments used by them have not been discussed or declared to be wrong. I don't think that anyone is even in a position to do so, because the sources that are taught at Al-Azhar in Egypt are the same as those used by Osama bin Laden and Aiman al-Zawahiri. But one person picks, another chooses, and yet another selects from these sources the things that suit them. We cannot go on without a radical religious reform in the Arab world, like the one initiated by Martin Luther. We have reached a dead end and are stuck in a dark tunnel.

We must completely rethink the fundamental principles. It is said that the independent interpretation of sources is allowed, and I agree with that. However, we simply have to rethink the fundamental principles. It is also said that the fixed values of religion cannot be rethought. But I say that it is exactly these values that we must study and rethink. We must draw new religious comparisons. If we don't, there is no hope for us, because we will continue living in the past and referring to the ideas of legal scholars who died more than 1,000 years ago. This is why I would like to stress once again that I don't believe political reform is possible

without religious reform. The 9/11 attacks showed many people that a reform movement and the revision of Islamic law have become an urgent necessity. It also showed that freedom and life are values that are not very marked in the Arab Islamic world. People now know that what the religious fanatics are doing in Afghanistan and Iraq is just leading to a dead end, because it is impossible to liberate a country with ideas like that. A reform movement remains ineffective as long as the legal foundations of Islam, which are the foundations on which this terrorism is based, have not been discussed. The United States and the Western world have presented the Arab Islamic world with reform plans, for example the alteration of the school curricula. But given that the moderate legal scholars at Al-Azhar are incapable of dealing with Al-Qaeda terrorists, how are they supposed to change the curricula? That would require a re-examination of the entire Islamic religion.

Almost every week we hear people say that we are inferior because God has made us weak. This weakness is the love of life and the hatred of death. In other words, anyone who loves life and hates death should feel guilty. I love life, so I am guilty. This has become a culture that is taught not only by Al-Qaeda, but also by absolutely every legal scholar. And we hear it every week on television, as if it were the most self-evident thing in the world. Traditional Islam is based on fundamental principles and religious thoughts that have not been declared wrong by official religious institutions. That is a problem, because it allows extremists to recruit large numbers of supporters. So the reformation of Islam requires the complete replacement of fundamental principles.'

## **9.6 A double-agent strategy stealth anti-Jihadist Muslims can use**

The so-called War of Ideas is a clash of opposing ideals, ideologies, or concepts through which nations or groups use strategic influence to promote their interests. The battle space of this conflict is winning the hearts and minds of the population. A very effective strategy to push back orthodox Islam is truly moderate Muslims targeting young Muslims who have not yet made up their mind, using as much influence as possible. A good approach to do this is through the use of Islamic Internet forums. Most of those forums are also open to non-Muslims, usually with the goal to convert them. Orthodox Muslims act as the experts on Islam. Moderate Muslims should try to influence undecided Muslims and prevent them from becoming orthodox. Non-Muslims can back up the views of moderate Muslims. A good approach is to start asking critical questions, for example: Why does Allah want you to trim your mustache and grow a beard? Why is he preoccupied with such trivial things? Why would Allah have to bribe his followers by promising them loot? Why do you say there's no compulsion in religion even though the Hadith says you should hit kids who don't pray? And the Qur'an encourages people to drink milk and tells us it is something being served in the Muslim Paradise, but if you claim the potential health risk of alcohol was enough to cause its prohibition, why not also ban the drinking of milk which is potentially more harmful because most of the world's population in the past and present is lactose intolerant? If milk is allowed, why are not all people biologically designed to digest milk?

At some point this will get them into trouble with orthodox forum users. In this case they could explain in private messages that they are applying Taqiyya for the benefit of the non-Muslim forum users. Of course, this will be a white lie about the lies. They are stealth anti-Jihadists who have joined non-Muslims in the War of Ideas by secretly fighting the orthodox system in Muslim communities. In doing so, they become *double agents* who in fact support freedom, democracy and human rights. In real life the situation is more

complicated. We have already mentioned that many Muslims are secretly heterodox, while giving the appearance of an orthodox Muslim. In this case heterodox Muslims should try to undermine the indoctrination system whenever possible without getting caught. A lot of people in the West are concerned about moderate Muslims not really being moderate. In reality there might be an equally large number of orthodox Muslims who are not really orthodox. What's missing is the step to becoming active participants and changing the system. As long as the silent majority remains silent and passive nothing is gained. What does this mean for us? We can in fact encourage truly moderate Muslims to assume responsibility and to take an active role in creating change. Doing this online is a good start. It's easy to remain anonymous. On the Internet they can help defend human rights and develop a culture of peace.

## **9.7 The importance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights**

On December 10, 1948 the General Assembly adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by a vote of 48 in favor, 0 against, with eight abstentions. Among the 48 countries voting in favor are Islamic countries like Afghanistan, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, and Turkey. When debating Muslims you can always ask questions whether the following articles of the Human Rights Declaration are supported by Islamic doctrine:

- Article 1: All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood.
- Article 2: Everyone is entitled to all rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.
- Article 3: Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.
- Article 4: No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.
- Article 5: No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.
- Article 6: Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.
- Article 16: Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution. Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.
- Article 18: Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.
- Article 19: Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinion without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

If the answer is yes, reply by saying: I was told that women's

- testimony in a court of law is worth half that of a man
- movement is strictly restricted
- wish to marry a non-Muslim cannot be granted
- rights of divorce are not equal.

Next you can point out the punishments which are in store for the transgressors of the Holy Law: amputations, crucifixion, stoning to death, floggings. A Muslim could argue that these were not unusual for a Muslim country, but what of their inhumanity? Again a Muslim could contend that they are of divine origin and must not be judged by human criteria. Yet by human standards, they are inhuman.

Non-Muslims living in Muslim countries have inferior status under Islamic law, and may not testify against a Muslim. In Saudi Arabia, it's even worse than that. The country follows a tradition of Muhammad who said: "Two religions cannot exist in the country of Arabia. Non-Muslims are forbidden to practice their religion, build churches, and possess Bibles."

As we have seen in chapter 5, disbelievers and atheists in Muslim countries do not have 'the right to life' mentioned in the Declaration's article 3. They are to be killed. Islamic jurisprudence generally divides sins into great sins and little sins. Of the seventeen great sins, unbelief is the greatest, more heinous than murder, theft and adultery. Slavery is recognized in the Qur'an. Muslims are allowed to cohabit with any of their female slaves and they are allowed to take possession of married women if they are slaves. This violation of the Declaration's article 4 cannot be explained away.

The notion of an individual who is capable of taking rational decisions and accepting moral responsibility for his free acts is lacking in orthodox Islam. Ethics is reduced to obeying orders. Of course, there is the notion of an individual who has legal obligations, but not in the sense of an individual who may freely set the goals and contents of his life, of the individual who may decide what meaning he wants to give to his life. In Islam, it is Allah and the Holy Law which set limits as to the possible agenda of people's lives. This principle contradicts the articles 18 and 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. During debate you can use current examples of human rights violations related to Islamic doctrine and Sharia law, see appendix H.

The principles of human rights are autonomous, universal and do not depend on any appeal to divine authority. These principles are rational, and can be argued for without recourse to supernatural knowledge. In fact, the compatibilists accepted the validity of the principles prior to their search for their spurious antecedents. Progress toward liberal democracy with respect for international human rights in the Muslim world will depend on the radical and critical reappraisal of the dogmatic foundations of Islam, rigorous self-criticism without comforting delusions of a glorious past, of a Golden Age of total Muslim victory in all spheres, the separation of religion and state, and the adoption of secularism. But secularism will never be adopted as long as it is seen as a Western 'disease', until the Muslim world has laid aside its unjustified, irrational, and ultimately destructive fear and loathing of the West and comes to a just recognition of the West's true values, and to a deep understanding of the philosophical foundations of liberalism and democracy. So we have to intensify our efforts for the promotion of these foundations.

## 9.8 Getting people to sign the Charter for Compassion

We need to show well-meaning and educated Muslims alternative ways and ask for their commitment and support for making the world a better place. The Charter for Compassion was created under the assumptions that the principle of compassion lies at the heart of all religious, ethical and spiritual traditions, calling us always to treat all others as we wish to be treated ourselves [even the early Meccan Surahs acknowledge that]. Compassion impels us to work tirelessly to alleviate the suffering of our fellow creatures, to dethrone ourselves from the center of our world and put another there, and to honor the inviolable sanctity of every single human being, treating everybody, without exception, with absolute justice, equity and respect. It is also necessary in both public and private life to refrain consistently and empathically from inflicting pain. To act or speak violently out of spite, chauvinism, or self-interest, to impoverish, exploit or deny basic rights to anybody, and to incite hatred by denigrating others (even our enemies) is a denial of our common humanity. We have to acknowledge that we have failed to live compassionately and that some have even increased the sum of human misery in the name of religion.

We therefore call upon all men and women to

- restore compassion to the center of morality and religion
- return to the principle that any interpretation of scripture that breeds violence, hatred or disdain is illegitimate
- ensure that youth are given accurate and respectful information about other traditions, religions and cultures
- encourage a positive appreciation of cultural and religious diversity
- cultivate an informed empathy with the suffering of all human beings, even those regarded as enemies.

We urgently need to make compassion a clear, luminous and dynamic force in our polarized world. Rooted in a principled determination to transcend selfishness, compassion can break down political, dogmatic, ideological and religious boundaries. Born of our deep interdependence, compassion is essential to human relationships and to a fulfilled humanity. It is the path to enlightenment, and indispensable to the creation of a just economy and a peaceful global community. Signing the Charter at [charterforcompassion.org](http://charterforcompassion.org) and asking others to do the same can help counter Islamic indoctrination and protect human rights. It also shows people who want change that they are not alone.

## 9.9 Final note

Many Muslims feel threatened by political Islam as well. They are on our side, even if they can't say so openly. Many of them have realized that they are trapped in a system that is difficult to escape from. There is considerable peer pressure and not everyone is willing to risk his or her life by trying to change Islam or even leaving it. Those Muslims need our support, not our wrath. They are our fellow human beings. Even pious Muslims supporting the Sharia are our fellow human beings. Some of them have been brainwashed since elementary school. Some got their brainwashing at some radical mosque when they were insecure, vulnerable teenagers. Everybody deserves a second chance. Many people have the capacity to change their minds. Our love for humanity should always come first. It should widen, not narrow, our hearts.

## **Appendix A - An overview of Islam and why it has been so successful**

If one wanted to deliberately design a collection of ideas and beliefs with the purpose of making one that might eventually out-compete every other religion or political system on earth, we would be hard-pressed to do better than Islam. Here we present twenty-eight key components of the package of ideas (or bundle of beliefs) known as Islam:

1. A standardized version of the set of beliefs (idea collection) is written down. This is something basic to several religions and isn't an Islamic invention, but it is an important factor in the success of Islam. Something only transmitted orally can change over time, but something written will be identical a thousand years from now, and with modern printing presses, can be reproduced in the millions, giving it an enormous advantage in spreading identical copies of the idea collection.
2. The Qur'an includes instructions for its own spread. It tells believers they must spread Islam. It is their holy duty to bring Muhammad's warnings and Islamic law to every corner of the world.
3. The idea collection includes instructions for its own preservation, protection, and duplication. The Qur'an, the most important of the Islamic holy books, directly tells its followers that they can never change or modify or modernize any of the teachings within the collection. It is perfect as it is. Despite the attempts of some liberal Muslims, it is a capital sin to try to change any of the teachings. This principle ensures the preservation of the whole collection.
4. Islam commands its followers to create a government that supports it. This may be one of the most ingenious ideas in the whole collection. Islam is the only religion that uses it. Other groups of religious people have had political aspirations, but no other major religious group orders its followers, as a religious duty, to create a government that follows its own system of law. Islam has the system of law called Sharia, and all Muslims are obligated to continually strive to make their government, wherever they are, follow it. Because of some of the other ideas added to Islam, you will see that this political addition to the idea collection has significant consequences. Many people are under the impression that the goal of Islam is to convert everyone to Islam. But the prime directive of Islam is to bring all people on earth under the rule of Islamic law.
5. There is the permission to spread the religion by war. This is another successful innovation. Although some other religions have spread themselves using force, they had very little justification from their own religious doctrines to do so. Not so with Islam. Expanding by conquest is very much accepted and encouraged by the idea collection. Islamic teachings present it this way: The non-Muslims need to be saved from the sin of following laws other than Allah's. If they won't voluntarily change their laws to Sharia, then it is a Muslim's duty to insist. The world cannot be at peace until every government on earth follows the laws of Allah. Muhammad's own experience showed the example, an example, says the Qur'an 91 times, that every Muslim should follow. At first, Muhammad tried to spread Islam by peaceful means. After thirteen years he'd gained 150 converts. But then he changed tactics and started using caravan raids, warfare, executions, ransoming captives, and assassination, and within ten years he converted tens of thousands. After he died, his followers used the same tactics and converted millions. And by now it is one and a half billion. The use of warfare combines synergistically and powerfully with the instruction to create an Islamic state. So Islam spread quickly as their armies got bigger. They conquered and set up Islamic states, most of which have lasted to this day, and the laws within an Islamic state make Islam very difficult to dislodge.

The laws also make it very advantageous to convert to Islam. This is one of the most effective methods ever invented for getting a set of beliefs followed by huge numbers of people. It's a method of control and indoctrination similar to those used successfully in totalitarian states. But as you'll discover below, Islam makes unique use of the power of the law to enforce complete conversion to the religion. Islam started under unique conditions. All other major religions were started within an already-existing state. Islam is a historical exception to this rule. Any organized government will, of course, put a stop to violent uprisings of a rebellious political group, especially one that wants to wage war and apply its own system of law. Christianity arose within the Roman Empire, for example. If Christianity had been a militant or political uprising, Rome would probably have killed or imprisoned the followers. Probably many military or political religions did start up then, but we've never heard of them. They couldn't get off the ground. But Islam arose in Arabia when there was no central ruling power. The whole area was comprised of individual tribes. Under those circumstances, conversion by war and the use of force was possible.

6. Lands must be conquered. Lands that Islam has lost must be reconquered (Spain and Israel, for example). The Islamic empire must continually expand. Contraction is bad; expansion is good. So if a land was once Islamic and now it is not, that's contraction, and must be remedied. According to Islamic teachings, the earth is Allah's. If there are parts of the earth not following Islamic law, it is the duty of the faithful to gain control of that land and establish Sharia. It is a sin to let it be.

7. The idea collection provides new soldiers by allowing polygamy. According to Sharia law, a Muslim man can marry up to four wives, and he can have sex with as many slave girls as he wishes. The Qur'an especially encourages men to marry widows. Men can also marry Christian women, but all children must be Muslims. These are important ideas to add if you are going to be losing a lot of soldiers in war. You need some way of replenishing your army. Otherwise the idea collection could die out from a lack of offspring. Women are regulated to being nothing more than servants to their husbands and baby factories for orthodox Islam.

8. It is a punishable offense to criticize Islam. You can see why this one is a good supporting idea for the collection. It helps suppress any ideas that would reduce the authority of Islamic ideas. This idea is in the Qur'an, and Muhammad set a fierce example of punishing people who criticized him or Islam.

9. You can't leave Islam once you're in. It is illegal in Islamic states to convert out of Islam. This is a critical part of Sharia law. Someone who has rejected Islam who was once a Muslim is an apostate. This is a crime and a sin, and the punishment for it is death with eternal damnation in hell thereafter. Obviously, you can see why this idea has been included in the collection, but this one has actually caused Islam a problem because those who are following Islam to the letter consider more moderate Muslims (those who want to ignore or alter the more violent passages of the Qur'an) to be apostates. Another idea in Sharia law says it's against the law for anyone to try to convert a Muslim to another religion.

10. Islam must be your first allegiance. You are a Muslim first, before any allegiance you give to your family, your tribe, or your country. This does two things: It causes a unity of people across borders, which allows the group to grow bigger than any other entity. In other words, the 'Nation of Islam' can grow bigger than any country, no matter how large, which gives the group a massive numerical advantage.

11. Dying while fighting for Islam is the only way to guarantee a man's entrance into Paradise. This belief creates fearless, enthusiastic warriors, especially given the Qur'an's vivid descriptions of the sensuous de-



lights of Paradise. A Muslim man has a chance of getting to Paradise if he is a good Muslim, but it is not guaranteed. However, if he dies while fighting for Islam, he is guaranteed to get in, and that's the only thing he can do to guarantee it.

12. You must read the Qur'an in Arabic. This unites believers by language, and language has a very powerful unifying influence. For added incentive to learn Arabic, another basic Islamic principle says you can't go to Paradise unless you pray in Arabic. So Muslims all over the world share a language. This makes it easier to coordinate far-reaching campaigns of protest, political pressure, and war.

13. You must pray five times a day. This is one of the five 'pillars', that is, one of the five central practices, of Islam. Within an Islamic state, this practice is enforced by law. Every Muslim must pray five times a day. The practice helps Islam dominate a Muslim's life, filling his daily rhythm with Islam. It would be impossible to forget anything you deliberately do so often. Five times a day, every day, a Muslim must bow down and pray to Allah. Research has shown that the more effort a person expends for a cause, the more he is likely to believe in it and value it. So this is a good way to eventually make believers out of people who became Muslims through coercion. Islam completely takes over every aspect of Muslims' lives. Not only are they required to pray five times a day, they have to go through a washing ritual beforehand. Islam dictates the laws, and the laws cover many public and private behaviors. In an Islamic state, it is impossible to be a casual Muslim.

14. The prayers involve moving together in time. When Muslims pray, they all face the same direction, they bow down, get on their hands and knees, and put their face on the mat, all in unison, and then rise back up. Again and again. When people move together in time, whether dancing or marching or praying, it creates a physical and emotional bond between them. That's why all military training involves close-order drill (marching in unison), even though it has been a long time since military groups have actually marched into combat. There is no longer a need for the skill, but military training retained the practice because it is so effective at creating a strong feeling of unity between soldiers. The same is true of any physical movements people make in unison. So the method of prayer in Islam helps Muslims feel unified with each other.

15. A woman is in a thoroughly subordinate position. This idea really helps support other ideas in the collection. If women had too much influence, they'd try to curb the warring. Women in general don't like to send their husbands and sons off to war. But if women have no say in the matter, then the rest of the ideas can express themselves without interference. By subordinating women, the idea collection prevents their effective vote against war, violence, and conquest. The rules and laws within Islam that keep women subordinate are numerous. For example, she is not allowed to leave her house unless she is accompanied by a male relative. Under Islamic law, a woman is forbidden to be a head of state or a judge. She can only inherit half of what a man can inherit. In court, her testimony is only worth half of a man's. She is not allowed to choose where she will live or who she will marry. She is not allowed to marry a non-Muslim or divorce her husband. He, however, can divorce her with a wave of his hand. And according to Sharia, he can (and should) beat her if she disobeys him. All of these ideas keep her subordinate, which helps keep the war machine going unimpeded by domestic rebellion.

16. The only way a woman can guarantee her passage into Paradise is if her husband is happy with her when she dies. This idea obviously helps with the subjugation of women. It gives her a strong incentive to subordinate her wishes to her husband's, because while she might have a chance to get into Paradise if

she's a good Muslim, the only way she can guarantee she will go to Paradise (and avoid eternal suffering in hell) is to make sure her husband is happy with her when she dies.

17. Allah gives Himself permission to edit his own work. It says in the Qur'an that if a passage written later contradicts an earlier passage, then the later one is the better one. The Qur'an was written in sections (each section is one of Muhammad's revelations, known as a Surah or chapter) over a period of 23 years. The circumstances of Muhammad's life and his religion changed quite a bit over those 23 years. One of the ideas in the Qur'an is 'this is the word of Allah.' People had already memorized his earlier revelations, and it would seem a little strange for the all-knowing, infinitely wise Allah to change something He had already said. But with this idea that later revelations abrogated or overwrote earlier revelations when they contradicted, the newer ideas could be accepted. Allah could edit His work. In his first 13 years of peacefully preaching, Muhammad only managed to win 150 followers. But as a military leader and violent conqueror, he was able to subjugate all of Arabia to Islamic law in less than 10 years. The peaceful ways were slow. Conversion by conquering and establishing Sharia was faster and more efficient. The bad news for non-Muslims is that the later, violent, intolerant verses abrogate the earlier peaceful, more tolerant passages.

18. The Qur'an uses the carrot and stick to reinforce behavior. Throughout the book are vivid descriptions of hell, where sinners and non-Muslims have to drink boiling, stinking water, are thrown face down into a raging fire, and have to be there for eternity, suffering endless torments in agony. There are also vivid descriptions of Paradise. In Paradise, believers wear green silk robes and recline on plush couches. Trees shade them, fruit dangles nearby. Believers have tasty food and refreshing drinks served to them in silver goblets. But to have a chance of reaching Paradise, they must be devout Muslims. To guarantee it, they must die in Jihad (for men) or make sure their husbands are always happy with them (for women).

19. Islam provides a huge and inspiring goal. Leaders of countries, companies, and religions have all discovered that you can get the most motivation and enthusiasm from your followers if you provide them with an expansive vision, an enormous goal. In the Islamic idea collection, the goal calls for a continuous effort to expand the domain of Islamic law until the entire world is subjugated to it. Many religions have the goal of converting others to the faith, but Islam has a method available nobody else has: To expand by seizing and converting governments to Sharia, or using the method of gaining one small, incremental concession or accommodation after another until Sharia law is being followed. Once the whole world is following Islamic law, peace will reign. That's why even terrorists can say with complete sincerity that Islam is a religion of peace. The Qur'an says it's better if non-believers accept Islam and become Muslims without force. But if they refuse, then you must do what you can to at least get them to live by the laws of Allah. So Muslims have been given quite a mission: To create a one-world government. An Islamic world. World peace. It is an enormous and inspiring and motivating goal, and creates a strong unity of purpose.

20. Non-Muslims must pay a large tax. Once a country is following Sharia law, non-Muslims are given the choice between becoming Muslim or becoming a Dhimmī. Dhimmīs are allowed to practice their non-Muslim religion if they pay the Jizyah (tribute tax). If they convert to Islam, they no longer have to pay the Jizyah. This obviously creates a practical incentive to convert. This is ingenious. The tax takes money away from non-Muslims and their competing religions and gives that money to support Islam. The income from these taxes (usually a 25% income tax) helped fund the Islamic conquests during the first two major Jihads. They conquered vast lands, most of them already filled with Christians and Jews, many of whom did not

convert at first, and their Jizyah poured huge sums of money into the Islamic war machine. Eventually, the numbers of Christians and Jews in those countries dwindled down as they converted or escaped (or in some cases, were massacred), until now, in most Islamic countries, Jews and Christians are very small minorities. The tax-the-non-Muslims idea helps the Islamic idea collection make more copies of itself by suppressing competing religions and financially supporting Islam. Several ideas within Sharia law extend this effect. For example, non-Muslims are not allowed to build any new houses of worship. They're not even allowed to repair already-existing churches or synagogues. This puts the houses of worship of any competing religion in a state of permanent decline. Also, non-Islamic prayers cannot be spoken within earshot of a Muslim, again, preventing Muslims from being infected by a competing religion. No public displays of any symbols of another faith may be shown either. All of this prevents the spread of any competing ideas, and makes competing religions die out over time. That's why today there are so many Muslim countries. Almost every other country in the world is made up of different religions, but because of these principles, Islam tends to displace all other beliefs and cultures wherever it becomes established.

21. A Muslim is forbidden to make friends with a non-Muslim. A Muslim is allowed to pretend to be a friend, but in his heart he must never actually be a friend to a non-Muslim. This is one of the best protections Islam has against Muslims leaving the faith, because conversions a new religion are usually made because a friend introduced it. Being forbidden to make friends with non-Muslims helps prevent that from happening.

22. The Qur'an counsels the use of deceit when dealing with non-Muslims. Muhammad instructed one of his followers to lie if he had to (in order to assassinate one of Muhammad's enemies). This set a precedent, and the principle was clear: If it helps Islam, it's okay to deceive non-Muslims. This instruction in the Qur'an has served Islamic goals very well through history. And it serves those goals today. Islamic leaders can say one thing in English for the Western press, and say something entirely different to their own followers in Arabic a few days later. Deceiving the enemy is always useful in war, and throughout history generals have used it. Islamic teachings consider Islam to be in a permanent state of war with the non-Islamic world until the whole world follows Sharia law. All non-Muslims living in non-Islamic states are enemies. So deceiving Westerners is totally acceptable because deceiving an enemy in a state of war is totally acceptable. It is encouraged if it can forward the goals of the spread of Islam. And so we have the strange phenomenon where organizations are ostensibly raising money for orphans, but really giving the money to terrorists. They deceived good-hearted Western non-Muslims into giving money to organizations that were actively killing Western non-Muslims. As it says in the Qur'an: "War is deceit". This idea gives Islam a tremendous advantage over other belief systems that encourage indiscriminate truthfulness.

23. Islam must always be defended. This idea is a primary linchpin that gives justification for war with almost anybody, as you'll see in the idea below. After the enemy is defeated, of course, Muslims must establish an Islamic state.

24. Islamic writings teach the use of pretext to initiate hostilities. The Qur'an devotes a lot of time complaining about people who did not support Muhammad when he first started his religion, with Allah often condemning them to torment in hell in the hereafter. The Qur'an is intensely intolerant of non-Muslims. Muhammad was somewhat pushy and insistent with his religion, and when others felt intruded upon and protested, Muhammad took that to mean they were trying to stop Allah's holy prophet from bringing the

revealed word of Allah to the world, so he was justified to fight them and destroy them as Allah's enemies. This is a demonstration of the principle of pretext. Non-Muslims of the world need urgently to become aware of this principle. Of all the ideas in the Islamic collection, this is the most dangerous to the West because it removes our natural self-preserving defenses. The use of pretext tends to make the West defenseless against Islamic encroachments. And it tends to make the West confused about how to respond to violent Muslim reactions.

The use of pretext means you need only the barest excuse to begin hostilities. It means actually looking for an excuse, and even trying to provoke others into striking the first blow thereby starting the hostilities. If the only way to get to Paradise is dying while fighting for Islam, you need hostilities. And if it is your holy duty to make all governments use Sharia law, you need to conquer non-Islamic governments. But you don't really want to look like the aggressor. Appearances count. All throughout the Qur'an, Muhammad tries to justify his aggression as defending Islam. The Qur'an repeats 91 times that followers of Islam should use Muhammad as a model and imitate him. So Muslims the world over try to find or create grievances, so they can recruit new warriors, so they can get a Holy War started, so they can fight and die in Allah's cause. And because of the rise of multiculturalism based on respect for all other cultures in the West, the use of pretext is very effective against people who are unfamiliar with Islam. Many Westerners are concerned that al-Qaeda is angry at the West for having troops in Saudi Arabia, for example. That's merely a pretext. They want all non-Muslims out of the Middle East. Then they say they will cease hostilities. It is a ridiculous and impossible goal, so they are justified in permanent war against the West to defend Islam. It's surprising that so many Westerners accept this particular pretext because it flies in the face of a fundamental Western principle: Equality. What Osama bin Laden is saying is, 'infidels are so undeserving and their very presence somewhere in Arabia defiles the entire country.' Wow. What does that say about the non-Muslims? Why doesn't this kind of racism or prejudice or infidelophobia (or whatever you want to call it) outrage more Westerners? Instead, many think we ought to pull out of the Middle East so we stop offending these poor Muslims. The principle of pretext means you try to provoke a hostile reaction and then use the hostile reaction as a reason to escalate hostilities. It's the same method schoolyard bullies have used for many years.

25. The explicit use of double standards. Islam has one standard for Muslims, and a different standard for non-Muslims, which always gives the advantage to Muslims and within a Muslim country, it provides incentives to convert. For example, Islam must be spread by its believers, wherever they are. But when others try to spread their religions, Muslims are supposed to see it as an aggression against Islam, an act of aggression that must be defended. Islam must always be defended. As another example, when Islam is defamed in any way, Muslims should violently defend it. Even in a cartoon. But Muslims can and should defame Jews and Christians in Muslim newspapers and television, and they should defame any infidel or enemy, as they defame the U.S. today. The Islamic supremacists of Saudi Arabia are pouring money into building mosques all over the free world. But according to Sharia law, which is the law in Saudi Arabia, no non-Muslim religious structures are allowed to be built. Yet Muslims all over the world protest loudly and violently when anyone in Europe or America resists the building of more mosques in their countries. Islamic supremacists don't see the irony in it. They don't feel strange having such an obvious double standard. They are, after all, Allah's followers and everyone else is deluded. Fairness and equality with such unworthy infidels would seem very out of place. A double standard seems completely appropriate from that perspective. The double standard principle is a key part of the idea collection, and it has been a great advantage in the spread of Islam (and

the suppression of competing religions). Sixty-one percent of the Qur'an is about non-Muslims and how to deal with them.

26. It is forbidden to kill a Muslim (except for a just cause). It is not forbidden to kill a non-Muslim. This causes a bond between Muslims, fear in non-Muslims, and motivation to become Muslim. This is also another example of an explicit Islamic double standard.

27. If Muslims drift away from Muhammad's teachings, Allah will end the world. That makes converting others and promoting Islam a matter of survival. It also motivates Muslims to prevent each other from losing faith.

28. The message in a standard Qur'an is difficult to decipher. Whether it was done intentionally or not, the Qur'an's message has been scrambled and in a sense, coded. This discourages almost all non-Muslims and a significant percentage of Muslims from understanding it. In what way is the message scrambled? First, the chapters are published out of order in every standard Qur'an. Rather than printing them using the chronological order in which they were revealed, the 114 Surahs of the Qur'an are arranged using a baffling method: They're arranged in order from the longest chapter to the shortest. That's the traditional order. When you read a standard Qur'an straight through like a normal book, the message is disjointed and the story jumps around and seems contradictory. One very important consequence of this curious disorder is that it hides the clear progression from Muhammad's semi-tolerance of non-Muslims to his violent hatred toward them. The disorder also prevents anyone from figuring out which passages are abrogated unless they know the chronological order of the Qur'an. The second way the Qur'an has been put into code is by putting the key somewhere else. Much of the Qur'an cannot be understood without being familiar with the life of Muhammad (by reading the Sira and the Hadith). These are primarily about Muhammad, what he said and did.

In other words, the Qur'an, the single most important holy book in Islam, can't be understood without the key, and the key can only be found somewhere else, which is similar to one of the ways a message can be written in code: Put the key to understanding the message somewhere else besides including it in the message. This is enough to keep most non-Muslims from understanding the Qur'an, and also keeps most Muslims on a need-to-know basis. So the only ones who really know what's going on are the imams, sheiks, muftis, mullahs and other scholars. They call the shots. Almost everyone else is in the dark. If the Qur'an wasn't put in code deliberately, it has been a tremendously fortuitous accident which has served the goals of Islam very well throughout history. Fortunately, someone has unscrambled the Qur'an for us. The book called "Simple Koran" by Bill Warner prints all verses in chronological order.

The ideal Muslim is like a robot without free will running Allah's program. If the robot obeys, it was Allah's will and he is pleased. If there is a runtime error in the program and the robot doesn't obey, it was Allah's will too, but the robot will still be hated and punished by Allah.

For some, the solution is to hate Muslims, but that doesn't make any sense. And if we did, we would be no better than the devout, orthodox Muslims who were instructed to hate us. But we are born free. As individuals we do have a choice, unlike most Muslims, who had no choice in their religion and who are trapped. Many of them don't know as much about their own religion as you now do, reading this document. The best thing any of us can do is to simply help people learn about Islam.

## Appendix B – The difference between the 7<sup>th</sup> century and 21<sup>st</sup> century mindset

Issue	Radical	Moderate
Anti-Semitism	Yes	No
Caliphate	Pro	Against
Criticism of Islam	No	Yes
Deceiving non-Muslims	Yes	No
Democracy	Against	Pro
Dhimmitude for non-Muslims	Pro	Against
Every deed (and word) of Prophet Muhammad (according to a hadith) was noble and is worthy of emulation	Yes	No
Freedom of (from) Religion	Against	Pro
Gender equality	Against	Pro
Jihad	Pro	Against
Government	Religious	Secular
Islamic reformation	Against	Pro
Islamic supremacy	Pro	Against
Israel	Against	Pro / Neutral
Koran over Constitution	Yes	No
Reaction to criticism of Islam or Prophet Muhammad	Anger / Violence	Reason / No reaction
Religious equality	Against	Pro
Requirement for religious clothing (burqa, veil, etc.)	Pro	Against
Sharia	Pro	Against
Terrorism	Pro / Neutral	Against
Theocracy	Pro	Against
Universal Human Rights	Against	Pro

Source: [muslimsagainstsharia.blogspot.de](http://muslimsagainstsharia.blogspot.de)

## **Appendix C – Excerpts from the book 'The Crisis of Islam' by Bernard Lewis**

From the lifetime of its founder Muhammad, and therefore in its sacred scriptures, Islam is associated in the minds and memories of Muslims with the exercise of political and military power. In the Muslim perception, the Jews and later the Christians had gone astray and had followed false doctrines. Both religions were therefore superseded, and replaced by Islam, the final and perfect revelation in God's sequence.

Islam has given dignity and meaning to drab and impoverished lives. It has taught men of different races to live in brotherhood and people of different creeds to live side by side in reasonable tolerance. It has inspired a great civilization in which others besides Muslims lived creative and useful lives and which, by its achievements, enriched the whole world. But Islam, like other religions, has also known periods when it inspired in some of its followers a mood of hatred and violence. It is our misfortune that we have to confront part of the Muslim world while it is going through such a period, and when most, though by no means all, of that hatred is directed against us. There are still significant numbers, in some regions perhaps a majority, of Muslims with whom we share certain basic cultural and moral, social and political, beliefs and aspirations.

In the classical Islamic view, to which many Muslims are beginning to return, the world and all mankind are divided into two: the House of Islam, where the Muslim law and faith prevail, and the rest, known as the House of Unbelief or the House of War, which it is the duty of Muslims ultimately to bring to Islam. It should by now be clear that we are facing a mood and a movement far transcending the level of issues and policies and the governments that pursue them. This is no less than a clash of civilizations.

Islam as such is not an enemy of the West, and there are growing numbers of Muslims who desire nothing better than a closer and friendlier relationship with the West and the development of democratic institutions in their own countries. But a significant number of Muslims are hostile and dangerous, not because we need an enemy but because they do.

In recent years, there have been some changes of perception and, consequently, of tactics among Muslims. Some of them still see in the West in general and its present leader, the United States, in particular, the ancient and irreconcilable enemy of Islam, the one serious obstacle to the restoration of God's faith and law at home and their ultimate universal triumph. For these there is no alternative to a war to the death, in fulfillment of what they see as the commandments of their faith. There is a second category of Muslims, who, while remaining committed Muslims and while being well aware of the flaws of Western society, nevertheless also see its merits such as its inquiring spirit, which produced modern science and technology, and its concern with freedom, which created modern democratic government and free speech. Those belonging to this category, while retaining their own beliefs and their own culture, seek to join the West in reaching toward a freer and better world. Then there is a third category who, while seeing the West as their ultimate enemy and as the source of all evil, are nevertheless aware of its power, and seek some temporary accommodation and bide their time in order better to prepare for the final struggle. They pose as moderate Muslims and are often able to fool people in the West (therefore it's so important that we learn to distinguish between truly moderate Muslims and fake moderate Muslims).

The rules for war against apostates are somewhat different and rather stricter than those for war against unbelievers. The apostate or renegade, in Muslim eyes, is far worse than the unbeliever. The unbeliever has

not seen the light, and there is always hope that he may eventually see it. In the meantime, provided he meets the necessary conditions, he may be accorded the tolerance of the Muslim state and allowed to continue in the practice of his own religion, even the enforcement of his own religious laws. The renegade is one who has known the true faith, however briefly, and abandoned it. For this offense there is no human forgiveness, and according to the overwhelming majority of jurists, the renegade must be put to death. Militant leaders have proclaimed a double jihad against both foreign infidels and domestic apostates. Most Muslim rulers whom we in the West are pleased to regard as our friends and allies are regarded as traitors and, much worse than that, as apostates by many if not most of their own people.

A good example was Anwar El Sadat, the third President of Egypt, serving from 1970 until his assassination by fundamentalist army officers in 1981. A key figure in the development that led to the assassination was Sayyid Qutb, an Egyptian who became a leading ideologue of Muslim fundamentalism and an active member of the fundamentalist organization known as the Muslim Brotherhood. Born in a village in Upper Egypt in 1906, he studied in Cairo and for some years worked as a teacher and then as an official in the Egyptian Ministry of Education. In that capacity he was sent on a special study mission to the United States, where he stayed from November 1948 to August 1950. His fundamentalist activism and writing began very soon after his return from America to Egypt. He wrote about his shocked response to the American way of life based on sinfulness and its addiction to what he saw as sexual promiscuity (Qutb outlined the contrast between Eastern spirituality and Western materialism and is considered to have been a major influence to Osama bin Laden). So the most powerful accusation of all is the degeneracy and debauchery of the American way of life, and the threat that it offers to Islam. This threat, classically formulated by Sayyid Qutb, became a regular part of the vocabulary and ideology of Islamic fundamentalists, and most notably, in the language of the Iranian Revolution. This is what is meant by the term the Great Satan, applied to the United States by the late Ayatollah Khomeini. Satan as depicted in the Qur'an is neither an imperialist nor an exploiter. He is a seducer and the insidious tempter who whispers in the hearts of men.

Al-Qaeda has held the United States explicitly responsible for the military takeover in Algeria. Here as elsewhere America, as the dominant power in the world of the infidels, was naturally blamed for all that went wrong, and more specifically for the suppression of Islamist movements, the slaughter of their followers, and the establishment of what were seen as anti-Islamist dictatorships with American support. Here too they were blamed by many for not protesting this violation of democratic liberties, by some for actively encouraging and supporting the military regime. Similar problems arise in Egypt, in Pakistan, and in some other Muslim countries where it seems likely that a genuinely free and fair election result would result in an Islamist victory (in Egypt the prediction came true in 2012).

In this, the democrats are of course at a disadvantage. Their ideology requires them, even when in power, to give freedom and rights to the Islamist opposition. The Islamists, when in power, are under no such obligation. On the contrary, their principles require them to suppress what they see as impious and subversive activities. For Islamists, democracy, expressing the will of the people, is the road to power, but it is a one-way road, on which there is no return, no rejection of the sovereignty of God, as exercised through his chosen representatives. Their electoral policy has been summarized as 'one man, one vote, once'.

The outward flow of oil and the corresponding inward flow of money brought immense changes to the Saudi kingdom, its internal structure and way of life, and its external role and influence, both in the oil-



consuming countries and, more powerfully, in the world of Islam. The most significant change was in the impact of Wahhabism and the role of its protagonists. Wahhabism is the official, state-enforced doctrine of one of the most influential governments in the Islamic world. The country is the custodian of the two holiest places of Islam, the host of the annual pilgrimage, which brings millions of Muslims from every part of the world to share in its rites and rituals. At the same time, the teachers and preachers of Wahhabism have at their disposal immense financial resources, which they use to promote and spread their version of Islam. Even in Western countries in Europe and America, Wahhabi indoctrination centers may be the only form of Islamic education available to new converts and to Muslim parents who wish to give their children some grounding in their own inherited religious and cultural tradition. The indoctrination is provided in private schools, religious seminars, mosque schools, holiday camps and, increasingly, prisons. Because of the reluctance of the state to involve itself in religious matters, the teaching of Islam in schools and elsewhere has in general been totally unsupervised by authority. This situation clearly favors those with the fewest scruples, the strongest convictions and the most money. Imagine that the Ku Klux Klan or some similar group obtains total control of the state of Texas, of its oil and therefore its oil revenues, and having done so, uses this money to establish a network of well-endowed schools and colleges all over Christendom, peddling their own peculiar brand of Christianity.

The exploitation of oil brought vast new wealth and with it new and increasingly bitter social tensions. In the old society inequalities of wealth had been limited, and their effects were restrained, on the one hand, by the traditional social bonds and obligations that linked rich and poor, and, on the other hand, by the privacy of Muslim home life. Modernization has all too often widened the gap, destroyed those social bonds, and through the universality of the modern media, made the resulting inequalities painfully visible. All this has created new and receptive audiences for Wahhabi and like-minded groups. It has now become normal to describe these movements as fundamentalist. The term is unfortunate for a number of reasons. It was originally an American Protestant term, used to designate certain Protestant churches that differed in some respects from the mainstream churches. The two main differences were liberal theology and biblical criticism, both seen as objectionable. Liberal theology has been an issue among Muslims in the past and may be again in the future. It is not at the present time. The literal divinity and inerrancy of the Qur'an is a basic dogma of Islam, and although some may doubt it, none challenge it.

Broadly speaking, Muslim fundamentalists are those who feel that the troubles of the Muslim world at the present time are the result not of insufficient modernization but of excessive modernization. From their point of view, the primary struggle is not against the Western enemy as such but against the Westernizing enemies at home, who have imported and imposed infidel ways on Muslim peoples. The task of the Muslims is to depose and remove these infidel rulers, sometimes by defeating or expelling their foreign patrons and protectors, and to abrogate and destroy the laws, institutions, and social customs that they have introduced, so as to return to a purely Islamic way of life, in accordance with the principles of Islam and the rules of the Holy Law.

## **Appendix D – Excerpts from a Spiegel interview with the Islamic reformer Bassam Tibi**

Bassam Tibi is a political scientist known for his analysis of international relations and for introducing the controversial concept of Euro-Islam for the integration of Muslim immigrants in Europe.

Spiegel: Are critics of Islam systematically silenced in Germany?

Tibi: Yes. Even the comparatively moderate Turkish organization DITIB says there are no Islamists, only Islam and Muslims. Anything else is racism. That means that you can no longer criticize the religion. Accusing somebody of racism is a very effective weapon in Germany. Islamists know this. As soon as you accuse someone of demonizing Islam, then the European side backs down. I have also been accused of such nonsense, even though my family can trace its roots right back to Muhammad and I myself know the Qur'an by heart.

Spiegel: You have said numerous times that the conflict between the Western world and Muslim groups here is an ideological war.

Tibi: The result of a conflict between two sides is that people politicize their cultural backgrounds. In Germany representatives of the Islamic communities try to hijack children who are born here, along with the entire Islamic community, to prevent them from being influenced by the society which has taken them in. Children born here are like blank sheets on which you can write European or Islamic texts. Muslim representatives want to raise their children as if they don't even live in Europe.

Spiegel: Many Germans believe that communities should live together peacefully without any parallel societies. Is it therefore right to compromise in order to avoid antagonizing Muslims unnecessarily?

Tibi: Quite the opposite. The Islamic officials who live here are very intelligent and view this as weakness. Muslims stand by their religion entirely. It is a sort of religious absolutism. While Europeans have stopped defending the values of their civilization. They confuse tolerance with relativism.

Spiegel: When something insults Muslims, we often tend to just back off. Doesn't this help defuse the conflict?

Tibi: No. That is simply giving up. And the weaker the partner is viewed by the Muslims, then the greater the anger which they express. And this anger is often carefully staged. The argument over the cartoons for example was completely orchestrated. Nothing was spontaneous. A lot of people don't know if Denmark is a country or a cheese. Where did they get the Danish flags? Protests like these are weapons in this war of ideas. Or take another example: The president of the Iranian parliament was visiting Belgium where he had an appointment with a female Belgian colleague. He refused to shake her hand, so she didn't meet with him. He left Belgium and accused her of racism. The accusation of cultural insensitivity is a weapon. And we have to neutralize it.

Spiegel: Can the Islam conference which the German minister of domestic affairs, Wolfgang Schäuble, organized in Berlin, help in this regard?

Tibi: No, because the biggest taboo is that there even is a conflict. Everyone denies that. Instead people talk about misunderstandings and how these should be resolved. But a conflict of values is not a misunder-

standing. Islamic orthodoxy and the German constitution are not compatible. And that is why the Islam conference failed.

Spiegel: So what's the answer then?

Tibi: Muslims have to give up three things if they want to become Europeans: They have to bid farewell to the idea of converting others, and renounce the Jihad. The Jihad is not just a way of testing yourself but also means using violence to spread Islam. The third thing they need to give up is the Sharia, which is the Islamic legal system. This is incompatible with the German constitution. There are also two things they need to re-define.

Spiegel: Which are?

Tibi: Pluralism and tolerance are pillars of modern society. That has to be accepted. But pluralism doesn't just mean diversity. It means that we share the same rules and values, and are still nevertheless different. Islam doesn't have this idea. And Islam also has no tradition of tolerance. In Islam tolerance means that Christians and Jews are allowed to live under the protection of Muslims but never as citizens with the same rights. What Muslims call tolerance is nothing other than discrimination.

Spiegel: How many of the more than 4 million Muslims living in Germany would agree to these demands?

Tibi: A few thousand perhaps.

Spiegel: And what about the organizations at the Islam conference? After all, they all clearly said that they accept the German constitution. They also stated that it is allowed to change religion or to have no religion at all, even though the Sharia punishes a loss of faith with the death sentence. Is this a credible statement?

Tibi: I doubt that these statements are correct. Only representatives of organized Islam went to Schaeuble's conference. Schaeuble's problem is terrorism. And then the organizations tell him that they are against terrorism. And then everything seems fine. But that is not an enduring solution.

Spiegel: So who should Schaeuble talk to? To you? For many years you have been a proponent of an enlightened form of Euro-Islam, a topic which has been much discussed. But you are pretty much a lone voice.

Tibi: I support reforming Islam and I am not alone in this. Next month I'm meeting 20 other Islamic reformers in Copenhagen. We are trying to reinvigorate the tradition of enlightening Islam. But our mistake is that we are not united.

Spiegel: And apart from these scientists and thinkers?

Tibi: It would be much more important to have enlightened Imams. But when the Alfred Herrhausen society wanted to invite a German-speaking Imam with European ideas to a discussion, no one could be found. In the end they took the Grand Mufti of Marseille. And why are there such people in France and not here? Because the French state and French society has worked on developing them.

Spiegel: So the German state should reform Islam?

Tibi: Of course not. But the French state helped set up a council of Muslims which was completely in line with European values. If the French state had not been involved, the council would have probably been in the hands of the Muslim Brotherhood. This is a challenge facing civil society, but the state also has to help. By staying neutral, as is the case here in Germany, you are handing victory over to the Islamists.

Spiegel: Schaeuble is looking for partners who can help in the teaching of Islam in schools and the training of Imams.

Tibi: That is a good start. The important thing is that the teachers must be trained here and that the state and the society decides on the curriculum.

Spiegel: You have often said that the integration of Muslims in Germany has failed. And that integration can only be achieved by educating a civil society. But who should do this and who decides who needs to be educated?

Tibi: I am thinking in particular about the re-education programs which were carried out in Germany after the Third Reich. Social studies teachers and political science faculties were given the task of turning young people into democrats. That worked then. Why shouldn't we have a similar model for Muslims? In youth clubs, or during Islamic instruction in schools. Of course it takes a long time, 50 years say, but we have to start now.

Spiegel: But how do you expect to draw the third generation immigrants away from the influence of the mosques?

Tibi: I don't have any clear idea either about how this should be done. The situation is this: young Muslims want to be members of the club, i.e. part of German society. But they are rejected. And parallel societies provide warmth. It is a vicious circle.

## **Appendix E – Excerpts from a Spiegel interview with German feminist Alice Schwarzer**

Spiegel: For decades, people have looked on without doing anything as some of Germany's Turkish women were stripped of their rights. Why has this stirred so little resistance in German society?

Schwarzer: Because every denunciation of this abuse is immediately branded as racism. But common sense is never wrong. There are women who stumble about beneath a mountain of cloth, while their husbands strides around in jeans. And there are girls who are supposed to enter into forced marriages. That's a scandal no matter what culture you belong to.

Spiegel: Well, you wouldn't hear any accusations of racism from the political right.

Schwarzer: Do you consider all conservatives to be racist? The left, especially, has appealed up till now for a tolerance of differences. But do people who make that argument think that Turkish women are a different type of people in another culture whose rules must be accepted, even if they're misogynist and misanthropic?

Spiegel: What have your personal experiences in the fight against the oppression of Muslim women been?

Schwarzer: Intimidation! It all started with my Iran trip in 1979, two weeks after the seizure of power by Ayatollah Khomeini, as I wrote about this new variant of fascism in my Emma magazine. They certainly didn't make any secret of their intentions, just like the Nazis in 1933. People pegged me as a racist and friend of the Shaw. And even today in Germany, no one wants to note that the so-called rebels in Chechnya have practiced ultra-orthodox Sharia law since 1994! I haven't heard any human rights activists protesting about that.

Spiegel: How do you explain this reaction?

Schwarzer: It's naked contempt for women, but also self-hatred as well as this German desire for beliefs. After the Nazis condemned everything foreign, the children now want to love everything foreign, with their eyes closed tightly. After their left-wing gods went into decline, they want to believe in these new gods.

Spiegel: Wasn't it the leftists who took up the issue of foreigners?

Schwarzer: Yes, but often under the cover of a multicultural ideology, which I consider to be dishonest. They veil the fact that we don't treat others with a basic attitude of equality, but rather in a patronizing manner. This special kind of love of things foreign is just the flip side of contempt of things foreign. We've just seen in the Netherlands what direction a wrongly understood tolerance can take us in. These self-righteous fanatics believe they have the right, even in our democracy, to butcher non-believers in order to muzzle any criticism of their delusion.

Spiegel: In Germany, the recent headscarf ban for teachers has drawn attention to the living conditions of Muslim women. The federal commissioner for integration policy believes that women wearing a headscarf can be more easily integrated, especially because they're allowed to leave the house.

Schwarzer: By so blindly supporting the minority of Muslim women who choose to wear the headscarf, she's also stabbing the majority in the back who deliberately don't cover themselves. Does the integration representative even know what kind of moral pressure a headscarf-wearing teacher can exert on a Muslim school girl and her parents? After all, the Islamists consider an unveiled woman to be a whore.

Spiegel: But don't basic rights include freedom of religion?

Schwarzer: That has nothing to do with religion, it's politics. Add to that the fact that a teacher's job isn't self-fulfillment, but rather to represent democracy. If an Islamic headscarf is permitted, then why not a full-body covering chador, niqab or burqa? In Swedish and English schools, girls have already shown up in burqas.

Spiegel: The courts have been dealing with suits from Muslims who want to assert their ideas in this country. How does Islamic law influence German legal practices?

Schwarzer: Insidiously. The Islamists have been conducting targeted propaganda in Germany since the mid-1980s. Their primary offensive is the social infiltration of their own people. Their second is the undermining of the democratic educational system. Their third is the infiltration of the constitutional state. In concerted actions they have, in the past several years, attempted to infiltrate the Sharia law into the Ger-

man legal system. The flag of this crusade is the headscarf. Professor Mathias Rohe said very openly when asked in 2002: In Germany, we are applying Sharia law every day. If a Jordanian gets married here, then we marry them under Jordanian law, including the right to polygamy.

Spiegel: You want to ward off Islamism using the constitution?

Schwarzer: Of course! We fought arduously for our freedoms, like enlightenment and democracy, and we can't allow ourselves to fall back from what we have achieved. Human rights are universally valid and indivisible, regardless of culture and religion.

Spiegel: What policies do you expect in order to protect women's rights and to counteract the influence of Islamists?

Schwarzer: There's much to be done because everything has been neglected. Mastery of the German language and the acceptance of our legal system has to become part of the criteria for naturalization. In the affected neighborhoods in the cities, youth programs and contact with the youth need to be actively pursued so that girls and boys are no longer so alienated from each other and so they are not open to incitement by mosque associations that are enemies of democracy. In these neighborhoods and at the university level, we need to actively and constructively put up resistance to the rabble-rouser propaganda of orthodox Muslims. And we have to give concrete aid to the acutely threatened women and girls.

Spiegel: Shouldn't the affected also raise their voices in the fight against radicals?

Schwarzer: The silence has ended. The most courageous are already starting to raise their voices. And they're paying dearly for it. Following the murder of Theo van Gogh, the name of Ayaan Hirsi Ali, a Dutch member of parliament of Somali-Muslim origin, has been on the death lists that have been found. She has gone into hiding. Should we all now remain silent out of fear? No. It's time to ask for a little bit of solidarity from democratically minded Muslim women and men.

## **Appendix F – Interview with Zeyno Baran, editor of 'The Other Muslims: Moderate and Secular'**

Zeyno Baran is a senior fellow at the Hudson Institute, which is a nonpartisan policy research organization dedicated to innovative research and analysis that promotes global security, prosperity, and freedom. Baran put together ten essays by genuinely moderate Muslims in Europe and the United States about what is going on regarding the internal struggle within Islam and what's wrong with how the West deals with it.

Q: You begin your book with this sentence: The most important ideological struggle in the world today is within Islam. Can you explain the nature of this struggle and how it is going?

Zeyno Baran: This struggle is essentially a Muslim civil war over whose definition of Islam will be accepted as mainstream. Will it be the version of the Islamists (shared by all political-religious radicals, both non-violent and violent) or that of traditional Muslims (cultural, secular, and pious). One will become accepted by a majority of Muslims, and by extension, of non-Muslims. Since the 1970s Islamists have made tremendous headway in this struggle thanks to money from Saudi Arabia and the Gulf region. They were thus able

to establish institutes and networks all over the world to spread Islamism. Today, many Muslims don't even realize what they believe to be authentic Islam is in fact a primarily political ideology of recent origin. Non-Islamists are still lacking in the financial resources necessary to organize effectively against the Islamists; this is true as much in the West (the focus of my book) as in Muslim-majority countries. So, in the short term I argue that Islamists will continue to be winning in this struggle. That said, I believe in the longer term both non-Islamist Muslims and non-Muslims will eventually wake up to the realization that Islamism is a serious ideological challenge to universal human rights.

Q: Precisely what is a moderate Muslim? Hasn't that term been subject of a lot of misuse and misunderstanding?

Zeyno Baran: You are exactly right. The misuse of the label moderate Muslim by Islamist groups operating in the West, has indeed led to major misunderstandings. This is precisely why I used this term in the book to clear up this misunderstanding and reclaim the term from the Islamists, many of whom represent themselves as moderates to Western policy makers. American and European policy makers have accepted as moderate people who do not commit violence. To me, however, that is a very narrow definition. An Islamist that participates in the electoral process with the goal of limiting women's rights or of introducing a Sharia regime is not moderate. The contributors to this book are all true moderates, i.e. those who fully support both universal human rights and the teachings of the Islamic faith. Being moderate does not mean they are not pious, which is another common misunderstanding of the term.

Q: Why is it wrong to base the definition of a moderate Muslim on simply those who don't use violence?

Zeyno Baran: The true divide within Islam is not between violence and nonviolence, but between moderation and extremism. Few Muslims resort to violence, but many more share the thinking of the violent extremism. Unless the ideology of Islamism is understood as the root cause of the violence, I don't believe we'll see an end to the terrorism and radicalism among Muslim communities. Moderation has to start with thought. If we are giving a free pass to those with extremist ideologies as moderates, then the true moderates will continue to be weakened.

Q: How have the North American and European governments helped the radicals and hurt the moderates?

Zeyno Baran: Western governments, in their desire to engage with Muslims, have often reached out to well-established Islamist organizations as their partners. In doing so, these governments did not realize that they were lending legitimacy to orthodox Muslims in the internal struggle against their moderate opponents. With the Islamists being the main *go-to Muslims* for Western governments, it has been much harder for the true moderates to make their voices heard.

Q: Why are Western media and institutions so easily fooled by radicals, and why do they seem to favor them?

Zeyno Baran: I think when Western media and institutions look for Muslim voices, they automatically gravitate to those who most closely resemble their preconception of what an authentic Muslim sounds like. This conception has of course been shaped by Islamist propaganda. In recent years, an authentic voice has been one that is opposed to US policies, especially in Iraq and Afghanistan, and that is strongly critical of Israel. Many in the media share these views as well, so it is in some ways a natural fit. The true moderates are

often accused of being neo-conservative or *not really Muslim* when they support US policies or express a more balanced view of the state of Israel; these ideas seem to Western journalists and policymakers to be *un-Muslim*, as if there were a single Muslim way of thinking! Certainly, the Islamists argue there are certain Muslim opinions on some issues, such as the Middle East peace process, but that's because they are trying to establish their own view as the single dominant one. It is as wrong as saying there is a Christian opinion on an issue, given the vast range of views held by individual Christians.

Q: How does assimilation and acculturation work with Muslim immigrants in the West and how should it work?

Zeyno Baran: Each country has had different policies and different experiences, but in general, European countries for many decades paid little attention to assimilation. The UK and the Netherlands in particular followed a blind multiculturalist policy that avoided any mention of assimilation or acculturation. This led to Muslim immigrant enclaves being formed in parts of European cities; when an area becomes heavily Islamic, then Islamists come in with their institutions and mosques, and establish themselves as the interlocutors between the immigrant community and Western authorities. Even after many of these governments decided to change their policies and developed programs for increased acculturation, they continued to work with the Islamists, whose ultimate responsibility is not to Muslim immigrants, but to the global Muslim Ummah as they understand it. Since these representatives had no interest whatsoever in promoting the integration and assimilation of European Muslims, this led to frustration on the part of Western governments and societies, which began wondering whether Muslims can ever truly become Western. In turn, this frustration, directed towards all Muslims, not just the extremists, fostered a sense of anger and victimization on the part of the Muslim immigrants, who felt they would never be accepted as long as they remained Muslim. A better way to ensure social cohesion would be to address the pragmatic needs of Muslim immigrants, which include jobs, education, equal rights, in accordance with the social norms of the country, with a sensitivity to different religious and cultural backgrounds. In practice, this would mean allowing the establishment of dignified prayer places for Muslims, while not assuming all Muslims go to the mosque all the time, or that the mosque is the only social place for Muslims. There need to be many other places where Muslims can go to socialize with each other and non-Muslims. These will develop naturally if Europeans can move away from characterizing these populations as *Muslim first*.

Q: Has the concept of multiculturalism helped or hurt in this struggle?

Zeyno Baran: Despite being born of good intentions, the Western policies of multiculturalism have made it harder for Muslims to become Western. The pendulum of respect for cultural and religious difference has swung too far, and Muslims have been trapped into their Muslim identity as *the other*, instead of being assisted in becoming *one of us*. One of the recent and most clear examples of this is the wearing of the burqa in the West. For years blind multiculturalists have looked the other way when seeing women covered from head to toe in a style contrary to most Western norms as well as to Islam itself. Islam simply mandates modesty in dress, which for many women traditionally meant the headscarf, but never the full covering. Yet, until recently, in another unintended consequence of multiculturalism, few Westerners were willing to tackle this issue as they did not want to be seen as intolerant or bigoted. The few that have spoken out have been silenced with threats of being labeled racist. As a result, intolerable forms of social behavior have continued to the point where they have become acceptable.



Q: How can Western societies win over Muslims without losing their own identity or surrendering to the Islamists?

Zeyno Baran: The question is which Muslims? The Islamists can never be won over since their long term goal is to see a world that is ruled with Sharia. If Western societies continue to try to judge their success in winning over Muslims by giving into Islamist demands, then they'll continue to lose their identity and their basic freedoms. But if Western societies were to side with non-Islamist Muslims, and learn from them how best to counter the short- and long-term goals of the Islamists, then I would say there is a great possibility that the West will not only successfully defend its own values and norms, but also help Muslims usher in a desperately needed Islamic Renaissance.

Q: How can moderates justify their interpretations of Islam when they appear to differ with the most important and basic Islamic texts?

Zeyno Baran: Many of these texts have been written centuries ago and in a particular context. Many moderates read them recognizing that what may have been a great social advancement in the 8<sup>th</sup> century cannot be taken literally in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Over the centuries, there were many different voices widely debating how to interpret the Qur'an and the Hadith; moderates follow the tradition of those who have used their rationality and interpreted revelation as well as historic developments within their correct context. There are also many moderates who have not read many of the basic Islamic texts; yet they are no less legitimate, because first, many of the radicals have never read many of these texts either and second, Islam is not just about the written text but the living tradition. Indeed, for centuries Muslims learned the basics of their religion orally, passing down teachings from one generation to another. The recent radical trend we see among Muslims is due to radicals picking and choosing certain passages from the Qur'an and other key texts, interpreting them in a way to make their case, and then presenting them as the most legitimate interpretations. Again, I'll draw an analogy with Christianity. It is as if saying that only one denomination's interpretation of basic texts is the correct one. Paraphrasing Bernard Lewis, the situation we face within Islam is as if a KKK-controlled state found major sources of oil, and used the money to spread its own version of Islam as the most correct form and the whole world gradually began seeing them as the most authentic voices.

Q: The Islamists are so well financed and well-organized how can the moderates compete? How can they win?

Zeyno Baran: This is the most difficult question. The moderates have not been able to compete and won't be able to compete unless there is help from the West. Theoretically some of the Muslim-majority countries that are threatened by Islamists could help, but in practice they are often too afraid to challenge them for fear of being labeled as apostates. The West knows from its own history the damage religious extremists cause to societies and the religion itself; they can help the moderates by no longer giving Islamists a free pass while their activists are working to undermine Muslim moderates and Western (or universal) values. They can also help by increasing visibility of the moderates' work, such as those who argue for secular rule using Islam's own texts and history, or those who push for Islamic Renaissance, without which I believe we'll never quite win against the radicals who are increasingly becoming the mainstream.

## **Appendix G - Excerpts from 'The Muslim Community is Hemorrhaging' article by Mirza B.**

We are hemorrhaging. Big time. And our doctors are opening more veins so that our life blood can drain out faster. It's almost like there is an unconscious intention of the Muslim community to end its existence, once and for all; at least to end its existence effectively as a people who are worthy of consideration and respect. If leadership is responsible for the condition of a people, then our leadership has failed spectacularly and has succeeded in making us the single most hated people on earth. The Americans are trying very hard to take this pre-eminent position, but as on date we are still ahead. In my view the biggest reason for this are the huge dichotomies and contradictions between our statements and our actions. People listen to us speak and then they see how we behave and they are asking questions.

We Muslims are a people who are the least self critical of all mankind. We love fooling ourselves. We teach our own history in a way that makes us look good and so effectively prevents us from learning anything useful that we can apply today. We have sanctified stupidity, ignorance and redundancy. It seems to me that perhaps our current reality is so bitter that we find it comfortable to retreat into a world of fantasy created out of selected incidents in our past, which we like to live in. No matter that this world increasingly has less and less to do with current reality. We have a leadership worldwide that, barring exceptions, is fraud, corrupt, blind and redundant. Our leaders are either actual exploiters of their own people or are so isolated from reality that they have not the foggiest notion about where the world is going or what the operative realities of the world are. Examples of corrupt Muslim leaders abound all over the world and need no elaboration. And since they lead a blind following, they have no problems retaining their seats despite generations of exploitative politics. There is nothing more dangerous and degraded than a guard dog that attacks and eats his own flock. Our political leaders are such dogs.

In India, home to 300 million Muslims, for example, the judicial commission appointed by the Government of India to assess the situation of the Muslims, the Justice Sachar Commission reported that the situation of the Indian Muslims in terms of education, access to jobs in the government and industry and political influence, is worse than that of Dalits and other backward classes. To date not a single Muslim political or religious leader has accepted responsibility for this shameful situation and resigned his position. Although this statement of mine will probably raise a lot of eyebrows, public accountability is yet another Islamic concept that is prominent by its absence in actual practice.

In almost every Muslim religious discourse worldwide, we hear innumerable stories of heroic military leadership of our illustrious predecessors in the remote past. But I ask myself, how many examples do we hear of educators who established universities? Of business leaders who built economies and industries? Of scientists who gave the world new inventions and discoveries? Of rulers who created models of administration and governance that can be emulated today? Especially governments that involved people in decision making? How many of our rulers were actually chosen by the people? How many examples do we hear about Muslim leaders who were social reformers and workers who worked to uplift oppressed people? The Nobel Prize winner Muhammad Yunus is a noble exception. If we don't stop this bleeding and fast, it will be too late. To expect something from those who are benefiting from the bleed is unrealistic. They are blood-sucking leeches who exist on the blood or those who don't care about the bleeding, to make the change is unrealistic. Change has to come from those who feel the loss badly enough to want to get out of their comfort zones and take action. It seems to me, going by what is happening to us Muslims in the world

and our response to it, we are a dead nation. We are a nation of corpses. It is the heart which is the seat of life in Islam. And our hearts are dead. That is our situation today. Do you want to change that? Here are two things that I believe we need to do if we want to change our situation. I don't say that the change will be instantaneous. But it will come in due course.

First, stop blaming others. The first sign of a desire to change is to accept that we have a problem. And that we are its authors. The empowering thing about owning the problem is that you also then own the solution. When we export blame as we are habituated to do, we also export the solution and so the problem remains with us and continues to trouble us. We must accept that we are the cause of our internal differences and strife. If we want to build mutual understanding, nothing and nobody can change that. People can try and they will try but they will never succeed if we don't let them. The coming together of the two Germanys and of the two Vietnams are classic examples.

You will be astonished to learn about a recently published book on Christian denominations, each with its own church, theological concept, literature, services and priests. The author counted a total of 33,000. Yes, I have not put too many zeros. There are actually 33,000 Christian denominations. But have you ever seen one denomination bombing another's church? Have you seen the followers of one denomination suicide bombing the followers of another denomination? Have you heard any statement from the Pope calling the Church of England infidel? Occasionally you might hear statements like my church is better than yours. Have you heard a statement from the Presbyterians or the Lutherans or anyone else calling the Catholics infidels? So who do you want to blame for the fact that we Muslims do this to one another? In my view the first thing to do is for people to get together in communities and own the problem with ourselves. We need to define the problem as it relates to each community that we live in and accept that we are its authors and owners and we are the ones who are going to solve it.

And second, we need to create problem solving committees. We have to create committees in each community that we live in, consisting of diverse people who meet periodically to address various problems and find solutions. These committees must have in their membership, people from all walks of life; scholars, professionals, business people, teachers, parents and so on. They must meet regularly and reasonably frequently and must garner support for their ideas. They must not only address issues relating to Muslims but also general societal issues that relate to other people who live in the same communities. This will build support for them and ensure that they are not isolated from others. We need to be out there solving our own and other people's problems. We need to be seen as useful members of the communities we live in. We need to be seen as people who have energy, who stand for principles and who are willing to apply those values to themselves. This means that we will and must stand for what is right and against what is wrong, even when our own people do neither. We need to walk our talk. Or we need to stop talking.

The world is sick of listening to Muslims talking about Islam. The world wants to see this Islam that we talk about in practice. The world is saying to us: 'Put up or shut up. Show us what you are talking about or shut up. We don't want to listen to you about this (peaceful) Islam which you yourselves don't practice. We don't want to listen to you about this utopian society that no longer exists and can't seem to be recreated. We want you to show it to us. If you think it is so good that you want to proselytize about it, then practice it yourself first and show us. Then we will perhaps listen to your lectures.'

## Appendix H - Excerpts from the 'Human Rights Watch 2012 World Report'

The 22<sup>nd</sup> annual World Report summarizes human rights conditions in more than 90 countries and territories worldwide in 2011. It reflects extensive investigative work that Human Rights Watch staff has undertaken during the year, often in close partnership with domestic human rights activists. Here's a short list of countries where significant human rights violations related to Islamic doctrine and Sharia law occur:

Afghanistan: Attacks and threats against women continue, frequently focusing on women in public life, school girls, and the staff of girls' schools. The incarceration of women and girls for 'moral crimes' such as running away from home, even when doing so is not prohibited by statutory law, also continues to be a major concern, with an estimated half of the approximately 700 women and girls in jail and prison facing such charges.

Bangladesh: The government tightened controls over civil society organizations by prosecuting labor union leaders and delaying foreign grants to NGOs. At this writing a bill proposing restrictions on media, which would prohibit the broadcast of certain religious and political speech, was under consideration. Violence against women including rape, dowry-related assaults, acid attacks, and sexual harassment continue. The military and police continue to employ torture and cruel, inhuman, or degrading punishment against suspects, violating both domestic and international law. Violence against women and girls and their discriminatory treatment under personal status laws persists. New cases were reported in 2011 of beatings, isolation, and other public humiliation of girls, all imposed following religious leaders' issuance of fatwas on issues such as talking to a man, pre-marital relations, having a child outside wedlock, and adultery. Women's groups are particularly concerned that such abuses continue even though the High Court division of the Bangladesh Supreme Court ordered government authorities to take preventive measures and prosecute perpetrators.

Indonesia: In 2011 incidents of religious violence got more deadly and more frequent, as Islamist militants mobilized mobs to attack religious minorities with impunity; short prison terms for a handful of offenders did nothing to dissuade mob violence. The government failed to overturn several decrees that discriminate between religions and foster intolerance. According to the Setara Institute, which monitors religious freedom, there were 216 cases of religious attacks in 2010 and 184 cases in the first nine months of 2011. Minority congregations reported that local government officials arbitrarily refused to issue them permits required, under a 2006 decree, for building houses of worship. Those who attempted to worship without a permit faced harassment and violence. In January the Supreme Court ordered the reopening of a Presbyterian church, overturning the Bogor administration's ruling which had revoked the church's building permit. However, Bogor Mayor Diani Budiarto refused to comply. Government ministers offered the church relocation. In October an Islamist organization began to harass churchgoers who were holding Sunday services on a sidewalk outside the sealed church.

Iran: In 2011 Iranian authorities refused to allow government critics to engage in peaceful demonstrations. The government continued targeting civil society activists, especially lawyers, rights activists, students, and journalists. In 2010 Iranian authorities recorded 252 executions, but rights groups believe many more were executed without official acknowledgement. Most of those executed had been convicted of drug-related offenses following flawed trials in revolutionary courts. Iran leads the world in the execution of juvenile

offenders, individuals who committed a crime before turning 18 years old. Authorities continue to shut down newspapers and target journalists and bloggers. Few if any independent rights organizations can openly operate in the country in the current political climate. Iranian women are discriminated against in personal status matters related to marriage, divorce, inheritance, and child custody. A woman requires her male guardian's approval for marriage regardless of her age. An Iranian woman cannot pass on her nationality to her foreign-born spouse or their children. A woman may not obtain a passport or travel outside the country without her husband's written permission. The government denies freedom of religion to adherents of the Bahai faith, Iran's largest non-Muslim religious minority. Authorities also targeted converts to Christianity. In September a revolutionary court convicted six members of the evangelical Church of Iran to one year prison terms on charges of propaganda against the state, allegedly for proselytizing. On September 25, authorities summoned Yousef Nadarkhani, the pastor of a 400-member Church of Iran congregation in northern Iran, to court and told him he had three opportunities to renounce his faith and embrace Islam. Nadarkhani refused to recant and faced possible execution as of this writing. In 2010 the judiciary had sentenced Nadarkhani to death for apostasy from Islam, despite the fact that no such crime exists under Iran's penal code.

Jordan: The country criminalizes speech critical of the king, government officials and institutions, Islam, and speech deemed insulting to other persons. In 2010 a revision of the penal code increased penalties for some speech offenses. In April several hundred persons demonstrated in Zarqa for the application of Islamic law and the release of prisoners. In an ensuing brawl with government supporters, in which police participated, numerous police and demonstrators were injured. Jordan's personal status code remains discriminatory despite a 2010 amendment. A Muslim woman is forbidden from marrying a non-Muslim. A non-Muslim mother forfeits her custodial rights after the child reaches seven years of age. There were four reported honor crimes in 2011. In June a court sentenced a father who murdered his daughter to 15 years in prison, later reduced to 10 years because her husband dropped private claims against him.

Malaysia: Although the constitution affirms the country is a secular state that protects religious freedom for all, treatment of religious minorities continues to raise concerns. In August 2011, Selangor state religious authorities raided a Methodist church where an annual charity dinner was being held. The authorities alleged that there had been unlawful proselytization of the Muslims present at the event but presented no evidence to support their allegations. Nazri Aziz, de facto law minister, said that since Islam allows underage marriage, the government can't legislate against it.

Nigeria: State governments in 12 northern states apply Sharia law as part of their criminal justice systems, which include sentences, such as the death penalty, amputations, and floggings, that amount to cruel, inhuman, and degrading punishment. In September a court in Zamfara State sentenced two men to amputation of their right hands. At this writing the case was under appeal. Serious due process concerns also exist in these proceedings, and evidentiary standards in the Sharia codes applied in these states discriminate against women, particularly in adultery cases. Nigeria's federal criminal code punishes consensual homosexual conduct with up to 14 years in prison. In states applying Sharia, consensual homosexual conduct among men is punishable by death (stoning), and by flogging and six months in prison in the case of women. Federal legislation that would criminalize anyone who enters into or assists a 'same gender' marriage was introduced in the Senate in July. Similar legislation has been introduced in the National Assembly at least twice before and stalled amid opposition from domestic and international human rights activists.

Pakistan: Religious minorities faced unprecedented insecurity and persecution. Freedom of belief and expression came under severe threat as Islamist militant groups murdered Punjab Governor Salmaan Taseer and Federal Minorities' Minister Shahbaz Bhatti over their public support for amending the country's often abused blasphemy laws. Pakistan's elected government notably failed to provide protection to those threatened by extremists, or to hold the extremists accountable. Across Pakistan attacks took place against Shia and other vulnerable groups. Emboldened extremists exploited the government's passivity by intimidating minorities further, and the year saw an upsurge of blasphemy cases and allegations. Minorities, Muslims, children, and persons with mental disabilities have all been charged under the law. Members of the Ahmadi religious community also continue to be a major target for blasphemy prosecutions and are subjected to specific anti-Ahmadi laws across Pakistan. Mistreatment of women and girls, including rape, domestic violence, and forced marriage, remains a serious problem. Public intimidation of, and threats to, women and girls by religious extremists increased in major cities in 2011.

Saudi Arabia: The country responded with unflinching repression to demands by citizens for greater democracy in the wake of the pro-democracy Arab Spring movements. New laws introduced or proposed in 2011 criminalize the exercise of basic human rights such as freedom of expression, assembly, and association. Authorities continue to suppress or fail to protect the rights of 9 million Saudi women and girls, 8 million foreign workers, and some 2 million Shia citizens. Each year thousands of people receive unfair trials or are subject to arbitrary detention. The Saudi guardianship system continues to treat women as minors. Under this discriminatory system, girls and women of all ages are forbidden from traveling, studying, or working without permission from their male guardians. In May 2011, Saudi authorities arrested Manal al-Sharif after she defied the kingdom's de facto ban on women driving. Al-Sharif appeared in a video showing herself behind the wheel. Prosecutors charged her with tarnishing the kingdom's reputation abroad. Saudi Arabia is the only country in the world to prohibit women from driving.

Authorities rarely inform suspects of the crime with which they are charged, or of supporting evidence. Saudi Arabia has no penal code, so prosecutors and judges largely define criminal offense at their discretion. Lawyers do not assist suspects during interrogation and face difficulty examining witnesses or presenting evidence at trial. Saudi Arabia does not tolerate public worship by adherents of religions other than Islam and systematically discriminates against its religious minorities, in particular Shia and Ismailis. Official discrimination against Shia encompasses religious practices, education, and the justice system. Government officials exclude Shia from certain public jobs and policy questions and publicly disparage their faith. Saudi Arabia does not allow political or human rights associations. In February intelligence forces arrested six persons who planned to found the kingdom's first political party. Saudi Arabia is a key ally of the U.S. and European countries. The U.S. failed to publicly criticize Saudi human rights violations or its role in putting down pro-democracy protests in neighboring Bahrain.

Somalia: Al-Shabaab continued to administer arbitrary justice in the areas it controls, including beheadings, beatings, and torture. Al-Shabaab remained in control of most of southern Somalia where every area of people's lives is regulated by an extreme form of Islamic law. Women and girls in particular have suffered from these harsh laws. Freedoms previously enjoyed by women in Somali culture have been severely curtailed to prevent them from mixing with men. This has also limited women's ability to engage in small-scale commercial enterprises. Harsh punishments, notably floggings, summary executions, and public beheadings, are common. Such punishments generally take place after summary proceedings without due process.

Sudan: The vast majority of Darfur's displaced population, estimated at 2.5 million people, remained in camps in Darfur and Chad. On several occasions, security forces carried out violent search-and-cordon operations, arresting dozens of camp residents. Government forces were also responsible for sexual violence against displaced women and girls. In January in response to demonstrations inspired by the popular uprisings in Egypt and Tunisia, security forces arrested more than 100 protesters in Khartoum and Omdurman alone. Dozens of protesters were detained for several weeks, subjecting them to beatings, sleep deprivation, electric shocks, and other forms of physical and mental abuse, including death threats and threats of rape. Throughout the year security forces used violence to disperse peaceful protests across the country, often at universities where students gathered to protest a range of government policies and price hikes, and detained many. Security officials were also implicated in sexual violence and harassment of female activists, including the brutal rape in mid-February of Safiya Ishaq, a youth activist who was forced to flee the country after speaking out about her ordeal. Two prominent journalists were charged with defamation for their coverage of the February rape of Safiya Ishaq by security officials. Other journalists have also been harassed or threatened with defamation charges for reporting on the case.

United Arab Emirates: The human rights situation in the UAE worsened in 2011, as authorities cracked down on peaceful dissent by arresting activists, disbanding the elected boards of civil society organizations, and preventing peaceful demonstrations. Human rights defenders and government critics face harassment, imprisonment, and criminal prosecution. The UAE's penal code criminalizes speech based on broad content-based restrictions, allowing the government to prosecute people for speech critical of the government, in contravention of international standards. The UAE adjudicates family law and personal status matters for Muslims pursuant to interpretations of Islamic law, with no option to seek adjudication pursuant to a civil code. The law in particular discriminates against women by granting men privileged status in matters of divorce, inheritance, and child custody. Emirati women can obtain a divorce through khul'a (a no-fault divorce) thereby losing their financial rights. They may only ask for a divorce in exceptional circumstances. Females can only inherit one-third of assets while men are entitled to inherit two-thirds. The law further discriminates against women by permitting Emirati men, but not women, to have as many as four polygamous marriages and forbidding Muslim women, but not men, from marrying non-Muslims. Emirati women married to non-citizens do not automatically pass citizenship to their children, a right enjoyed by Emirati men married to foreign spouses. Despite the existence of shelters and hotlines to help protect women, domestic violence remains a pervasive problem. The penal code gives men the legal right to discipline their wives and children, including through the use of physical violence. The Federal Supreme Court has upheld a husband's right to chastise his wife and children with physical abuse.

Yemen: Human rights violations increased significantly in 2011, as authorities sought to quash largely peaceful demonstrations challenging the 33-year rule of President Ali Abdullah Saleh. Government forces and armed gangs attacked, harassed, or threatened scores of Yemeni journalists and human rights activists, many for reporting on or denouncing attacks on protesters. Authorities continued to prosecute journalists in specialized criminal courts that failed to meet international standards of due process. Women in Yemen generally have low social status and are excluded from public life. Child marriages and forced marriages remain widespread, exposing young girls to domestic violence and maternal mortality and truncating their education. Judges are not obliged to ensure a girl's free consent before notarizing a marriage contract.

## **Appendix I - The World after 9/11 - An interview with Ibn Warraq**

Secularist Muslim intellectual Ibn Warraq (not his real name) was born on the Indian subcontinent and educated in the West. He believes that the great Islamic civilizations of the past were established in spite of the Qur'an, not because of it, and that only a secularized Islam can rescue Muslim states from fundamentalist madness. Little wonder that he chooses to keep his identity secret. The name Ibn Warraq is one that's traditionally been adopted by dissident authors throughout the history of Islam. And in this case, Ibn Warraq uses it because he fears for his safety. He believes that there are truly moderate Muslims, but that pure Islam itself is not moderate at all. And, he says it's time for Western Muslims and Western politicians to stop denying Islam's role in the violence of September 11 and other terrorist attacks. Here are excerpts of an interview:

Q: Ibn Warraq, do you think that Islamic leaders around the world, apart from the Taliban, have any sense that the attack of September 11 represents a big crisis for them, a big crisis for Islam, perhaps even more than it does for America?

Ibn Warraq: Well, the problem is of course is that there is no such thing as a Pope in Islam, so who are exactly the Islamic leaders? There are all sorts of proclaimed Islamic philosophers and spokesmen, occasionally we refer to the Al-Azhar University in Cairo as a sort of authoritative voice, but really there is no hierarchy and there is no such thing as the Islamic spokesman. But the various Islamic philosophers, thinkers, spokesmen who are sort of trundled out on occasions like this are beginning to realize that something drastic has happened, and that a real re-thought of things has to take place, that is for sure. I have seen some incredible statements from people I never expected such statements from.

Q: Like who?

Ibn Warraq: For example, the Mufti of Marseilles. A mufti is a sort of assistant to a judge who's capable of giving a religious judgment. He said: 'If violent fundamentalists are acting canonically, I denounce the hypocrisy of Muslim theologians who refuse to criticize the theology which underwrites all this violence.' Others of course are just going along the same old way saying that we mustn't confuse Islam with Islamic fundamentalism, as though nothing has happened. And unfortunately these are the kind of people many politicians seem to be listening to.

Q: What do you think has happened? What do you think happened to Islam on September 11?

Ibn Warraq: I of course didn't think it happened to Islam on September 11 as I always knew that it was like that in any case. It just simply underlines what I've been trying to say for the last six years, and other people, more courageous and more informed than I, have been saying it for even longer. That is to say that what happened on 9/11 is somehow within Islam. It's essential to Islam in some sense, meaning that fundamentalism is somehow an essential consequence of Islam itself. And now I think, for the first time at least in France, there has been a complete breakthrough in the way we discuss Islam. Certainly in conservative newspapers, but also newspapers like Figaro, have started to criticize Islam in a very, very fundamental way. It's quite ironical that both Bush and Blair are the two leaders who have introduced religion into political life and now they refuse to use the word Islam when talking about terrorism. If they cannot analyze the



situation and see that Islam is the motivating factor behind all this, then how on earth can we tackle the problem?

Every ill in the world, including the Third World of course, has been attributed to the wicked West, and there's been incredible nonsense written about colonialism and racism and so on, as though only the West was guilty of this. Muslims were deeply implicated in the slave trade. Islam was an imperialist religion which destroyed Christianity in the Near East, yet nobody mentions those facts. We cannot hope to have a civic society if we do not value the same things, if we do not pursue the same goals, and we cannot do this if we keep emphasizing the differences. We must have a shared core of values.

We shouldn't be afraid of looking critically at Islam in the way that we have looked critically at Christianity, or any other religion, in the way that we have criticized the Bible. Higher Biblical criticism has existed since at least the 17<sup>th</sup> century with Spinoza and so on, going on to the 19<sup>th</sup> century in Germany. And yet nobody dares to look at the Qur'an in the same way. Even in the academic community there is a kind of taboo about discussing the Qur'an scientifically.

Q: When you speak to young Palestinians or Syrians in the Middle East, they'll often tell you that they just want a Western life, in fact.

Ibn Warraq: Exactly. But we don't get the media focusing on going to these people and encouraging their viewpoint. Did you know that at the time of the event on September 11 that there were a certain number of demonstrations in favor of the Americans in Iran? Same thing happened in Pakistan, but we almost never see this.

Q: Is one of the key problems that Islam faces its Arabic tribal origins? Christianity was a cosmopolitan religion from the word go, Judaism was forced to become one. Is Islam a kind of attempt to sort of transform the whole world into an Arabic tribe?

Ibn Warraq: Oh yes, that is the agenda of political Islam. But within Islam generally, there has been this current that says that Islam is the perfect religion, the Prophet was the last of the prophets, and it is the duty of every Muslim to bring this religion to the whole of humanity. There is a certain logic in that, it's not my logic because I don't accept their premise.

Q: In fact you say somewhere I think that of all the major world religions, Islam is the least original. I know some people will find that offensive. I mean Islam sees itself as advancing the revelation that was granted to Judaism and Christianity, but what do you understand that advance to consist in?

Ibn Warraq: Well, I don't see any advance whatsoever. Unless people want to see its uncompromising monotheism as some sort of an advance, but that was implicit in Judaism.

Q: But something interesting and amazing happened there in the Arabian Desert. What was it that ignited the whole world, from Morocco to Indonesia?

Ibn Warraq: People have often wondered why it was so successful. It came at a time when the Byzantine Empire and the Persian Empire were at a low ebb, and it took full advantage in a military sense, and the conquered populations of course threw in their lot with the conquerors, very quickly. I have no particular theory to advance. You get the usual panoply of explanations from the Marxists to the Freudians. More

recently in fact, you hear that Islam is the fastest growing religion and all that, and this is repeated ad infinitum, without any statistics or facts to back it up. There have been an incredible number of people converting in, of all places, Algeria, to Christianity, because they see Islam as a death-orientated religion. But of course since apostasy is punishable by death, this is not readily admitted. So although there is a kind of reaction against it, there is also this identity crisis, vis-à-vis the success of the West, ever since Napoleon invaded Egypt at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, Islam has had a kind of identity crisis. So there has been a tendency to go back to the cultural roots of their civilization, and even now, I know people who call themselves Muslims and they are in fact atheists. I mean there are Muslim atheists, if you like, but Islam remains a source of identity, particularly at this time, because they feel completely rudderless without any sort of charismatic leader; most of them live under autocracies, if not outright dictatorships. So there has been a return through one's cultural roots, but again, I don't know what the attraction historically was, which resulted in the success of Islam throughout the world.

Q: You are very critical of the kind of political correctness of the people, you call 'Western apologists'.

Ibn Warraq: Yes, I find it quite distressing that it's implicit in such an attitude by the way is the kind of racism they think they're getting away from, there's a kind of condescension which says you mustn't hurt the sensibilities of these poor Muslims, as though they are children who must be shielded from the adult world of criticism, which I find extraordinary. And the other thing I find quite extraordinary is that many of these scholars are Western apologists who are Christians.

Q: Is one of the problems here in the West that we refuse to acknowledge, we've forgotten in fact, how much our secular democratic institutions, how much the freedom that we've won, actually came out of Christianity?

Ibn Warraq: You're absolutely right. In a sense, Christianity always accepted the separation of the two spheres. You know the famous saying in the Gospel according to St. Matthew: 'Render unto Caesar what is Caesar's, and render unto God what is God's.' That is supposed to be an indication of the separation of the church and state. Look at how secularization took place in the West, surprisingly one of the forces for secularization was Christianity itself. As soon as it accepted the idea of a contrary opinion, the moment that European opinion decided for toleration, it decided for eventual free marketing opinion.

Q: Could I ask you, is the separation of church and state impossible for Islam? And I'm thinking, we're aware of a nation like Indonesia, or like Turkey, where a strong army keeps Islam in its place, but that's not what I'm talking about, and that's not what you would mean by separation of church and state either, would you?

Ibn Warraq: I think it is possible, but it's a hard job for the country concerned. Turkey is the only one which has an absolute separation built into its constitution. The others make some sort of a reference to Islam or Islamic law in their constitution, saying that the law of this country is inspired by the Sharia or by the Qur'an and so on, but I don't see why it shouldn't be. I mean it's quite obvious that in fact many of the countries were going toward a kind of secular state, even a country believe it or not, like Iraq was essentially a secular state. It was a dictatorship of course of the most awful kind, but there was no kind of concessions made to the religious parties, or to religious demands. Same thing with Syria. There's no intrinsic reason why a country with a majority of Muslims should not head in the path toward secularism.

In fact Pakistan ironically, was founded by Muhammad Ali Jinnah, who was an atheist. This is not recognized, no Pakistani would admit this, and then of course the first leader after Jinnah's death was Liaquat Ali Khan, and who was on the verge of introducing a secular constitution when he was assassinated, and we believe the assassination was by somebody linked to one of the religious parties. And I've seen interviews with various women's groups, various intellectuals in Pakistan over the last ten years, who say that the people of Pakistan have never been for the mullahs, for these obscurantist elements, and they essentially have a kind of relaxed attitude to Islam and the thought is Islam, the religion, should be reduced to the private sphere. And I think Bangladesh was also going in a secular way. But then of course the greatest change for all these countries has been the revolution in Iran. That has helped to put the clock back by 50 years. We had all sorts of secular movements, for example, women in Egypt very courageously in the 1920s burnt their veils publicly. But each time politicians have given in to the religious fundamentalist lobby. People had great expectations for the Benazir Bhutto when she took over in the late 1980s, and yet she sort of made pacts with the religious groups, you know, they said they would leave her alone and they would not question her authority because she was a woman, if she didn't attack their power. It was a complete disappointment to all the feminist groups, all the women of Pakistan when she did nothing to advance their cause. People had a high expectation, and she talked about democracy, but unfortunately she caved in each time (and she was assassinated by radical Muslims in December 2007).

Q: Do you think that the events of September 11 may possibly drive a wedge between Muslims living in the West and Muslims across the Muslim world?

Ibn Warraq: Yes, this is going to be definitely a watershed. There is already a change among Western intellectuals and their willingness to criticize Islam. There is a growing group of secular-minded Muslims, ex-Muslims and free thinkers of Muslim origin who get together regularly. We are not betraying our own culture; on the contrary, we are dignifying humanity by being critical of the religion of Islam. We should take advantage of the freedom of expression that the West gives us, to look critically, instead of withdrawing into a kind of sullen silence. All of us should take this opportunity to openly look at our roots, at the problem of interpreting the Qur'an, for example, at the position of women, the need for separation of state and church and so on. So I think it is a great opportunity for Muslims to examine what it is in their religion that pushes them to such violent acts.

As for the Muslims elsewhere, most live under authoritarian governments without the freedom of expression, with the limited exception of Turkey. There are lone voices, very courageous lone voices, even in those countries. You have a secularist philosopher called Sadiq al-Azam in Syria for example; you have some very courageous individuals in Egypt; in Tunisia you have Muhammad Sharfi, who's a secularist. They're the people that we should encourage.

Muslims have not ever been told to examine their faith in a critical way, so the shock is going to be even greater for them, as it is for any child who lives in an over-protected environment, who suddenly has to go out and earn a living and has to stand up on his or her own feet. This is exactly the kind of shock they need. What does a child do? He or she has to look reality in the face, and this is what Muslims have to do. They have to examine their sacred texts and see what is wrong with them, what is in them that drives people to murder 3,000 people in one go. It's no good pretending it's got nothing to do with Islam, so they've got to examine their religion and look reality in the face. And I can't see there's going to be any soft way out of

this. They've just got to wake up and they've got to grow up. So instead of shouting, 'Oh, you're insulting our Prophet, and oh, you're insulting our religion', they've got to face reality (even if it hurts). I have a Dominican priest friend who once said to me: 'You know, throughout the ages Catholicism really received some slaps in the face, and believe me, it has done us a lot of good.'

This implies that Islam is potentially going to be required, maybe by the West, to go through something big like the Reformation that the Christian Church went through. Of course, we're talking about one of the biggest stories in the history of religion. I see this as megalomaniac. But it's got to start somewhere. We need to start planting the seeds today.

## **Appendix J - An interview with Nasr Hamid Abu Zayd about reforming Islam**

Q: The question of what the Muslim attitude to violence is still one that very much preoccupies the West. You recently pointed out that recourse to the Qur'anic Surahs is totally misleading in today's context.

Abu Zayd: Of course, the Qur'an sometimes uses very strong language in its exhortations to fight. Researchers have to question why the Qur'an employs such strong, persuasive language in this case. The context is crucial here. The Arabs who believed in Muhammad were to be convinced of the need to fight against their own families and, in so doing, reject pre-Islamic traditions. So it was forbidden for an individual to fight against his own tribe. But the arrival of Muhammad as prophet drew so many members of various tribes to him. When the time came for them to defend their new community, the threat came from their own tribes. The uncompromising tone of the Qur'an is understandable here. Islam was not born out of a world empire; it arose from a world of tribal tradition, tribal laws and pagan rules. Blood bonds and tribal ties did not hold the new community together. They came, after all, from many different tribes. They came together into a new kind of tribe, one that from the beginning was locked in conflict with other tribes. They had to defend themselves. All of this formed the Qur'an. It is very much a product of its formative influences. We cannot understand the Qur'an without knowledge of the historical background.

Q: You have referred several times to the interpretation of the Qur'an by John of Damascus. This important churchman in the early Islamic period pointed to a number of things in Islam that he regarded as contradictory. What does this eighth-century Christian theologian have to say to us today with regard to the Qur'an exegesis?

Abu Zayd: The first lesson as I understood it from my first reading of his provocative analysis of the Qur'an was this: this is an 8<sup>th</sup> century polemical debate, but one which was nevertheless very productive, because the early Islamic theologians saw the questions raised by John as a challenge, not as a threat. The relevance for me of all these provocative challenges within the anti-Islamic discourse today, such as the Muhammad cartoons or films like 'Fitna' or 'Submission', is that I always try to get other Muslims to see them as a challenge also. After all, nothing can really threaten great civilizations which have survived for centuries during which they have developed very differing political systems, from the tribal to the imperial, from nation state to global order. John of Damascus wasn't trying to spur Islamic theologians on to greater things. All he did was to show the relationship between the Muslim and the non-Muslim world, a relationship that was

deeper and more historical than we realize. The idea of two separate worlds divided from one another is wrong. Such worlds have never existed.

Q: What was it that made Islam a great civilization?

Abu Zayd: It was the way in which it interacted with other cultures, the worldwide cultural exchange which was already well established by the end of the 7<sup>th</sup> and beginning of the 8<sup>th</sup> centuries and which was carried on via Spain and Sicily. Just think of the Islamic philosophy and scholarship that was translated into Latin. Civilizations are like waves and always in movement: coming from Africa or the old Iraq, to Greece and from there to the Middle East. There was the Hellenistic period, when Alexander the Great tried to spread his rule through the entire region. Then came the Islamic civilization. And finally the Renaissance and the modern Western civilization. This type of exchange, which emphasizes the importance of dialogue between the civilizations and religions, began in the 7<sup>th</sup> century.

Q: In saying that you are contradicting the current claims of critics of Islam who maintain that there was no serious exchange or dialogue and that Islam and individualism are incompatible.

Abu Zayd: Exactly. That is also an important argument against the idea that, from a Muslim point of view, conversion to a different faith is not possible. Once a Muslim, says the prevailing opinion among Islamic scholars, always a Muslim. Or you have to make yourself scarce. I believe that the Prophet's invitation to the people to follow him in their faith is based upon the assumption of their freedom to choose. People who do not have a free choice do not need to be invited, after all. The basic right of every person to follow a new spiritual leader should be ensured by his also having the opportunity to change his mind again.

Q: You mentioned the wave-like movements in the global historical process, the at times very creative and dynamic periods of the Muslim world. But at some point around the 14<sup>th</sup> or 15<sup>th</sup> century this vitality seems to have disappeared. Why do you think this happened?

Abu Zayd: I do not agree entirely with what you are saying. If you compare Islamic thought of the 15<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> century with the developments in Islamic thought in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries you will discover a great diversity of ideas. The problem is that some people tend to have rather fixed ideas about Arabs. They cannot even distinguish between places as different as Tunisia and Saudi Arabia. They see Islam as fixed, unchanging, which just is not the case. There is a change underway in the Muslim world, a reformation. It began at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and continued through the 20<sup>th</sup>. It has gone through highs and lows.

Q: But you see yourself as a victim of these changes?

Abu Zayd: Yes, I am a victim. But I am also a witness to the changes that are taking place, in spite of all the terrible things that have happened. The famous Arab-Spanish philosopher Averroes was condemned. Nevertheless, despite that, his ideas have spread through the West, they went via Syria, were translated into Latin and formed the foundation of the church at that time. We must always pay attention to context, both local and international. We mustn't forget that the Christian world, too, has condemned many thinkers. Nevertheless, there, too, an internal dynamism was set in motion.

Q: In the course of your work how do you relate to those aspects of the historical Islamic tradition which you think might be opposed to the notion of women's and children's rights?

Abu Zayd: Every tradition has both negative as well as positive aspects. The positive aspects are to be further developed, while the negative aspects need to be discussed closely, to see if they are indeed essential elements of the faith or are actually simply human creations.

Q: How does this work relate to what you have been previously engaged in?

Abu Zayd: I see it as part of my long interest in Islamic hermeneutics, the methodology of understanding the Qur'an, the Sunnah and other components of the Islamic tradition. Of particular concern for me are certain assumptions in popular Islamic discourse that have not been fully examined, and have generally been ignored or avoided. Thus, for instance, Muslim scholars have not seriously reflected on the question of what is actually meant when we say that the Qur'an is the revealed *Word of God*. What exactly does the term *Word of God* mean? What does revelation mean? We have the definitions of the word and revelation given by traditional scholars, but other definitions are also possible. When we speak of the *Word of God*, are we speaking of a divine or a human code of communication? Is language a neutral channel of communication? Was the responsibility of the Prophet simply that of delivering the message, or did he have a role to play in the forming of that message? What relation does the Qur'an have with the particular social context in which it was revealed? We need to ask what it means for the faith Muslims have in the Qur'an if one brings in the issue of the human dimension involved in revelation.

Q: Are you suggesting that the Qur'an cannot be understood without taking into account the particular social context of seventh century Arabia? In other words, are there aspects of the Qur'an that were limited in their relevance and application only to the Prophet's time, and are no longer applicable or relevant today?

Abu Zayd: What I am suggesting is that in our reading of the Qur'an we cannot undermine the role of the Prophet and the historical and cultural premises of the times and the context of the Qur'anic revelation. When we say that through the Qur'an God spoke in history, we cannot neglect the historical dimension, the historical context of seventh century Arabia. Otherwise you cannot answer the question of why God first 'spoke' Hebrew through his revelations to the prophets of Israel, then Aramaic, through Jesus, and then Arabic, in the form of the Qur'an. In a historical understanding of the Qur'an one would also have to look at the verses in the text that refer specifically to the Prophet and the society in which he lived. Some people might feel that looking at the Qur'an in this way is a crime against Islam, but I feel that this sort of reaction is a sign of a weak and vulnerable faith. And this is why a number of writers who have departed from tradition and have pressed for a way of relating to the Qur'an that takes the historical context of the revelation seriously have been persecuted in many countries. I think there is a pressing need to bring the historical dimension of the revelation into discussion, for this is indispensable for countering authoritarianism, both religious and political, and for promoting human rights.

Q: Could you give an example of how a historically grounded reading of the Qur'an could help promote human rights?

Abu Zayd: Take, for instance, the question of chopping off the hands of thieves, which traditionalists would insist be imposed as an Islamic punishment today. A historically nuanced understanding of the Islamic tradition would see this form of punishment as a borrowing from pre-Islamic Arabian society, and as rooted in a particular social and historical context. Hence, doing away with this form of punishment today would not, one could argue, be tantamount to doing away with Islam itself. By thus contextualizing the Qur'an, one

could arrive at its essential core, which could be seen as being normative for all times, shifting it from what could be regarded as having been relevant to a historical period and context that no longer exists.

Q: If one were to take history seriously, how would a contextual, historically grounded understanding of the Qur'an reflect on Islamic theology as it has come to be developed?

Abu Zayd: As I see it, Sunni Muslim theology has remained largely frozen in its ninth-century mould, as developed by the conservative Asharites. We need to revisit fundamental theological concepts today, which most scholars have ignored, for there can be no reform possible in Muslim societies without reform in theology. Till now, however, most reform movements in the Sunni world have operated from within the broad framework of traditional theology, which is why they have not been able to go very far.

Q: How would this new understanding of theology that you propose reflect on the issue of interfaith relations?

Abu Zayd: When I suggest that we need to reconsider what exactly is meant by saying that the Qur'an is the *Word of God*. Muslims must also remember that the Qur'an itself insists that the *Word of God* cannot be limited to the Qur'an alone. A verse in the Qur'an says that if all the trees in the world were pens and all the water in the seas were ink, still they could not, put together, adequately exhaust the *Word of God*. The Qur'an, therefore, represents only one manifestation of the absolute *Word of God*. Other Scriptures represent other manifestations as well. Then again, many Sufis saw the whole universe as a manifestation of the *Word of God*. But, today, few Muslim scholars are taking the need for interfaith dialogue with the seriousness that it deserves. Most Muslim writers are yet to free themselves from a rigid, imprisoning chauvinism.

Q: How does this way of reading the Qur'an deal with the multiple ways in which the text can be understood and interpreted?

Abu Zayd: The Qur'an, like any other text, can be read in different ways, and there has always been a plurality of interpretations. The text does not stand alone. Rather, it has to be interpreted, in order to arrive at its meaning, and interpretation is a human exercise and no interpreter is infallible. As Imam Ali says, the Qur'an does not speak by itself, but, rather, through human beings. True, Muslims from all over the world do share certain rituals and beliefs in common, but their understanding of what Islam and the Qur'an are all about do differ considerably. It is for us to help develop new ways of understanding Islam that can promote human rights, while at the same time being firmly rooted in the faith tradition.

## **Appendix K - Excerpts from the Declaration Toward a Global Ethic**

The world is in agony. The agony is so pervasive and urgent that we are compelled to name its manifestations so that the depth of this pain may be made clear. But this agony need not be. It need not be because the basis for an ethic already exists. This ethic offers the possibility of a better individual and global order, and leads individuals away from despair and societies away from chaos. We are women and men who have embraced the precepts and practices of the world's religions. We affirm that a common set of core values is found in the teachings of the religions, and that these form the basis of a global ethic. We affirm that this truth is already known, but yet to be lived in heart and action. We affirm that there is an irrevocable, un-

conditional norm for all areas of life, for families and communities, for races, nations, and religions. There already exist ancient guidelines for human behavior which are found in the teachings of the religions of the world [early Meccan Surahs for Islam] and which are the condition for a sustainable world order.

We are interdependent. Each of us depends on the well-being of the whole, and so we have respect for the community of living beings, for people, animals, and plants, and for the preservation of Earth, the air, water and soil. We take individual responsibility for all we do. All our decisions, actions, and failures to act have consequences. We must treat others as we wish others to treat us. We make a commitment to respect life and dignity, individuality and diversity, so that every person is treated humanely, without exception. We must have patience and acceptance. We must be able to forgive, learning from the past but never allowing ourselves to be enslaved by memories of hate. Opening our hearts to one another, we must sink our narrow differences for the cause of the world community, practicing a culture of solidarity and relatedness.

We consider humankind our family. We must strive to be kind and generous. We must not live for ourselves alone, but should also serve others, never forgetting the children, the aged, the poor, the suffering, the disabled, the refugees, and the lonely. No person should ever be considered or treated as a second-class citizen, or be exploited in any way whatsoever. There should be equal partnership between men and women. We must not commit any kind of sexual immorality. We must put behind us all forms of domination or abuse.

We commit ourselves to a culture of non-violence, respect, justice, and peace. We shall not oppress, injure, torture, or kill other human beings, forsaking violence as a means of settling differences. We must strive for a just social and economic order, in which everyone has an equal chance to reach full potential as a human being. We must speak and act truthfully and with compassion, dealing fairly with all, and avoiding prejudice and hatred. We must not steal. We must move beyond the dominance of greed for power, prestige, money, and consumption to make a just and peaceful world.

Time and again we see leaders and members of religions incite aggression, fanaticism, hate, and xenophobia, and even inspire and legitimize violent and bloody conflicts. Religion often is misused for purely power-political goals, including war. We are filled with disgust. We condemn these blights and declare that they need not be. An ethic already exists within the religious teachings of the world which can counter the global distress. Of course this ethic provides no direct solution for all the immense problems of the world, but it does supply the moral foundation for a better individual and global order: A vision which can lead women and men away from despair, and society away from chaos. We women and men of various religions and regions of Earth therefore address all people, religious and non-religious. We wish to express the following convictions which we hold in common:

- We all have a responsibility for a better global order.
- Our involvement for the sake of human rights, freedom, justice, peace, and the preservation of Earth is absolutely necessary.
- Our different religious and cultural traditions must not prevent our common involvement in opposing all forms of inhumanity and working for greater humaneness.
- The principles expressed in this Global Ethic can be affirmed by all persons with ethical convictions, whether religiously grounded or not.



Guarantees of freedom of conscience and religion are necessary but they do not substitute for binding values, convictions, and norms which are valid for all humans regardless of their social origin, sex, skin color, language, or religion. We are convinced of the fundamental unity of the human family on Earth. We recall the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations. What it formally proclaimed on the level of rights we wish to confirm and deepen here from the perspective of an ethic: The full realization of the intrinsic dignity of the human person, the inalienable freedom and equality in principle of all humans, and the necessary solidarity and interdependence of all humans with each other.

We are all fallible, imperfect men and women with limitations and defects. We know the reality of evil. Precisely because of this, we feel compelled for the sake of global welfare to express what the fundamental elements of a global ethic should be for individuals as well as for communities and organizations, for states as well as for the religions themselves. We trust that our often millennia-old religious and ethical traditions provide an ethic which is convincing and practicable for all women and men of good will, religious and non-religious. At the same time we know that our various religious and ethical traditions often offer very different bases for what is helpful and what is unhelpful for men and women, what is right and what is wrong, what is good and what is evil. We do not wish to gloss over or ignore the serious differences among the individual religions. However, they should not hinder us from proclaiming publicly those things which we already hold in common and which we jointly affirm, each on the basis of our own religious or ethical grounds.

We know that religions cannot solve the environmental, economic, political, and social problems of Earth. However they can provide what obviously cannot be attained by economic plans, political programs, or legal regulations alone: A change in the inner orientation, the whole mentality, the hearts of people, and a conversion from a false path to a new orientation for life. Humankind urgently needs social and ecological reforms, but it needs spiritual renewal just as urgently. As religious or spiritual persons we commit ourselves to this task. The spiritual powers of the religions can offer a fundamental sense of trust, a ground of meaning, ultimate standards, and a spiritual home. Of course religions are credible only when they eliminate those conflicts which spring from the religions themselves, dismantling mutual arrogance, mistrust, prejudice, and even hostile images, and thus demonstrate respect for the traditions, holy places, feasts, and rituals of people who believe differently.

There is a principle which is found and has persisted in many religious and ethical traditions of humankind for thousands of years: What you do not wish done to yourself, do not do to others. Or in positive terms: What you wish done to yourself, do to others! This should be the irrevocable, unconditional norm for all areas of life, for families and communities, for races, nations, and religions.

Every form of egoism should be rejected: all selfishness, whether individual or collective, whether in the form of class thinking, racism, nationalism, or sexism. We condemn these because they prevent humans from being authentically human. Self-determination and self-realization are thoroughly legitimate so long as they are not separated from human self-responsibility and global responsibility, that is, from responsibility for fellow humans and for the planet Earth. This principle implies very concrete standards to which we humans should hold firm.

Earth cannot be changed for the better unless we achieve a transformation in the consciousness of individuals and in public life. The possibilities for transformation have already been glimpsed in areas such as war

and peace, economy, and ecology, where in recent decades fundamental changes have taken place. This transformation must also be achieved in the area of ethics and values! Every individual has intrinsic dignity and inalienable rights, and each also has an inescapable responsibility for what she or he does and does not do. All our decisions and deeds, even our omissions and failures, have consequences. Together we can move mountains! Without a willingness to take risks and a readiness to sacrifice there can be no fundamental change in our situation! Therefore we commit ourselves to a common global ethic, to better mutual understanding, as well as to socially beneficial, peace-fostering, and Earth-friendly ways of life. We invite all men and women, whether religious or not, to do the same!

The 'Declaration Toward a Global Ethic' was signed by numerous religious scholars, including 50 Christians, 18 Muslims, 16 Hindus, 15 Buddhists, 9 Zoroastrians, 7 Sikhs, 6 Jews, and 6 Bahais.

## **Appendix L - The Anti-Jihadist Glossary of Terms**

Abrogation: The doctrine based on Qur'an 2:106, 13:39, 16:101, 17:86, and 87:6-7 stating that Allah rescinded previous revelations on the same subject, for example the treatment of Jews and Christians

Acid attacks: A popular method of militant Muslim men to punish their disobedient wives

Activist Muslim: An orthodox Muslim who is active in spreading orthodox Islam with either violent or non-violent means

Age of Enlightenment: A cultural movement of intellectuals in 18th century Europe and the United States, whose purpose was to reform society and advance knowledge. It promoted science and intellectual interchange and opposed superstition, intolerance and abuses by religious and state-run institutions

Agnostic: A person who believes that there is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the existence of God and seen as an idolater by orthodox Islam

Ahl al-Kitab: See People of the Book

Ahmadiyya: An Islamic reformist movement founded in British India at the end of the 19th century with the intention of bringing about the final triumph of Islam as per Islamic prophecy

Al Wala Wal Bara: An Islamic concept that requires one to love what Allah loves, and hate what Allah hates, also referred to as loyalty and disavowal

Al-Azl: Incomplete sexual intercourse when the man withdraws his penis and ejaculates outside the woman's body

Al-Qaeda: A global militant Islamist organization founded by Osama bin Laden in the late 1980s with its origins being traceable to the Soviet War in Afghanistan. It operates as a network comprising both a multi-national, stateless army and a radical Sunni Muslim movement calling for global Jihad and a strict interpretation of Sharia law

Al-Shabaab: The Somalia-based cell of al-Qaeda which has imposed its own strict form of Sharia law

Alim: A scholar in any field of knowledge

Allah: The Arabic name for God

Allahu Akbar: The Arabic term for 'Allah is Greater' often used as a mantra or battle cry of militant Muslims

Anti-Islam movement: A global group of activists who fight against the spread of orthodox Islam

Anti-Jihadist: An activist committed to eliminating orthodox Islam or stopping the spread of orthodox Islam

Apostasy: The abandonment or renunciation of a religious or political belief

Ashura: A day in the Islamic month Muharram on which Shia Muslims beat themselves bloody with swords, chains, knives and other metal objects

Asma Allah al-Husna: The list of Allah's 99 names. According to a Hadith, the one who enumerates them all will enter Paradise

Assalamu alaikum: A greeting by a Muslim to another Muslim meaning 'peace be upon you'

Atheist: A person who rejects belief in God and seen as an idolater by the doctrine of orthodox Islam

Awliya: The Arabic term for protector or friend

Baghawat: The insurgency against a legitimate government

Bahai: A follower of the Bahai religion and seen as an idolater by the doctrine of orthodox Islam

Barbarism: The absence of a sophisticated culture and advanced civilization

Beheading: The act of intentional decapitation as a means of murder or execution and a common punishment prescribed by the Sharia

Blasphemy: The act of insulting or showing contempt or lack of reverence for Allah or the prophet Muhammad. The penalties for blasphemy can include fines, imprisonment, flogging, amputation, hanging, or beheading

Blind anti-multiculturalism: The complete rejection of the multiculturalist concept

Blind multiculturalism: A form of multiculturalism that does not distinguish between tolerant and intolerant cultures

Blind obedience: The act of following instructions without applying critical thinking

Blind political correctness: A form of political correctness that also seeks to avoid offense against intolerant people and ideologies

Blind tolerance: A form of tolerance that includes tolerating intolerance

Boko Haram: A violent Jihadist terrorist organization based in the northeast of Nigeria which strongly opposes man-made laws.

Booty: See Ghanimah.

Bucailleism: An Islamic movement based on the belief of scientific foreknowledge in the Qur'an

Buddhist: A follower of Buddhism and seen as an idolater by the doctrine of orthodox Islam

Burqa: An enveloping outer garment worn by women in some Islamic traditions to cover their bodies when in public including the entire face

Caliph: The head of state in a Caliphate, and the title for the leader of the Islamic Ummah

Caliphate: A theocracy based on Islamic Sharia law

Camel urine: An ineffective Islamic medicine prescribed for various illnesses

Candid Progressive's Guide to Islam: See Handbook for Infidels.

Chador: A black garment or open cloak worn by many Iranian women and female teenagers in public spaces

Charter for Compassion: A document expressing the need to make compassion a clear, luminous and dynamic force in our polarized world

Clash of civilizations: A theory, proposed by political scientist Samuel P. Huntington, that people's cultural and religious identities will be the primary source of conflict in the post-Cold War world

Compassion: The virtue of empathy for the suffering of others. It is regarded as a fundamental part of human love, and a cornerstone of greater social interconnection

Concubine: A woman who lives with a man but has lower status than his wife or wives

Counter-Jihadist: See Anti-Jihadist

Cult: A (religious) movement whose beliefs or practices are considered abnormal or bizarre

Cultural relativism: The concept that civilization is not something absolute, created as a response to Western ethnocentrism

Dar ad-Dawa: A region where Islam has recently been introduced

Dar al-Harb: The house of war referring to countries which are not yet under Islamic rule

Dar al-Islam: The lands that are under the rule of orthodox Muslim governments

Dawah: The preaching and proselytizing of Islam, literally 'issuing a summons' or 'making an invitation'

Death threat: A common tactics used by militant Muslims to silence critics of Islam

Devout Muslim: An orthodox Muslim who follows all instructions contained in the Qur'an and Sunnah

Dhimmi: A non-Muslim living in an Islamic country who is forced to pay Jizyah and who cannot serve in the army or government, display symbols of faith, or build or repair places of worship

Din: The complete way of life based on Islamic revelation

Disbeliever: Someone who rejects Allah and who does not believe in Muhammad as the final messenger of Allah

Dogmatic Islam: See Orthodox Islam

Double-agent strategy: Secretly fighting the orthodox system in Muslim communities by giving the appearance of an orthodox Muslim using a white lie about the use of Taqiyya

Eid Mubarak: The greeting reserved for use on the festivals of Eid al-Adha and Eid al-Fitr meaning 'may you enjoy a blessed festival'

Eid al-Adha: The Festival of Sacrifice

Eid al-Fitr: The Festival of Breaking the Fast

Enlightened Islam: A form of progressive Islam that stresses the accomplishments of the Age of Enlightenment

Euro-Islam: A hypothesized new branch of Islam which would combine the duties and principles of Islam with the contemporary European cultures, including Europe's post-Enlightenment values and traditions such as human rights, rule of law, democracy and gender equality.

Face veil: See Full Hijab.

Faith junkie: A religious extremist who is addicted to carrying out the instructions of religious doctrines

Fajarah: Wicked evil doers

Fake moderate Muslim: An orthodox Muslim who gives the appearance of being a moderate Muslim

Fake orthodox Muslim: A truly moderate Muslim who gives the appearance of being an orthodox Muslim with the goal of winning over undecided (young) Muslims

Fard: An obligatory duty that every Muslim is required to perform, for example the five daily prayers

Fasaqa: See Fuwaysiqah

Fasiq: A sinner who has violated Islamic law and usually referring to someone whose character has been corrupted

Fatwa: An Islamic religious ruling or a scholarly opinion on a matter of Islamic law, issued by a recognized religious authority in Islam

Fiqh: Islamic jurisprudence as a complimentary expansion of Sharia law.

Fitna: Chaos, turmoil, disbelief, disagreement and division among people

Five pillars of Islam: The Islamic creed, five daily prayers, donating to the poor, fasting during Ramadan, and the pilgrimage to Mecca at least once in a lifetime

Freedom of religion: The right to convert to other religions including the right to be an atheist or agnostic

Friendship prohibition: A doctrine of orthodox Islam stating that a Muslim cannot be a true friend of a non-Muslim (fake friendships are allowed if it supports the cause of Islam)

Full Hijab: A full-body veil also hiding the face, which is mostly worn by strict orthodox Muslim women who choose to wear it, or by women whose strict orthodox Muslim husbands force them to wear it

Fuwaysiqah: The deviation from the right way

Gazwa: A pre-Islamic tribal practice of raiding others for a living that Muhammad assimilated into Islam. It is also the name given to the 78 raids in which Muhammad participated personally

Gentle Jihad: See Stealth Jihad.

Genuinely moderate Muslim: See Truly moderate Muslim

Ghanimah: Booty that is taken from the fighting enemies by force

Gharbzadegi: A pejorative Persian term variously translated as Westoxification, Westitis, Euromania or Occidentosis. It is used to refer to the loss of Iranian cultural identity through the adoption and imitation of Western models and Western criteria in education, the arts, and culture; through the transformation of Iran into a passive market for Western goods and a pawn in Western geopolitics

Ghusl: The full ablution required for various rituals and prayers, for example after having sexual intercourse or at the completion of the menstrual cycle

Global ethic: The vision of a global transformation of ethical awareness based on the assumption that men and women are dependent on shared basic ethical values, criteria and attitudes for peaceful co-existence

Golden Rule: A principle stating that one should treat others as one would like others to treat oneself, and that one should not treat others in ways that one would not like to be treated

Great Satan: A pejorative Persian term applied to the United States by the late Ayatollah Khomeini. Satan as depicted in the Qur'an is neither an imperialist nor an exploiter. He is a seducer and the insidious tempter who whispers in the hearts of men

Hadith: The traditions of the prophet Muhammad

Hafiz: Someone who has memorized the entire Qur'an

Haji: The pilgrimage to Mecca

Halal: Lawful, permitted, good, beneficial, praiseworthy, and honorable

Hamas: The Palestinian Sunni Islamist political party that governs the Gaza Strip with its military wing called the Izz ad-Din al-Qassam Brigades

Handbook for Infidels: A collection of ideas to be used by progressive counter-Jihadists

Haram: Sinful and strictly forbidden

Harbi: A non-Muslim living in the house of war in which Islam does not dominate and must therefore be fought until Islam dominates it

Hasan hadiths: Traditions of the Prophet with acceptable authenticity

Hate group: An organized group or movement that advocates and practices hatred, hostility, or violence toward members of a race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation or other aspects of society

Hate speech: A form of communication that vilifies a person or a group on the basis of color, disability, ethnicity, gender, nationality, race, religion, sexual orientation, or other characteristic. Orthodox Islam uses an interpretation of the Qur'an and Sunnah that include parts that qualify as hate speech as it vilifies non-Muslims, Muslim apostates, homosexuals and disobedient Muslim women

Hawwa: The Islamic name for Eve

Heterodox Muslim: A Muslims that is not in agreement with all accepted beliefs of Islam

Hezbollah: A Shia Islamic militant group and political party based in Lebanon that receives financial and political support from Iran and Syria. Its paramilitary wing is regarded as a resistance movement throughout much of the Arab and Muslim worlds

Hijab: A veil which covers the hair, which is mostly worn by orthodox Muslim women who choose to wear it, or by women whose orthodox Muslim husbands force them to wear it

Hijra: The migration of the prophet Muhammad and his followers to the city of Medina in 622 CE

Hikmah: Wisdom referring to the highest possible level of understanding attainable by a Muslim

Hindu: A follower of Hinduism and seen as an idolater by orthodox Islam

Hira: A cave about 2 miles from Mecca where the Prophet received his divine revelations

Hour: Beautiful and pure young men and women that Muslims believe inhabit Paradise

Human rights: Inalienable, universal fundamental rights to which a person is inherently entitled simply because she or he is a human being

Ibn Warrag: A popular alias adopted by apostates of Islam

Ibrahim: The Islamic name for Abraham

Idolater: An atheist, agnostic or followers of non-Judeo-Christian religions such as Hinduism or Buddhism

Ijtihad: The endeavor of a Muslim scholar to derive a rule of divine law from the Qur'an and Hadith without relying on the views of other scholars

Incitement to hatred: The intentional use of hate speech

Infidel: See Disbeliever

Infidelophobia: The persistent, irrational fear of non-Muslims despite the awareness and reassurance that non-Muslims are not dangerous and that there is no need to hate or fight them

Injil: The Islamic name for the New Testament's gospels

Inshallah: Arabic for 'God willing', which means that sth. will occur in the future only if it is the will of God

Isa al-Masih: The Islamic name for Jesus Christ

Islam is the solution: A slogan used by the Muslim Brotherhood

Islam: The Arabic word for submission

Islamic indoctrination: The process of making people take Islam's doctrines more and more seriously

Islamic jurisprudence: A complimentary expansion of the Sharia by Islamic jurists

Islamic reformation: The process of reforming Islam with of goal of making it compatible with human rights and secular laws

Islamic Resurgence: See Islamic revival

Islamic revival: A movement dedicated to reviving the Islamic religion throughout the Islamic world, which began in the 1970s. It is manifested in greater religious piety and in a growing adoption of Islamic culture, dress, terminology, separation of the sexes, speech and media censorship, and values by Muslims. It includes a feeling of a growing universalistic Islamic identity as often shared by Muslim immigrants and their children who live in non-Muslim countries

Islamism: A set of ideologies holding that Islam is as much a political ideology as a religion. The term was coined to differentiate Islam as a modern political ideology from Islam as a faith

Islamist extremist: See Militant Muslim

Islamist terrorism: The use of terror, especially as a means of coercion, in the name of Islam

Islamization: The process by which an entity is transformed by one or more of the teachings of Islam to become a new entity with Islamic features and characteristics. Islamic values slowly gain the upper hand over all other value systems

Islamophobia: An oxymoron used to stigmatize criticism of Islam and silence opposition to orthodox Islam

Isra: The night journey during which Muhammad is said to have visited Heaven

Jahannam: A special form of hell which was specifically created featuring an eternal fire so that Allah can torture disbelievers such as Christians and disobedient Muslim women

Jahiliyyah: The time of ignorance before Islam was realized

Janaba: A state of spiritual impurity that occurs due to sexual intercourse or ejaculation and necessitates major ritual ablution

Jibreel: The angel who revealed the Qur'an to the prophet Muhammad

Jihadist: A militant Muslim engaged in the actual fight

Jizyah: An additional tribute tax to be paid by Jews and Christians in Islamic countries

Jumuah: The Friday prayers

Kafir: A liar who rejects Allah and who does not believe in Muhammad as the final messenger of Allah. The plural is Kuffar

Khutbah: A speech delivered by a Muslim cleric before Friday prayers.

Kitman: A concept similar to Taqiyya, but rather than outright dissimulation, it consists of telling only a part of the truth when the omission of the rest is justified

Kufrul-Istibdaal: Disbelief because of trying to substitute Allah's Laws

Kufrul-Istihaal: Disbelief out of trying to make haram into halal.

Kufrul-Juhudi: Disbelief from obstinacy after being presented with Allah's truth

La ilaha illa Allah: Arabic for 'there is none worthy of worship but God' which is the most important expression in Islam. The uttering this formula of faith is called Tahlil

Last Messenger of Allah: A description of the prophet Muhammad

Legitimate Islamic rape: Sexual intercourse of a Muslim man with a female slave against her will

Liberal Muslim: See heterodox Muslim

Low-profile Jihadi: See Stealth Jihadist

Madrasa: A religious school with a strong focus on Islamic indoctrination

Mahr: The payment for the use of a woman's vagina in sexual intercourse

Mansukh: That which is abrogated, referring to the doctrine of al-Nasikh wal-Mansukh (abrogation) of earlier parts of the Qur'anic revelation by later parts

Martyr: A Muslim who has died fulfilling a religious commandment, or waging war for Islam

Maryam: The Islamic name for Mary

Meccan Surahs: Chapters of the Qur'an revealed to Muhammad before 622 CE

Medina Surahs: Chapters of the Qur'an revealed to Muhammad between 622 and 632 CE

Militant Muslim: An orthodox Muslim who is actually willing and capable of inflicting the full range of violence prescribed by the Islamic doctrines

Misogyny: The hatred or dislike of women or girls manifested in numerous ways, including sexual discrimination, denigration of women and violence against women

Moderate Islamist: An oxymoron coined to describe a moderate supporter of Islam as a political ideology

Moderate Muslim: Either a truly moderate Muslim or a fake moderate Muslim

Muharebeh: A person who wages war against God

Munafiq: A Muslim apostate who keeps his apostasy a secret

Murtad: An apostate of Islam

Musa: The Islamic name for Moses

Muslim Brotherhood: The largest and most influential Islamist movement. It was founded in Egypt in 1928 as a Pan-Islamic, religious, political, and social movement by Hassan al-Banna and strongly influenced by Sayyid Qutb. Its stated goal is to instill the Qur'an and Sunnah as the sole reference point for ordering the life of the Muslim family, individual, community and state

Mutah: A temporary arrangement whereby a man and a woman enter into a contractual arrangement to marry each other for a specified period of time. The man gives the woman something of value, and in exchange he is allowed to enter into sexual relations with her, legally, without committing fornication. At the end of the period specified in the contract, usually a few days at most, each party walks separate ways and neither is indebted to the other

Myth: A sacred narrative often related to the human struggle to deal with the great passages of time and life such as birth, death, marriage, the transitions from childhood to adulthood to old age

Najasat: An unclean thing

Najis: Impure, unclean non-Muslims

Nikah: A contract for the ownership and use of the vagina

Niqab: An enveloping outer garment worn by women in Arab to cover their bodies when in public including the entire face, except for a small vertical slit for the eyes



Non-Muslim: See Disbeliever

OIC: The Organization of the Islamic Conference which is an association of 56 Islamic states promoting Muslim solidarity in economic, social, and political affairs

Orthodox Islam: The standard Islam which requires the agreement with all doctrines and instructions contained in the Qur'an and Sunnah

PBUH: An acronym that stands for Peace Be Unto Him

Pak: Pure, clean Muslims

People of the Book: A term referring to Jews and Christians

Phobia: A persistent, abnormal, and irrational fear of a specific thing or situation that compels one to avoid it, despite the awareness and reassurance that it is not dangerous

Pious Muslim: Either a devout Muslim or a deeply religious progressive Muslim

Political Islam: See Islamism

Political correctness: A term which denotes language, ideas, policies, and behavior seen as seeking to minimize social and institutional offense in occupational, gender, racial, cultural, sexual orientation, certain other religions, beliefs or ideologies, disability, and age-related contexts

Polytheist: A person who believes in multiple deities and seen as an idolater by orthodox Islam

Progressive Muslim: See Truly moderate Muslim

Prophet: A person who has received messages from Allah

Psychopathy: A personality disorder characterized by lacking empathy, coldheartedness, lacking guilt, manipulateness and other antisocial behaviors such as parasitic lifestyle and criminality

Pure Islam: See Orthodox Islam

Qitaal fee sybil Allah: The fight in the cause of Allah

Qur'an: The holy book of Islam that contains the messages and instructions from Allah

Radical Muslim: A Muslim following the instructions of orthodox Islam

Radical mosque: A place of worship that spreads orthodox or even militant Islam

Rajm: The practice of stoning

Ramadan: The month of fasting when the Qur'an was first revealed

Religion of peace: A false label used to mask the true intentions of orthodox Islam

Religious deception: See Taqiyya.

Ribat: The guarding of Muslims from infidels

Ruh: The divine breath which God blew into the clay of Adam

Sabb: An act of blasphemy by insulting Allah or Muhammad

Sahih Hadiths: Fully authentic traditions of the Prophet

Salafism: An ultra-conservative form of orthodox Islam that emphasizes the Salaf ancestors, i.e. the earliest Muslims, as model examples of Islamic practice

Salam: The Arabic word for peace

Sawm: A period of 30 days, in the month of Ramadan, of every year. Consumption of food or water, sexual relations with ones husband or wife is forbidden from sunrise till sunset. Unlike Medical fasting, Sawm has numerous adverse effects that have been observed using scientific studies and news sources

Schools of Islamic jurisprudence: Slightly different versions of Islamic laws such as the Hanafi, Shafi, Maliki, and Hanbali schools

Sectarian violence: A form of violence inspired by sectarianism, that is, between different sects of one particular mode of ideology or religion within a community. Religious segregation often plays a role in sectarian violence. An example is Sunni-Shia violence

Secular Muslim: A truly moderate Muslim stressing the importance of the separation of state and religion

Shadid: A Muslim martyr

Sharia finance: A form of banking that is consistent with the principles of Sharia law

Sharia: The Islamic law based on the Qur'an and the Sunnah

Shaytan: Satan or the devil, also known as Iblis

Shia: Adherents of Shia Islam, who view Ali as the successor of Muhammad. He is regarded as being infallible and appointed by Allah by divine decree to be the first imam. Ali's sons Hassan and Hussayn are seen as custodians of Islam by the will of the Prophet

Shirk: The belief in other gods besides Allah (polytheism) considered the most heinous crime in Islam. Belief in the Trinity is considered to be Shirk

Sira: The biography of the prophet Muhammad

Skepticism: A questioning attitude towards knowledge, facts, opinions or beliefs stated as facts, or doubt regarding claims that are taken for granted elsewhere

Sociopathy: A personality disorder characterized by a pervasive pattern of disregard for, and violation of, the rights of others

Stealth Jihadist: A fake moderate Muslim who is active in spreading orthodox Islam

Stealth anti-Jihadist: A fake orthodox Muslim who has joined non-Muslims in the War of Ideas by secretly undermining the orthodox system in Muslim communities

Stoning: The Islamic punishment for married adulterers whereby a group throws stones at them until they die

Strict orthodox Islam: The most literalist, strict and puritanical approaches to dogmatic Islam rooted in the complete rejection of individuality. Examples are Salafism and Wahhabism

Sunnah: The way of Muhammad which consists of the Hadith (traditions of Muhammad) and the Sira (biography of Muhammad)

Sunni Islam: The largest branch of Islam using the Al-Kutub Al-Sittah Hadith as primary source in conjunction with the Qur'an as the basis of all jurisprudence methodologies

Supremacist Islam: A strict form of orthodox Islam that stresses the superiority of Islam over all other religions and the need to replace them with Islam

Surah: A chapter in the Qur'an which consists of several verses

Tahlil: The uttering the formula of faith which is 'La ilaha illa Allah'

Tahruf: The claim that Biblical scriptures were forged or corrupted while the Qur'an has remained in its original form

Takfir: The practice of one Muslim declaring another Muslim to be an unbeliever or kafir

Taqiyya: The permission for a Muslim to lie or use deception when it can help further the cause of Islam. It is most often used to distort Islamic teachings, and also in the attempt to deceive people into believing that they are being persecuted for their faith in the West

Tawrat: The Torah as revealed to Musa (Moses)

Theocracy: A form of government in which official policy is governed by immediate divine guidance and pursuant to the doctrine of a particular religion. The Islamic theocracy is called caliphate

Tolerance: A fair, objective, and permissive attitude toward those whose opinions, practices, race, religion or nationality

Totalitarianism: A political system where the state recognizes no limits to its authority and strives to regulate every aspect of public and private life wherever feasible

Traditional Islam: See Orthodox Islam

True Islam: See Orthodox Islam

True believer: See Devout Muslim

Truly moderate Muslim: A Muslim who supports the Golden Rule and rejects all doctrines of orthodox Islam that violate human rights and the fundamental principles of democracies

U.N. Arab Human Development Report: A large document written by Arab intellectuals in the year 2002, which paints an accurate picture of the dismal state of Arabic societies

Ulema: A body of Muslim scholars recognized as having specialist knowledge of Islamic sacred law and theology

Ummah: The collective worldwide body of Muslim believers, including both the Muslim population of Dar al-Islam and the Muslim population of Dar al-Harb who are living outside the lands where Islam rules

Unbeliever: See Disbeliever

Uswa Hasana: The prophet Muhammad seen as the perfect human

Wahhabism: An ultra-conservative form of orthodox Islam based on a revivalist movement instigated by the eighteenth century theologian Abd al-Wahhab in Saudi Arabia

War of Ideas: A clash of opposing ideals, ideologies, or concepts through which nations or groups use strategic influence to promote their interests abroad. The battle space of this conflict is winning the hearts and minds of the population

WML: The World Muslim League which is a Saudi organization dedicated to spreading Wahhabi propaganda around the world

Wudu: The procedure for washing parts of the body using water in preparation for formal prayers or handling and reading the Qur'an

Zalimun: A term referring to polytheists, wrong-doers, and unjust people

Zina: Unlawful sexual relations referring to both adultery and fornication. Adultery for a Muslim is the consensual sex with a woman who does not qualify as his wife, his concubine or his slave

This document was last updated on August 11, 2012. To check the availability of a newer version, please go to <http://indoctrinationwatch.yolasite.com>