

[3 Things About Islam](#)

The video that the commentary below is based on.

Dear friends and patriots,

For those who haven't seen it, attached to this letter is a link to a video that has been making the rounds called "Three Things You Didn't Know About Islam." It is the most cleverly-presented anti-Muslim piece I've seen. I don't have the research at my disposal to specifically contradict everything it's saying, but the political motivations seem fairly obvious to me. The other links on the same page are, "Obama is a Muslim", etc. But even that aside, when you watch it, it tells the average person, "these people are indoctrinated by the Qur'an to lie to you, so nothing they can say can be trusted. And the Qur'an orders them to be in a state of constant war until everyone and every government is Muslim, governed by Sharia law." What do you think a person of average sensibilities is intended to conclude here? The inescapable conclusion is that if you don't kill them now, future generations will be fighting them forever and/or eventually be converted to Islam. When you watch it, ask yourself what an open-minded person of reasonable sensibilities who knows nothing about Islam is intended to take away from that video? Do you think he walks away better informed?

As luck would have it I'm about one-fourth of the way through the Qur'an. I bought a copy before we went on vacation last month. I wouldn't say I'm studying it like I studied the Bible, but merely reading it closely to have a working understanding of the basic content and structure. I would therefore probably give a more complete analysis if I finished before commenting. But given that this is going around, it seems timely to go ahead and comment on it now.

My initial impression of the Qur'an is one of the first items mentioned in the video. Having read the Bible thoroughly, one obvious difference is that the Qur'an is written by a single person. And at the quarter point it's fair to say, from the perspective of an American reader not schooled in Islam, that it is extremely repetitive. While there are new points and instructions made as it goes along, certain phrases are repeated again and again and again, and the general tone and feel of it doesn't really change. For instance, one night I moved my bookmark several pages ahead and then closed it without moving it back to the correct page. When I picked it up a few nights later and started reading from that spot it took me about half a page to realize that I hadn't yet gotten to that point, and then it took another ten minutes of leafing around to find where I had left off. So it's fair to say that for me so far it hasn't been a particularly enjoyable or compelling read, but it has been interesting enough to continue. The non-scholar reading the Qur'an would probably be surprised at the number of Biblical references. While I knew that there was much from the Bible before purchasing it, I didn't anticipate the extent of it. Moses, the twelve tribes, numerous references to Jesus and Mary (Jesus being the "anointed one of God"), Noah, Adam and the Garden of Eden, Abraham (of course, as the Arabs also trace their line back to him), etc., etc. It might be as much as a third of it so far.

One thing that becomes readily apparent is Muhammad's antagonism toward the Jews, whom he refers to as "the people of the Book." He clearly was in close proximity to many Jews in his

early life and had access to Biblical teaching, although it was probably a different translation than what eventually constituted the King James as some of the stories have different details, though the differences are pretty minor. In Muhammad's view the Jews were given the Bible by God, and they used it as a tool for power while ultimately failing to follow it themselves. They also, in his view, attempted to conceal the truths in it from the rest of the world, and Muhammad was clearly bitter about all of this. While he does say repeatedly that some of the Jews are good and follow God rightly, the others are to be treated as infidels. There are a few verses that command Muslims to murder those who stand against them, which would include the majority of Jews from Muhammad's perspective, but mostly the text is filled with retorts that Muslim's are instructed to say. His treatment of Christians is more amicable. He reveres Christ and says that it is right that God would send his son among men as a testament, but he rebukes those who attest that Christ is God, as there is only one God and no man can be a manifestation of him, and he finds the concept of the Holy Trinity to be blasphemous. As you are already aware, I agree with him on this last part.

Perhaps the remaining three-fourths of the Qur'an will inspire me to make some sort of amendment or correction to this letter, but my impression thus far is that the problem with Islam is the "prophet" Muhammad, much as the problem with Christianity is the "apostle" Paul. This should not be interpreted to say that Paul isn't an apostle or that Muhammad isn't a prophet, that's not for me to say, but the things they wrote, while demonstrating a great deal of zeal and good intent, ultimately came down to their own self-declarations as God's chief ambassador to mankind. They lay down their own laws as though those laws come directly from God, and their more radical followers treat them as such. Paul declares himself to be "not less than chiefest among the apostles", and Muhammad, in addition to laws, prescribes terrible punishments for those who transgress. Paul goes expressly away from practically everything Jesus did and taught, declaring Jesus to be God and Paul himself to be his founder of the church, and Muhammad cuts off the Bible prior to Paul and inserts himself as the chief prophet. And they both declare themselves to be the final arbiter, warning against any who attempt to add to or change what they wrote.

Strikingly similar is their treatment of women. You've likely heard of Paul's exhortations against women teachers, or preachers, and his "if a woman enters a church without her head covered, you should shave her head," and the like. What a cruel little man to write such a thing and pass it off as though it came from God. [For a more detailed analysis on this subject see [Understanding the New Testament](#)] While I haven't gotten to the part where supposedly Muhammad teaches that you shouldn't have women at your funeral, because they are unclean, I have read a passage where he writes a paraphrase of the following: "If you swear an oath, swear it before two men as witnesses to hold you to it. But if you can't find two men, then a man and two women will do, because the one woman will remind the other of it," as if God is telling us through him that a woman's word is worth half a man's. What is noteworthy about this to me is that his opinion may have been very forward thinking at the time he lived. It is likely that at the time the witness of a woman was given much less weight. The same could be said of his laws of inheritance, which values women less than men but does give them rights of inheritance. But he wrote these things in a way that says it's the law of God for all time, and many would still choose to treat it as such. Regarding Paul's treatment of women, I've heard ministers on the radio

defend him as a man of his time. But if he, as a man of his time, declared laws that put women much lower than men, why didn't Jesus do the same? If it was God's will, why didn't Jesus declare it? As far as Muhammad's inheritance laws go, people should remember that in the Western world, Europe and America for a long time, unmarried women had little to no property rights until only a couple of hundred years ago.

What's so insidious about the enclosed video is that it initially seems positive and informational. Soft classical music plays in the background, and it starts with a simple declaration that more or less says everyone is indoctrinated with their own opinion and regards everyone else's differing opinions as stupid. Then it eases you into the inescapable (by their argument) conclusion in my first paragraph. Here's some of the on-line commentary: "This confirms everything I knew about Islam." "Religious tolerance is an axiom in America. But in Islam are we really dealing with just a religion, or something else entirely?" The supposed patriot who wrote this is saying that a core belief of our political system, religious tolerance, doesn't apply to our treatment of Islam. That's exactly what this video is attempting to accomplish. Dehumanize your enemy and dehumanize their beliefs. It's always a prelude to war. They might argue, "But we're not dehumanizing Muslims, just their beliefs." Try to suggest that religious tolerance shouldn't apply to Christians and see what happens to you. It would be labeled as hate speech on a hundred websites in a matter of days, and that would be a fair reaction. And I'm not saying the White Roses video shouldn't be tolerated just because it amounts to hate speech. In a free world we have to tolerate hate speech to a degree, but see it for what it is.

And it shouldn't be lost on anyone that it's a group "calling themselves The White Roses." Yet everywhere I saw this posted online, which is apparently all over the place, they present this bio of the White Roses who boldly spoke out against Nazi Germany and were beheaded for it. The people who made this video are not them. They just took the name and write anti-Muslim propaganda, as if Islam is the same as Nazi Socialism and as if they themselves are risking their lives in the name of free speech while under military occupation. "Us = good, brave, truth-seeking - them = evil, manipulative, murderous, truth suppressing." Us versus them propaganda based on simple word association.

They say their interpretation of Islam, where Islam seeks "peace" by complete world domination, is the only interpretation, and the third leg of their argument is the concept of "taqiyya". I had one of my staff research this, and from everything I've been able to find, the idea of Taqiyya is that a Muslim can disguise their religion to save their own life or the life of another. Here's what it says in Wikipedia: "Taqiyya is done for reasons of safety. For example, a person may fear that he might be killed or harmed if he does not observe taqiyya. In this case, taqiyya is obligatory. Sometimes, taqiyya may lead to the death of an innocent person; if so, it is not permissible. It is therefore haram (forbidden) to kill a human being to save one's own life." It seems to me like there are multiple interpretations, and the one chosen by "The White Roses" is the one that incites anger and intolerance. For them to say it's the only interpretation amounts to a lie, and a deliberate lie is always a deliberate attempt to misinform. Aside from that, a simple reading of history suggests that there have been many more killed in the name of Christ by those trying to spread Christianity than those killed in the name of Allah, the Crusades being but one example. Our current tryst in the Middle East where our young people die and the public treasury is

drained to further the economic and political ends of certain among the wealthy and powerful is a more current example. This should in no way negatively reflect on anything Christ said and instead springs from interpretations of Paul.

I wrote earlier that the problem with Islam is Muhammad himself. I will not retreat from that. As long as there are devout Muslims willing to kill people for things like drawing cartoons of Muhammad, so many others willing to defend such murderers, whole countries of women forced to walk around dressed like faceless black ghosts, and violators of laws openly stoned to death, the face of Islam will never really be with God. Maybe the “mainstream media”, the same media that the “White Roses” and every other radical group believes is against them, has come up short on this, but it seems to me that the Muslim powers that be consistently fail to disavow the “laws” that brought about the murder in cases like this. They themselves have to acknowledge that such things can not be commands of God, and if Muhammad is dead wrong in some cases, like he so often is regarding women, then he could have been wrong in any case and all Sharia law can be called into question. I have no reason to doubt that there are some Muslims who follow the radical interpretation that the “White Roses” say is the only interpretation, and they do believe that Sharia law should be the actual law. But we have a radical Christian minister right here in Columbus named Rod Parsley who boldly and openly preaches that law in the United States should come directly from the Bible, literal interpretations of the Bible, and there are thousands of others like him in this country alone with millions of followers. Check out the movie “Jesus Camp”, where children are indoctrinated to be “warriors for God” against Islam, et al. When the Jesus camp organizer is asked how it differs from Muslims indoctrinating their children for violence, her response is, “the difference is that we’re right.” Radicals seem to be quite empowered worldwide of late. They have the right to teach and to believe as they do, and we have the duty to fight them with simple truths, right actions and goodwill. I hope there are Christians and Muslims both with me in this.

As I explain in Truths of God (page 29, second paragraph) [see [Truths of God](#)], God’s love is akin to the love that parents have for their children. Jesus refers to our heavenly Father many times in just this way. God intends that we love one another, and when his children murder each other or otherwise hurt or enslave one another it saddens him. And there are consequences. It is safe to say that God doesn’t want us attempting to hurt or control one another with Sharia law any more than he would have us do so with other laws of man found in the Bible. But political hate propaganda like this piece put together by the so-called “White Roses” is not a step in the right direction. Taking a radical interpretation of another people’s beliefs and saying it’s the only interpretation of them in an attempt to demonize or dehumanize those people is a path only to more conflict. A better way of dealing with differently thinking individuals who aren’t otherwise causing you harm can be found in the second part of the following excerpt from Matthew Chapter 22: “Master, which is the great commandment in the law? Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.”

So it is.

Bob Young.

