

CRESCENT OF BETRAYAL

DIRECTOR'S CUT (v. 1.0)

Copyright © 2007 by Alec Rawls

Alec Rawls and World Ahead Media hereby grant limited permission for anyone to download, transmit, transfer and reproduce this director's cut version of Crescent of Betrayal until September 1, 2007. After September 1st, reproduction, transfer and transfer of this document are strictly forbidden. Copies of the print version of the book, and CD's of this draft version of the book, will be available for order at the CrescentOfBetrayal.com website.

CRESCENT OF BETRAYAL

Dishonoring the Heroes of Flight
93

ALEC RAWLS



World Ahead Publishing, Inc.

Published by World Ahead Publishing, Inc., Los Angeles, CA

Copyright © 2007 by Alec Rawls

All rights reserved. After September 1, 2007, no part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, scanning, or otherwise, without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who may quote brief passages in a review. Limited permission is granted to reproduce, transmit and transfer this manuscript, without alteration, until September 1, 2007.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty: While the publisher and the author have used their best efforts in preparing this book, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this book and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. The advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for your situation; consult with a professional where appropriate. Neither the publisher nor the author shall be liable for any loss of profit or any other commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages.

World Ahead Publishing's books are available at special discounts for bulk purchases. World Ahead Publishing also publishes books in electronic formats. For more information, visit www.worldahead.com.

Director's Cut Edition

ISBN 10-Digit: 097467012X

ISBN 13-Digit 9780979045127

LCCN: 2006938849

Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

CONTENTS

PREFACE— ix

INTRODUCTION — xi

PART I: MURDERERS' MOSQUE

CHAPTER ONE — 25
A Crescent Pointing at Mecca

CHAPTER TWO — 37
A Beautiful Disguise

CHAPTER THREE — 51
The Forty-Four Blocks

CHAPTER FOUR — 67
The Tower Sundial

CHAPTER FIVE — 75
The World's Largest Mosque

PART II: GETTING AWAY WITH IT

CHAPTER SIX — 99
The Abettors

CHAPTER SEVEN — 119
Duty to Warn

CHAPTER EIGHT — 131
Down the Rabbit Hole

CHAPTER NINE — 149
The Internal Investigation

**PART III: OUR NATIONAL DIVIDE: PARTISAN DIS-
HONESTY IN THE WAR ON TERROR**

CHAPTER TEN — 167
The Arc of Truth Suppression

CHAPTER ELEVEN — 175
Another Murdoch

CHAPTER TWELVE — 189
Striving for Defeat

CHAPTER THIRTEEN — 209
“If We can stay Together”

**PART IV: OUR WORLD DIVIDE: TRUTH SUPPRESSION
IN THE ISLAMIC WORLD**

CHAPTER FOURTEEN — 225
Killing Critics

CHAPTER FIFTEEN — 239
Islam and the Ten Commandments

CHAPTER SIXTEEN — 255
Common Ground and Hallowed Ground

AFTERWORD — 269

NOTES — 275

PART FIVE

**OUR WORLD
DIVIDE**

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

KILLING CRITICS

PRESIDENT BUSH PRAISES Natan Sharansky's book, *The Case for Democracy*, as inspiration for his terror-war strategy of using democracy to fight Islamic terrorism, but after Palestinian elections gave the terrorist group Hamas an overwhelming victory in January 2006, even Sharansky now agonizes about the terrible downside risks of bringing democracy to people who may not be ready for it. "It's like having German elections the day after the defeat of Hitler," frets Sharansky.¹

On the other hand, there is a lot to be said for trusting people, and giving them a chance. There is a lot to be said for the spirit in which the jurors of the Flight 93 Memorial Project accepted a crescent-shaped memorial for their murdered parents and children and spouses. They chose to believe in the common humanity that all peoples share. And aren't they right? Isn't it true, that if we could poll each human heart, then amongst those whom we have freed from hell on earth, we could trust that the great majority would embrace their freedom, by choosing tolerance over murder?

The challenge is to get to that polling of the human heart. It takes more than elections. It also requires honest information, and here the Islamic world faces the exact same obstacle to moral democratic outcomes that the West does. It is burdened by terrifically powerful truth-suppressing mechanisms. These mechanisms are not subtle like the ways of truth suppression in the West. Theocratic Islam simply kills off its critics. This is the hold that must be broken if democracy is to free the Islamic world.

Unfortunately, theocratic Islam's violent reaction to criticism is reinforced by the Western left's presumptive deference to non-Western claims of offense. When the Islamofascists erupt in outrage, Western multiculturalists have conditioned themselves to feel guilt and submit to demands for atonement. The result is a perfect storm of truth suppression, a two-pincer-armed crescent-of-deadly-embrace for truth and liberty.

Criticism=Blasphemy=Death

Under *sharia* law, the body of Islamic law established by centuries of interpretation of Muhammad's scripture and example, the traditional punishment for blasphemy is death. Blasphemy is defined broadly as anything that insults Islam, Mohammad or the Koran, either directly or indirectly. Thus Islamic blasphemy laws amount to a death penalty for anyone who dares to differ with theocrats.

In many Muslim countries today, severe punishments for blasphemy are regularly enforced (more often extra-judicially than judicially). Pakistan's 1987 blasphemy law was written to allow lesser penalties than death, but this moderation was rejected by Pakistan's Federal Shariat Court, which ruled that "the penalty for contempt of the Holy Prophet...is death and nothing else."²

Accusations of blasphemy are often extremely arbitrary, creating a general paranoia in Islamic countries about saying anything that could possibly be interpreted as critical of Islam. A typically capricious example is the elderly Pakistani janitor who in 2005 was told to burn a pile of papers at work, then charged with blasphemy when it was claimed that the pile included Koranic verses. The janitor was convicted and only international outrage forestalled application of the death penalty.³

With this caliber of accusation, no death penalty for blasphemy has yet been carried out in Pakistan, but where convictions are overturned, the accused are often murdered upon release. Sixteen such murders are documented to have occurred in Pakistan between 1996 and 2003.⁴

Amnesty International reports that in Pakistan, even the flimsiest blasphemy accusations are "*uncritically accepted by the prosecuting authorities* who themselves may face intimidation and threats should they fail to accept them." [Emphasis in original.]⁵ "The main effect," says Cleveland State University law professor David F. Forte, "is to

KILLING CRITICS

unless a reign of private terror against Christians and other religious minorities.”

That may be true in terms of who is actually subject to state-sanctioned or private violence under Pakistan’s blasphemy laws, but the resulting suppression of Islamic criticism falls as much on Muslims as on religious minorities. Through 2003, 43 percent of those accused of blasphemy in Pakistan were Muslim.⁶ Given that Pakistan is 97 percent Muslim, the rate at which Muslims are accused is much lower than for religious minorities, but given the kind of accusations that stand up in court, it is plenty sufficient to make the Muslim majority extremely fearful of saying anything that even approaches being critical of theocrats.

Similar conditions exist in many other Muslim countries, especially with the spread of what Paul Marshall calls “extreme *sharia*” (meaning the extreme *application* of traditional *sharia* law). Over the last forty years, this “extreme *sharia*” has flowed across the Islamic world on a tide of Saudi oil money.⁷ Not surprisingly, the Saudis themselves are in the forefront in prosecuting blasphemy. It’s hard to tell the numbers of people persecuted for blasphemy in Saudi Arabia because the kingdom maintains a system of secret trials, but the numbers are large, especially for persecuted minorities, and examples find their way into the news with some regularity.⁸

In 2003 a Yemeni national managed to get into the newspaper by jumping out the window of a third story Saudi courtroom. He had just been sentenced to beheading after his Saudi roommate accused him of insulting Islam.⁹ Another way that cases get in the paper is when the authorities want to provide an example, such as the 2005 sentencing of a high school chemistry teacher “to more than three years in prison and 750 lashes for talking to his pupils about his views on a number of current topics, such as Christianity, Judaism and the causes of terrorism.”¹⁰

Afghanistan, which was ruled by the Saudi-funded Taliban until overthrown by U.S. troops in 2001, is still facing a grave threat from the enforcement of *sharia* blasphemy laws. When the interim government of Afghan President Hamid Karzai appointed Sima Samar to be its first minister of women’s affairs in 2002, the country’s new *sharia* court immediately charged her with blasphemy for saying that she did not believe in the rule of *sharia* law. Samar had to flee Afghanistan for her life.¹¹

Afghan journalists have also been charged with blasphemy. In 2003 two journalists had the temerity to ask, at their most inflammatory: "If Islam is a perfect religion and the final law in heaven, then why do so many of its disciples act so badly?"¹² Under fierce pressure from the United States, the journalists were released, but threats against their lives forced them to leave the country.¹³

Even with constitutional democracy now established in Afghanistan, blasphemy laws are still used to suppress all questioning of Islamic authority. In 2005, a journalist was charged with blasphemy for suggesting that Islam is open to a more tolerant view of apostasy (conversion away from Islam) than the *sharia* courts impose. According to prosecutors, the journalist "violated the law by saying that while apostasy was taboo, it was not a crime under Islam."¹⁴

Iran is also big on blasphemy charges. In 2002 Iranian university professor Hashem Agahari was so bold as to suggest that people should think for themselves, instead of accept the word of the *mullahs* on what the Koran really says. "Are people monkeys to emulate someone else?" he asked, and was sentenced to death for blasphemy. Three years later he was retried and re-sentenced to five years in jail, where he sits today.

So it goes across much of the Islamic world. Whatever control the theocrats have, their first priority is always to secure their power by using their interpretation and enforcement of *sharia* law to destroy all opposition. The problem is less extreme where *sharia* is applied less extremely, but the severest penalties for blasphemy are completely traditional. Islamic theocrats have been brutalizing their critics for more than a millennium.

There are some small Muslim sects like the Ahmadis who disavow punishment for blasphemy. "In essence," says Rafiq Hayat, leader of the Ahmadis in England, "we are calling for a *jihad*—a battle for hearts and minds—to persuade people through our conduct and good deeds that Islam is all about peace. We see it as our duty to liberate Islam from the rhetoric of extremist and ignorant *mullahs* and those who follow them blindly."¹⁵

For this deviance, the Ahmadis are persecuted as heretics throughout much of the Muslim world, subject to prosecution under blasphemy laws. Moderation in Islam depends on *escaping* the application of established *sharia* law.

As the pseudonymous Muslim apostate Ibn Warraq put it: "There may be moderate Muslims, but Islam itself is not moderate."¹⁶ Not yet.

KILLING CRITICS

Not so long as strict adherence to Islam means strict adherence to interpretations of the Koran and the *hadiths* that were formulated by theocratic totalitarians to secure the interests of theocratic totalitarians. It is the ancient rules of oppression that need to be broken.

John Locke's Letter on Toleration (Director's Cut)

The inside of a *burka*. That is how large the mental world of a person who lives under *sharia* is. Anything that strays outside is violently struck, the way the Taliban struck with metal rods at any woman's ankle that ever showed. The only freedom in the world of Islamic blasphemy laws is the freedom to be one of the ankle strikers. Large numbers embrace that freedom to suppress others, and are utterly debased by it.

God made man in his own image, says Genesis 1:24. The essence of that image is choice, because God, being all powerful, has unlimited choice. If "God is love," as John tells us (1Jn 4:8), it is because God *chooses* to love, and he leaves us free to do the same.

Choice carries consequences. There is a right and wrong in the world, and wrong must be punished, but the mind must be free, or God's purpose is betrayed, according to any religion that (like Islam) upholds Genesis as true revelation. As John Locke put it in his *Letter on Toleration* three hundred years ago:

[T]rue and saving religion consists in the inward persuasion of the mind, without which nothing can be acceptable to God. And such is the nature of understanding that it cannot be compelled to the belief of anything by outward force. ... [I]t is one thing to persuade, another to command, one thing to press with argument, another with penalties. ... [L]aws are of no force at all without penalties, and penalties in this case are absolutely impertinent, because they are not proper to convince the mind.¹⁷

Thus, says Locke, if there is "but one truth, one way to heaven," then men's hopes of it can only be dashed if they are "put under the necessity to quit the light of their own reason and oppose the dictates of their own consciences."

This is what finally stopped Christians from killing for control of other men's minds and lives. We finally came to understand our Bibles, and realized what it means to be created in God's image: that man must have freedom of choice. Locke's *Letter* put the stamp on it, and became the inspiration for the formalization of religious liberty in the United

States Constitution. That same letter, is also Europe's heritage. Except for anti-Semitism, religious intolerance ended in the West. Now the Islamic theocrats want to bring it all back, a thousand times over. Only *they* can read the word of God they claim. Only *they* are created in God's image.

God may have a thing or two to say about that.

Faith and Reason

In a September 2006 speech on faith and reason, Pope Benedict called upon Muslims to adhere to the concept of a rational God and reject the "evil and inhuman" idea that faith can be spread by the sword.¹⁸ As has become commonplace, the Islamic world erupted in murder threats, sprinkled with murder. Tasnim Aslam, spokesman for Pakistan's Foreign Ministry, explained: "Anyone who describes Islam as a religion as intolerant encourages violence."¹⁹ An umbrella group of Sunni extremists, the Mujahedeen Shura Council, was more specific:

We will break up the cross, spill the liquor and impose head tax, then the only thing acceptable is a conversion (to Islam) or (killed by) the sword... God enable us to slit their throats, and make their money and descendants the bounty of the mujahideen.²⁰

Can Pope Benedict hit the nail on the head or what? If we call evil evil, the Islamofascists will slit our throats, loot our cities and drag our women away by the hair for breeding stock, which of course is what they are planning anyway, in case anyone has not been listening for the last ten years.

Pope Benedict's faith-and-reason speech perfectly lays out the challenge that radical Islam presents, and how the West is failing to meet it. In structure, the speech is a criticism of modern Western secularists for limiting their concept of reason to what is scientifically provable, instead of extending reason to what cannot be scientifically proven, like the nature of God and the mysteries of faith. Views about God may not be scientific, but they can still be either more or less reasonable, and unless reason is extended to spiritual concerns, the modern world becomes vulnerable to religious unreason.

As an example of religious unreason, and the need to engage it with reason, Benedict cited the Ottoman Empire's fourteenth-century attacks on Christendom, and a Byzantine emperor's condemnation of those attacks. "Violence is incompatible with the nature of God and

KILLING CRITICS

the nature of the soul,” declared Manuel II Palaeologus.²¹ Held hostage by the Ottomans, Emperor Palaeologus was witness to Muslim sieges of Byzantine cities in the 1390s. The Ottomans, according to their usual plan of conquering, were out to slaughter, loot, take slaves, and steal women. Palaeologus attributed this evil to Muhammad himself. Here are the words of Manuel, as quoted by Pope Benedict:

Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new, and there you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command to spread by the sword the faith he preached.

Manuel’s critique of Islamic violence constitutes an early version of Locke’s thesis:

God is not pleased by blood—and not acting reasonably is contrary to God’s nature. Faith is born of the soul, not the body. Whoever would lead someone to faith needs the ability to speak well and to reason properly, without violence and threats... To convince a reasonable soul, one does not need a strong arm, or weapons of any kind, or any other means of threatening a person with death...

What reasonable Muslims might object to in these remarks today (and in their quotation by Pope Benedict) is the presumption that the historic evils of Muslim conquest should be attributed to Muhammad himself. In the fourteenth century, however, this was not an issue. Manuel was speaking to a Muslim who accepted that violent religious conquest was commanded by Muhammad. There was no thought in that era of an Islamic reformation that might reject the violent interpretations of the Koran that had long been adopted by the great Islamic powers. Today, the question of Muhammad’s intent is exactly the question that needs to be addressed.

If only Pope Benedict would ask his critics what they are upset about. Are Muslim protestors upset because Benedict’s fourteenth century quote attributed the evil of conversion by the sword to Muhammad, or are they angry because the quote called conversion by the sword evil at all? The Islamofascists are angry at the latter, which is just the line we need to draw through the Islamic world, separating the good from the bad so that we can help the good against the bad.

Of course the *New York Times* had to do its best to confuse the issue by pretending that it was peaceful Muslims who wanted to be-

head the Pope. Bill Keller, et.al. demanded that Pope Benedict apologize because:

For many Muslims, holy war—jihad—is a spiritual struggle, and not a call to violence. And they denounce its perversion by extremists, who use jihad to justify murder and terrorism.²²

Logic, *New York Times* style: many Muslims are peaceful, so the Pope should apologize for urging Islam in general to be peaceful. It ought to be obvious that here can be no reform in Islam until there can be criticism, but in *Times*-think, the way to support peaceful Muslims is to hand the Islamofascists another victory in their drive to eliminate all criticism, even of violent *jihad*.

Being triply clear that one is not necessarily criticizing Muhammad, but is only criticizing murderous interpretations of Muhammad's religion, will not force the Islamofascists (or the editors of the *New York Times*) to be rational, but it will strip them of their cover.

Islamic Imperialism and Western *Dhimmitude*

In 1983, Ayatollah Khomeini decided that it was not enough to apply the death penalty for blasphemy just inside of Iran. Salman Rushdie's novel, *The Satanic Verses*, contained the forbidden whiff of challenge, and so Khomeini issued a *fatwa*, calling on Muslims all over the world to find and kill Rushdie.

This imperialistic reach is the source of the 9/11 attacks. The Khomeini-ists and the Wahhabists, despite representing Shiite and Sunni Islam respectively, share the same ambition to impose Islamic totalitarianism on the entire world. As Khomeini put it in 1942:

Islam makes it incumbent on all adult males, provided they are not disabled or incapacitated, to prepare themselves for the conquest of countries so that the writ of Islam is obeyed in every country in the world.²³

Pretty ambitious for a gang of men in robes with no education beyond the eleventh century, but then they conquered much of the world on their first go-round; they have vast oil wealth on their side; and perhaps most importantly, they find themselves aided and abetted at every turn by the truth evading culture of the Western left, which controls half of America, and most of Old Europe.

In America, the left's control of the media is balanced by a politically powerful conservative movement. Across most of Europe, the

KILLING CRITICS

left is in complete control of both the media and the powers of state, allowing us to see what happens when the culture and policies of the left are given full rein. A defining incident was the November 2004 murder of Danish artist Theo van Gogh, who had received many death threats for daring to depict Islam's suppression of women. Van Gogh was shot on an Amsterdam street and left in a pool of blood with his head hacked halfway off. Despite the explanatory Koranic verses that were stabbed to van Gogh's chest, Dutch Prime Minister Jan Peter Balkenende insisted that: "Nothing is known about the motive."

Van Gogh's murder was the enforcement of Islamic blasphemy laws by radical Muslims living in Holland who refuse to recognize Danish sovereignty, yet Western political correctness could only look away. Van Gogh, after all, had violated the left's own highest principle. He had failed to defer to the minority culture's claims of offense. For the government to acknowledge Muslim culpability would only compound the unpleasantness. It would be insensitive to Muslims, and would certainly bring charges of "Islamophobia."

Bat Ye'or coined the term *dhimmitude* to describe the second class status that traditional Islam seeks to impose on non-Muslims.²⁴ The fundamental Islamic demand is for submission (*Islam*). When the Western left demands politically correct deference to Muslim claims of offense, it is in fact abetting the Islamofascist demand that Western society submit to Islamic blasphemy laws. It is in effect demanding surrender to Islam.

Not that this is the *purpose* of political correctness. The only reason the left does anything is to wage war on its domestic political opposition: those nasty conservative white male capitalists that the left has gotten the collective majority of "minorities" to gang up against. Empowering minority claims is one of the fundamental weapons that has allowed this gang-up to work. That makes it sacrosanct to the left. Europe's left-wing governments cannot defend the West against unreasonable minority claims without giving up one of the keys to their own political power. Since domestic power is all that the left is cognizant of, looking critically at minority claims becomes an impossibility. They will all die before they shift their hostility away from their domestic political opposition.

Lambs to the Slaughter

Incident after incident shows the Western center-left determined to go like lambs to the slaughter. When Canadian authorities arrested sev-

enteen Muslim terrorists in June 2006 for plotting to blow up the Canadian Parliament and behead the Canadian Prime Minister, an assistant commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police described the arrestees as representing a “broad strata” of Canadian society, noting that: “Some are students, some are employed, some are unemployed.”²⁵ “It is difficult to find a common denominator,” proclaimed the lede in the *Toronto Star*.²⁶

The Mounties weren’t quite being honest, as the *Globe and Mail* reported two days later:

Before the raids came the sensitivity training: Tactical-squad Mounties learned how to properly handle Korans prior to arresting 17 terrorism suspects on the weekend. And that’s not all. The RCMP also made sure there were clean prayer mats on hand for their suspects when they were sent to jail cells.²⁷

Toronto Police Chief Bill Blair even bragged about suppressing the Muslim identity of the terrorists: “I would remind you that there was not one single reference made by law enforcement to Muslim or Muslim community.”²⁸

Europe and Canada actually use the law to keep people from discussing the connection between Islam and terrorism. At the time of her death in September 2006, Italian journalist Orianna Fallacci was on trial in her native Italy for writing books about Islamic aggression and European appeasement. Her crime? “Vilifying a state-recognized religion.” Telling the truth is actually illegal now in much of Europe.²⁹

Thanks to the First Amendment, the forces of political correctness do not have that option in the United States, but they are just as systematic in refusing to implicate Islam according to the facts. When French Muslims erupted into nationwide riots for weeks on end in late 2005, loudly rejecting French sovereignty, American newspapers were united in describing the rioters as “unemployed youths” and “immigrants.” When Washington D.C.’s “Beltway sniper” turned out to be an American-born convert to radical Islam with a young illegal immigrant *protégé*, most newspapers described him only as ex-military.³⁰

Our worst newspapers try to cover up for radical Islam even when the cause is hopeless. On March 3, 2006, an Iranian student at the University of North Carolina rented the largest SUV he could find and drove it through The Pit where students gather on campus, trying to kill as many as possible and injuring nine. The next day, university police chief Denis Poarch told reporters that the attacker, Taheri-azar,

KILLING CRITICS

said that he intentionally ran over his fellow students to “avenge the deaths of Muslims around the world.”³¹ On the 8th, the *New York Times* finally covered the story (on page 18), but with a glaring omission:

According to statements taken by the police, Mr. Taheri-azar, 22, an Iranian-born graduate of the university, felt that the United States government had been ‘killing his people across the sea’ and that his actions reflected ‘an eye for an eye.’³²

No mention of Islam. No mention that Taheri-azar had been perfectly clear that “his people” were Muslims. If *The New York Times* could have gotten away without reporting that the 9/11 terrorists were Muslim, it would have.

Ideological Appeasement

England shows what happens when the West tries to appease rather than challenge intolerant Muslim voices. Our British cousins have been as deferential as humanly possible towards Muslim complaints of every stripe. Consider some examples.

In September 2005, a local British government council banned Pig-let toys and other pig paraphernalia from its offices. Ironically, the ban was imposed in the name of “tolerance” for Muslim intolerance of Pig-let toys.³³

In June 2006 it came out that the British government was sponsoring citizenship education to immigrants that sought to be “impartial” about terrorism. It actually encouraged immigrants to think of what they might want to blow up and why!³⁴

In August 2006 a British passport office rejected the photo of a five-year-old girl because her shoulders were showing, explaining to the befuddled mother that a Muslim passport checker might be offended.³⁵

In September 2006, the government announced that it would not conduct counter-terror raids without alerting Muslim leaders first.³⁶

The British people are just as deferential to Muslim sensibilities as their government. Polls have found that the British people are the most expansive in Europe in their non-judgmental goodwill towards Muslims. The result of all this prostration? A higher percentage of Muslims in England want to destroy the West than anywhere else in Europe.³⁷

Appeasement *always* encourages aggression. There has never been an exception in the history of mankind. It doesn’t matter whether the appeasement is ideological or military. Submission to intolerant demands is a “root cause” of totalitarian ambition.

Ever since 9/11, Westerners have been wondering when Muslim leaders in the West are going to start being outraged at murder committed in the name of Islam, instead of at every step taken to interdict such murders. The answer is simple. The great majority of Muslim leaders in the West are Saudi funded orthodox Wahhabists (like bin Laden), and those Muslims in the West who reject the intolerant dogmas are intimidated. The Saudi-funded evil watches over Western Muslims like a vast KGB, backed up by the fraction of brown-shirt believers.³⁸

The dissenting voice is going to have to come from outside. It is Westerners who have to counter Islamofascist ideology. We cannot leave the job up to others as if only Muslims can speak legitimately about Islam. Unfortunately, this is exactly what the politically correct multi-culturalists who dominate the Western news media are trying to enforce.

The Cartoon Intifada: Blame it on NASCAR Dads

The world's two great cultures of truth suppression established a whole new level of cooperation with the 2006 cartoon intifada. In riots across the globe, angry Muslims murdered hundreds to protest cartoon depictions of Muhammad published by the Danish newspaper *Jyllands-Posten*. While every American newspaper covered the riots on their front pages for over a month, virtually none of them were willing to show their readers what the rioting was about, explaining that to publish the cartoons would be "perceived as a particularly deliberate insult," as the *New York Times* put it.³⁹

The cartoons can't be shown here either, because Borders and Waldenbooks are refusing to carry publications that print them.⁴⁰ All of this censorship has been justified by completely mis-representing the censored cartoons. The real story is of cartoonists using all of their creativity to come up with ways of depicting Muhammad that no sane person could possibly be offended by. All but three of the twelve Muhammad cartoons are maximally deferential, depicting Muhammad as a saint, placing his image in the heavens, etcetera.

The three less than maximally deferential cartoons allude to Islamic violence and suppression of women. Thus when the *New Republic's* Robert Wright writes in the *New York Times* that self-censorship of the cartoons is virtuous the same way that self-censorship of bigoted Amos and Andy cartoons was virtuous fifty years ago, he could not be more dishonest. The *Times* is censoring the

KILLING CRITICS

opposite of Amos n' Andy. It is censoring *criticism* of bigotry and intolerance.

Complete misrepresentation of censored material, on the biggest news story of the day. For scorers of intellectual dishonesty, that's a full twisting double backflip, but even this was not enough for NBC.

After several months of cartoon riots, a *Washington Post*-ABC News poll showed that a majority of Americans were noticing that Muslims are disproportionately violent.⁴¹ It's pretty hard to miss. Brit Hume noted the disgrace:

What is striking about this is what offends these Muslims who are protesting and these imams. Does the slaughter of innocent people in many parts of the world in the name of Allah offend them? Is that a sacrilege worthy of protest? No, not in the least.⁴²

But in the world of the P.C. left, noticing that a substantial fraction of the Muslim world is murderously insane constitutes an unconscionable act of bigotry on America's part, and NBC knew just what to do about it: dress some Muslims up like Taliban and troll them through NASCAR events, trying to elicit anti-Muslim behavior, with hidden cameras and mikes at the ready.⁴³

Radical Muslims are waging war on the entire world, and NBC decides that what is needed is a sting operation against NASCAR dads? When no negative reactions were encountered, NBC planned to broaden the operation to get the results they wanted. No mention would be made, of course, of NBC's failed attempts to solicit antagonism. Only exposure of their slanderous scheme stopped them from eventually provoking some incident with which to tar all conservatives.

How about investigating those whose behavior *warrants* investigation? How about trolling a Jew in a *yarmulke*, or a Christian carrying a Bible, through any Muslim neighborhood on the planet? Dearborn, Michigan would do nicely. But the left only recognizes one enemy: their domestic political opposition. The Islamists can cut the leftist's heads off one by one and the last one still won't realize that he is next.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

ISLAM AND THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

AMERICA'S TRUTH-SUPPRESSING mechanisms are suppressing some startling truths: Paul Murdoch's terrorist-memorial mosque and Joe Wilson's daring treason, just to name two. What are the truths that Islam's truth suppressing mechanisms have been suppressing? Are there revelations hidden here too, the exposure of which can sink the ambitions of the Islamofascists the same way that exposure can sink the ambitions of Murdoch and Wilson?

The answer can only be 'yes.' The faith of the Flight 93 families—that the peoples of the Islamic world have the same capacity for good as Christians and Jews and others—can only be borne out. Some will always remain willing slaves to falsehood, imaging some advantage in the suppression of truth, but most will not.

Sharia law's betrayal of fundamental Islamic requirements is not even hidden. When the merest accusation will suffice to put any critic to death the totalitarian theocrats have little need for subtlety. The crushing of competition by force has always been the way of tyranny, and there is the rub. Can a religion that claims to speak for the God of Abraham and Moses really just go killing off all its critics?

Apostasy and Abrogation

"Thou shalt not murder," says the Sixth Commandment, and killing other than in self defense against violent attack is murder. Where possible, societies interpose mechanisms for distinguishing the guilty from the innocent before executing those who aggress or plot to aggress, but social intervention cannot not alter the definition of murder.

“Thou shalt not murder” does not mean “unless you pass a law saying you can murder.”

There is no clearer murder than the traditional Islamic death penalties for blasphemy and apostasy. Blasphemy is ideological opposition, not violent opposition, and apostates do no harm to others. They only impose on themselves the dictates of their own conscience. Yet the death penalty for apostasy is standard across the Islamic world. Even those apostates who reside beyond the reach of Islamic governments are today being put on apostate hit lists.¹

The textual justification for killing apostates comes from Verse 4.89 of the Koran, which warns against befriending infidels:

They desire that you should disbelieve as they have disbelieved, so that you might be (all) alike; therefore take not from among them friends until they fly (their homes) in Allah’s way; but if they turn back, then seize them and kill them wherever you find them, and take not from among them a friend or a helper.

Shakir Translation

Sounds pretty clear. But contrary instructions in the Koran are also pretty clear:

Say : O ye that reject Faith! I worship not that which ye worship, Nor will ye worship that which I worship. And I will not worship that which ye have been wont to worship, Nor will ye worship that which I worship. To you be your Way, and to me mine.

Koran, Chapter 109 entire, Yusuf Ali Translation

And:

Let there be no compulsion in religion: Truth stands out clear from Error: whoever rejects evil and believes in Allah hath grasped the most trustworthy hand-hold, that never breaks. And Allah heareth and knoweth all things.

Koran, Verse 2.256, Yusuf Ali translation

Why is established *sharia* law based on the intolerant verse, instead of on the tolerant verses? Because traditional Islamic jurisprudence interprets the Koran according to the principle of “abrogation,” where verses that come later chronologically are held to abrogate, or in-effect annihilate, any conflicting earlier verses.²

ISLAM AND THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

The Koranic verses that are cited as justifications for the doctrine of abrogation actually seem to prohibit it:

Nothing of our revelation (even a single verse) do we abrogate or cause to be forgotten, but we bring (in place) one better or the like thereof. Knowest thou not that Allah is Able to do all things?

Koran, Verse 2.106, Pickthal Translation

(Such has been) the course of Allah with respect to those who have gone before; and you shall not find any change in the course of Allah.

Koran, Verse 33.62, Shakir Translation

Perfected are the words of your Lord in truth and justice. None can change His words.

Koran, Verse 6.115, Dawood Translation.

In sum, the Koran itself is quite clear that earlier verses of the Koran are *not* supposed to be seen as abrogated. Rather, later verses are to be viewed as refinements (“better or the like”) that give a fuller expression of earlier verses, not as new directions that erase earlier verses. The doctrine of abrogation is a theocratic innovation, used to secure theocratic power, at the expense of what the Koran actually says.³

Some individual Muslims take this view of abrogation, but the only Muslim sect that rejects abrogation is the persecuted Ahmadiyya. In every other sect, the theocrats chose power over scripture.

The Ten Commandments

Whatever the tenability of the doctrine of abrogation, if there is anything in the Koran that could *never* be abrogated, it is the condemnation of those who would forget the Mosaic law in general, and the Ten Commandments in particular. This declaration is repeated over and over in the Koran because it is the very foundation of the Islamic religion.⁴ It is where Islam both stakes its claim to the God of Abraham, and condemns Jews and Christians for being unfaithful God’s earlier revelations.

The third chapter of the Koran begins with a declaration of what is affirmed and what is suspect in The Book (the Bible, containing the Jewish and Christian scriptures):

Allah! There is no god but He,-the Living, the Self-Subsisting, Eternal. It is He Who sent down to thee (step by step), in truth, the Book, confirming what went before it; and He sent down the Law (of Moses) and the Gospel (of Jesus) before this, as a guide to mankind, and He sent down the criterion (of judgment between right and wrong). ...

He it is Who has sent down to thee the Book: In it are verses basic or fundamental (of established meaning); they are the foundation of the Book: others are allegorical. But those in whose hearts is perversity follow the part thereof that is allegorical, seeking discord, and searching for its hidden meanings, but no one knows its hidden meanings except Allah. And those who are firmly grounded in knowledge say: "We believe in the Book; the whole of it is from our Lord:" and none will grasp the Message except men of understanding.

Koran, Chapter 3, Verses 2-7, Yusuf Ali translation

Here Muhammad is explicit that the parts of The Bible that he accuses Christians and Jews of perverting are not the basic verses of scripture, but the allegorical ones. The Ten Commandments are the most basic and non-allegorical in the entire Book. Thus whatever else Muhammad is referring to here as true revelation in Torah and Gospel, he is at the very least declaring that the Ten Commandments are a true revelation from the one God.

In general, "the criterion (of judgment between right and wrong)" is a reference to the Koran itself. But Muhammad also uses it to refer explicitly to the Ten Commandments, as in verse 2.53:

And remember We gave Moses the Scripture and the Criterion (Between right and wrong): There was a chance for you to be guided aright.⁵

Thus Muhammad is declaring the Ten Commandments, above and beyond the Mosaic scriptures in general, to be true revelation, integral to the Koran. As a result, the many condemnations of those who forget the Mosaic revelations apply *a fortiori* to those who forget the Ten Commandments.

Even if the principle of abrogation were legitimate, it could never abrogate this: the very foundation of Islamic religion, where the Islam's claim to the god of the Bible is laid. Thus whatever rule of Koranic interpretation is applied, one criterion for legitimacy is that

ISLAM AND THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

interpretations must remain consistent with the Ten Commandments, or Islam simply ceases to exist on its own terms: its claims to Abrahamic foundations are gone.

During the centuries when the current body of *sharia* law evolved, the theocratic interpreters of Islam favored the most ruthless interpretations of the Koran because these interpretations gave them the tyrannical power they craved. They could kill every critic. They could wield absolute power. But placing their drive for advantage ahead of moral truth detached them from moral reality. They chose not to remember what God had revealed to Moses, making every one of them fuel for the fire, according to the Koran.

Violent Verses can be Interpreted as Conditional on Circumstances of Defensive War

The Koran denies that it contains contradictions:

If it had not come from God, they could surely have found in it many contradictions.

Koran 4.82, Dawood Translation

Rather, it contains explications:

No sooner will they come to you with an argument than We shall reveal to you the truth, better expounded.

Koran 25.33, Dawood Translation

Thus the question becomes, how can the later more violent verses of the Koran be seen as explications of the earlier peaceful verses? The answer is simple: they must be seen as conditional on circumstances of defensive war, where killing is not murder. Inspection of the Koran's violent verses makes this plausible. Consider the directive in Verse 4.89 to kill those who turn back from Islam. The very next verse places specific limits on the instruction to kill apostates:

Except those who join a group between whom and you there is a treaty (of peace), or those who approach you with hearts restraining them from fighting you as well as fighting their own people. If Allah had pleased, He could have given them power over you, and they would have fought you: Therefore if they withdraw from you but fight you not, and (instead) send you

(Guarantees of) peace, then Allah Hath opened no way for you
(to war against them).

Koran, Verse 4.90, Yusuf Ali Translation

4.90 reveals 4.89 to a highly circumstantial instruction, having to do with a situation of ongoing violent conflict where allegiances may be faked for strategic purposes. In this instance, only pretending to be a Muslim (revealed by “turning back”) could be seen as analogous to wearing the uniform of the enemy in time of war, which even under the Geneva Conventions is punishable with execution on the spot. At the same time, those who turn away from Islam, not to join the other side, but because they do not want to fight on either side (“those who approach you with hearts restraining them from fighting you as well as fighting their own people”) are not to be harmed.

John Esposito, professor of religion at Georgetown University, backs this interpretation: “To be a Muslim was to live in an Islamic state or empire, so the presumption was you were not only becoming the enemy of God but the enemy of the empire.”⁶

For 4.89 to be consistent with the Ten Commandments, the further condition must be added that the empire is engaged in defensive war. Then 4.89 could be seen as pertaining to a situation of self-defense where killing can properly be *justified* as self-defense. The same goes for all of the Koran’s other violent admonitions. All can and must be interpreted as limited to circumstances of defensive war in which homicide is not murder. Otherwise the Sixth Commandment is violated and Islam is in condemned by its own founding stones.

Traditional *sharia* law most certainly *is* condemned by its own founding stones. It turns 4.89 into a general command to kill apostates, which is a general command to commit murder, which according to the Koran means that authors and followers of *sharia* law are all going to burn. Significant numbers of Islamic scholars over the years have protested the criminalization of apostasy as un-Islamic. Dr. Mohammad Omar Farooq of Upper Iowa University has compiled a list of over one hundred “notable Islamic voices affirming the freedom of faith,” but under the thumb of *sharia* law, they are not heard in the Islamic world.⁷

Mischief in the Land

A key verse of the Koran is 5.32, where Muhammad refers directly to the Sixth Commandment, as received by the Jews:

ISLAM AND THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

On that account: We ordained for the Children of Israel that if any one slew a person—unless it be for murder or for spreading mischief in the land—it would be as if he slew the whole people: and if any one saved a life, it would be as if he saved the life of the whole people. Then although there came to them Our messengers with clear signs, yet, even after that, many of them continued to commit excesses in the land.⁸

To generate the established Islamic blasphemy laws, where any criticism of theocratic prerogatives is answered with death, totalitarian Islam classifies all criticism as “spreading mischief in the land.” Elsewhere, however, the Koran is even more specific about the allowed grounds for killing, and it explicitly bars violence as a reaction to criticism.

The twenty-fifth chapter of the Koran is titled “*Al Furqan*,” which translates into English as “the criterion (of right and wrong).” This is also Muhammad’s title for both the Koran and the Ten Commandments. Like many chapters of the Koran, almost all of *Al Furqan* consists of repeated assertions that unbelievers will go to Hell, then at the very end, it includes a bit of substance about the criteria of right and wrong. It cites the First Commandment (not to worship other gods), the commandment not to commit adultery, the commandment not to bear false witness, and the commandment not to kill without just cause. In the process, it specifies that ideological opposition does *not* constitute just cause for killing:

True servants of the Merciful are those who walk humbly on the earth and say: ‘Peace!’ to the ignorant who accost them...who invoke no other deity besides God, and do not kill except for a just cause... who do not commit adultery; who do not bear false witness, and who maintain their dignity when listening to profane abuse...

Koran Verses 25.63-72, Dawood Translation

There is no necessary contradiction between “*Al Furqan’s*” statement that profane abuse does not constitute just cause for killing and Verse 5.32’s allowance for killing those who “spread mischief in the land.” These verses are reconciled simply by understanding that ideological opposition is not to count as “spreading mischief” in a way that justifies homicide.

Because the Koran denies many times that it contains contradictions, anyone who takes the Koran seriously is compelled to embrace this available reconciliation. Similarly with another chronologically later verse that touches on this same critical question of whether ideological opposition can justify violence. Here is Verse 2.217:

Fighting in [the Sacred Month] is a grave matter, and hindering (men) from Allah's way and denying Him, and (hindering men from) the Sacred Mosque and turning its people out of it, are still graver with Allah, and persecution is graver than slaughter; and they will not cease fighting with you until they turn you back from your religion, if they can; and whoever of you turns back from his religion, then he dies while an unbeliever—these it is whose works shall go for nothing in this world and the hereafter, and they are the inmates of the fire; therein they shall abide.

This verse can be read two ways. It can be read to justify killing over ideological opposition, on the grounds that to be turned away from the true religion means going to hell, which is worse than death (“persecution is worse than slaughter”), or it can be read as an assertion of legitimate grounds for defensive violence (being forcibly “turned out” by people who “will not cease fighting”). The latter interpretation is consistent with the version of the Ten Commandments stated in “*Al Furqan*,” which should make it the necessary interpretation, if one accepts the Koran’s own claims that it does not contain contradictions.

The lack of any necessary contradiction between “*Al Furqan*” and the later verses means that the “*Al Furqan*” verses cannot tenably be interpreted as abrogated. For the doctrine of abrogation to be legitimate at all, it must at least be limited to cases of genuine contradiction between different parts of the Koran, but the theocrats have used the doctrine of abrogation to simply throw away those parts of the Koran they do not like.⁹ They don’t want to be limited in what they can kill people for, so they simply chop “*Al Furqan*” out of the *Furqan* (the Koran).¹⁰

It is certainly possible that the theocrats are correct: that Muhammad actually did change his mind and decide to turn Islam into a religion of looting, rape and murder. Many passages in the *hadiths* (the sayings of Muhammad, as passed down by his contemporaries) suggest that this is the case.¹¹ If so, then instead of being a true prophet of the God of Abraham, Moses, and Jesus, Muhammad was simply the most

ISLAM AND THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

evil man who ever lived, commanding his followers: "thou shalt kill," "thou shalt steal," and "thou shalt commit adultery."

The Islamofascists insist that Muhammad did order all of these crimes, but to do so they have to read the Koran in ways that make it inconsistent with itself. If the Koran's claims to consistency are taken seriously then Islam submits to the Ten Commandments and the possibility that Muhammad was a true prophet of the God of Abraham remains open.

Biography vs. Koran

The main obstacle to an interpretation of Islam that consists with the Koran's affirmation of earlier scripture is the practice (common to both Shiite and Sunni Muslims, who together make up 95 percent of all Muslims) of interpreting the Koran in terms of Muhammad's biography. For instance, on the question of whether ideological opposition can justify violence, the *hadiths* say: "Whoever insults a prophet, kill him."¹² It is this *hadith*, not "*Al Furqan's*" rejection of violent reaction to insult, that gets quoted on placards across Europe at every fresh excuse for Muslim outrage. It is the *hadiths*, not the Koran, that underpin the *sharia* death penalty for blasphemy throughout the Islamic world.

Similarly at many other points. The reported words and deeds of Muhammad often suggest that he did not limit violent attack to circumstances of defensive war. Traditional Islamic jurisprudence settles this dilemma by using the man as the measure of the book, but there is a glaring problem with this interpretive scheme. It constitutes the most blatant idolatry. Muhammad the man is in effect being placed above the revelations that were supposedly passed through him by God.

It isn't just that the *hadiths* and other biographical materials are fallible reports. (The *hadiths* were not even compiled until two hundred years after the death of Muhammad, when various scholars, each with their own flaws and agendas, tried to extract what was authentic from out of what was acknowledged to be a morass of false reports concocted by interested parties.) More fundamentally, the *hadiths* are the reported words of Muhammad the *man*, who *himself* is acknowledged by Islam to be fallible, while the verses of the Koran are held to have been dictated to Muhammad by the Archangel Gabriel.

In a score of different places the Koran demands obedience "to God and the Apostle," but none of these passages obscure the distinction between Muhammad the man and Muhammad as the transmitter

of prophecy.¹³ Interpretations that do obscure this distinction are inconsistent with the hundred different Koranic verses that condemn idolatry and should be theologically barred on that account. Similarly with the two verses of the Koran that exalt Muhammad's character and example (68.4 and 33.21). Both are most straightforwardly read as referring to Muhammad in his role as prophet.¹⁴

But Muslim authorities do not need to read the Koran coherently. They have power. According to the *hadiths* (whether they are accurate or not), Muhammad the man authorizes murder, where the internal consistency of the Koran forbids it. The Islamofascists want to be able to murder whoever threatens their power, so they follow the man (or what is said of the man) and rip pages out of the Book.

Not surprisingly, Muslims who reject the practice of filtering the book through the man have had *fatwas* issued against them by Saudi Arabia's Sunni Wahabbist clergy and have ended up on apostate hit lists.¹⁵ This is what the Wahabbists and the Khomeini-ists do. Any Muslim who has the audacity to think straight, any Muslim who follows honest reason, is seen as a threat by Islamic authorities, who respond with terror.

The Islamic "gates of *ijtihad*" (of Koranic interpretation) need to be reopened, but it is only going to happen if the West is willing to support and engage in the kinds of criticism that the terror-masters are trying to suppress.¹⁶

Taking Idolatry Seriously (Director's Cut)

Muslims are capable of taking idolatry seriously. Prohibitions on worshipping Muhammad are the historical background for today's "cartoon *jihads*," where the most innocuous depictions of Muhammad are attacked as forbidden idolatry.

Of course it is illogical to extend the Islamic prohibition on depictions of Muhammad to unbelievers. People who do not believe that Muhammad was a true prophet are certainly in no danger of worshipping his image. One of the Danish cartoons makes exactly this point. It depicts Muhammad putting his hand up to a pair of bomb and sword wielding *jihadists*, declaring: "Easy my friends, when it comes to the point, it is only a drawing made by a non-believing Dane..."

By ignoring the meaning and logic of idolatry (obvious enough even to an infidel cartoonist), Islamic theocrats turn the prohibition on treating Muhammad as an idol into a *form* of treating Muhammad as

ISLAM AND THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

an idol. By singling Muhammad's image out for religiously-required special treatment, the theocrats are treating Muhammad's image as sacred.

This is nothing, however, compared to the pervasive and profound idolatry that comes from the Muslim practice of filtering the Koran through the *hadiths*. It is bizarre that those who insist on erasing the face of Muhammad from historical artwork can turn around and measure the Book by the man, but this is what happens when Islamic totalitarians make it a crime to think straight. By regarding the life of Muhammad as the measure of what the Koran calls for, they turn Muhammad into an idol far more thoroughly than any praying at his tomb or viewing of his image.

Of course Christians do the same thing when they treat the behavior of Jesus as the ideal to emulate, but Christians view Jesus as God. Muslims are supposed to view Muhammad as a fallible man. Idealization of Muhammad crosses the line into idolatry when reports of the man are allowed to dictate the meaning of the supposed word of God and even turn Islam away from the Abrahamic and Mosaic foundations upon which the Muslim "Book" stakes all of its claims.

Ideally Muslims should also think straight about the possibility that Muhammad was not a prophet; that his claims of right might not be right; and that there might be no heavenly afterlife awaiting even those who do *genuine* right, none of which anyone has grounds to be certain of. Christianity calls for no such irrational belief. Instead, Christian faith comes through understanding the message of love (Romans 10:17). Those who hear the message of love have their eyes opened to what there is to love in the world, and there discover the rightness of acting for love.

Since Muslims regard Jesus as a true prophet, this advance may be within the eventual grasp of Islam, but the first step is to renounce the simple idolatry of using the man as the measure of the Book.

Islam and Democracy

The late al Qaeda-in-Iraq leader Abu Musab al-Zarqawi described the threat that democracy presents to Islamofascism:

We have declared a bitter war against the principle of democracy and all those who follow this wrong ideology....Islam requires the rule of Allah and not the rule of the people or the majority...All those who vote are infidels."¹⁷

If the “rule of *Allah*” is equated with the Islamofascists’ assertions about the will of *Allah*, then Zarqawi was right, but it is only this—not any essential core of Islam, but just the power of Islamic totalitarians to rule all Muslim minds—that is threatened by democracy, and will be destroyed by democracy, *if* we do our part.

The position of the Islamofascists is extraordinarily fragile. They use systematic murder to keep anyone from questioning their violation of the Commandment not to murder, but they could never say out loud that they deny the Ten Commandments. We just have to bring that question out of the dark. Ask every Muslim you meet whether Islam demands obedience to the Ten Commandments. Ask them whether Muslims are granted special exemptions from what Muhammad called “The Criterion of Right and Wrong.” The fascists have been embracing every rationale for exemption from the commandment not to murder, but they can’t say it, and challenging them to say it will unmask them as spurners of the God of Moses.

American traitor Adam Gadahn, who in August of 2006 delivered al Qaeda’s invitation for Americans to convert or die (the traditional Islamic declaration of war), asserted how the Koran is to be understood. Here is how he speaks for Muhammad:

Islam is the only religion acceptable to God and came with the revealed book, the Koran, which abrogates all previous revelations, like the Torah and Evangel [Gospel].¹⁸

Muhammad’s “eternal book” states otherwise.¹⁹

It confirms the Scriptures which came before it, and stands as a guardian over them.

Koran, Verse 5.48, Dawood translation

Nothing is said to you that has not been said to other apostles before you.

Koran, Verse 41.42, Dawood translation

In denying that the Koran confirms previous revelation, Gadahn abrogates every one of the Koran’s claims to Abrahamic and Mosaic foundations, creating a version of Islam that is what the Koran itself calls purest idolatry:

ISLAM AND THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

Have they idols which in the practice of their faith have made lawful to them what God has not allowed?...Woeful punishment awaits the wrongdoers.

Koran, Verse 42.21, Dawood translation

Abd al-Wahhab and the Ayatollah Khomeini are such idols, claiming it is lawful to systematically violate the Sixth Commandment. Abul-Ala al-Maudoodi, the Pakistani cleric who was one of the twentieth-century authors of the claim that previous revelations are abrogated by the Koran, is such an idol.²⁰ The costumed traitor Gadahn aspires to be such an idol. Which are Muslims going to follow, these idols, or their Koran?

In their own communities, the Islamofascists suppress the truth with threats of violence, but in taking on the West, they rely on complicity from the West itself. They rely on politically correct multiculturalism to defer to Islamofascist claims of offense, and so far it is working. Few voices are exposing the Islamofascists' rejection of the proclaimed Abrahamic and Mosaic foundations of their own religion. Few are pointing out to the Muslim *umma* that, if the Koran is right, then their going along as their religion is claimed by murderers condemns them all to Hell.

This silence is not cultural sensitivity. It is insensitivity, an unwillingness to engage and comprehend and help retrieve those who have been herded into Islam's forced-march away from moral sanity. When we decline to judge, how are we better than those Muslims who decline to judge, and end up abetting murder? By adhering to the left-wing religion of multiculturalist non-judgmentalism, we are failing to act as a conscience for a full third of humanity who have gone astray of basic moral sense. Our moral cowardice is enabling their moral perversion.

Just Tell the Truth (*Director's Cut*)

Jesus told us to trust in truth. Asked by Pilate to account for himself, Jesus replied:

For this cause I was born, and for this cause I have come into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth. Everyone who is of the truth hears My voice."

John 18:37, New King James Translation

This is the example Christians are supposed to follow. The substance of Christianity is to love your neighbor, the method is to trust in truth. So what are we waiting for?

Atheists are always insisting that they need no religion to comprehend right and wrong, and they are certainly correct that they shouldn't need religion to get this much right. It is just a rational fact that nothing but the truth matters. To trade honest reason for manipulative advantage can only advantage error. So how can so much of our society, especially the non-religious part of our society, be so mired in politically correct multiculturalism that we won't speak the truth about Islamofascism's complete perversion of Islam's own proclaimed foundations?

We have an information systems advantage over the Muslim world. By speaking the truths about Islam that the Islamofascists are suppressing, we can break their ideological hold on Muslims. Together with democracy, that freeing of Muslim minds can free the Muslim world. Free minds, given free choice, will bring down theocratic Islam's Berlin Wall: its twin death penalties for blasphemy and apostasy. Only when this happens will non-suicidal embrace with the Islamic world be possible.

Alternatively, we can continue with ideological appeasement. Then the Islamofascists will win whatever elections we are able to sponsor. Majority rule will become a tyranny of the majority that puts to death all critics of Islamofascism. The fascist democracies will start working on weapons to annihilate us, and we will have to annihilate them. But at least our multiculturalists will still be able to claim moral purity: they never offended anyone.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

COMMON GROUND AND HALLOWED GROUND

IN SEPTEMBER 2005, when the controversy over the original Crescent design first arose, reporter Kirk Swauger asked a local *imam* what he thought:

Fouad El Bayly of Somerset, leader of the Islamic Center of Johnstown, has said Muslims immediately would recognize the symbolism in the design. The crescent is a symbol of Islamic faith, El Bayly said. "You pick something to be identified with," he said.¹

El Bayly was due to return from Egypt just before I left for Pennsylvania in July 2006. When I arrived, I managed to reach him and he graciously suggested we meet for dinner at the Eton Park restaurant. That sounded appropriate, there in the English-named city of Somerset, surrounded by a vast Sherwood Forest. "I'll look it up in the phone book," I said.

Good thing I saw the sign atop a thirty-foot pole, designed to be visible from the turnpike: Eat'n Park. If I ever have a restaurant, I'm going to name it The Parquineet.

"Eton Park" turned out to be an excellent choice: clean, stylish, bright colors, low light, beautiful waitress, good menu. El Bayly and I talked for three hours.

An Islam to Welcome

Not knowing what kind of Muslim Fouad might be, I expressed my curiosity about Islam: does it require adherence to the Ten Commandments? "Absolutely" was El Bayly's answer.

“What about the bin Ladenist interpretation?” I asked him: “They say that the Koran only forbids the killing of the innocent, and they say that no one who resists their demands is innocent. Does the Koran grant Muslims any special exemptions from the Commandment not to commit murder?”²

“The terrorists are wrong,” El Bayly insisted: “Islam only permits killing in self-defense.”

“And that is only defense against physical harm?” I double-checked, “or conspiracy to commit physical harm? It does not allow killing over insult, or ideological opposition?”

“Ideological opposition is not grounds for killing in Islam,” El Bayly affirmed.

Robert Spencer has pressed many Islamic spokesmen to define who they regard as “innocent,” and has encountered many dodges. Not so with Fouad El Bayly. He accepts the Ten Commandments as the founding stone of Islam.

I shared with him my view that, for the Koran to be consistent with this founding stone, all of the many admonitions to violent *jihad* in the Koran must be seen as conditional on circumstances of defensive war.

“They *are* conditional on circumstances of defensive war,” El Bayly corrected me.

I can live with that kind of believer. Yet at the same time, El Bayly had become a sponge for leftist disinformation about the war in Iraq. “It was all based on lies,” he fumed, chagrined that he had personally been responsible for delivering “thousands of votes” to President Bush. But what was he upset about?

“Iraq has been freed from a murderous dictator,” I said. “The Iraqi people are well on the way to choosing their own leaders and being able to defend themselves. Where is the downside?”

Fouad claimed that millions of Iraqis have been killed in the Iraq war.

Those weren’t the numbers I had heard. In December 2005, President Bush put total civilian deaths in Iraq at about thirty thousand. More recent figures were up to about forty thousand.³ On the other hand, Saddam had been murdering between fifteen thousand and forty-five thousand every year, and the sanctions regime necessary to keep his ambitions in check was causing as many as sixty thousand

COMMON GROUND AND HALLOWED GROUND

deaths a year.⁴ Far from costing large numbers of Iraqi lives, the Iraq war was saving Iraqi lives, even as it freed the Iraqi people.

It wasn't surprising to hear fantastic casualty figures from someone who had just spent a couple of months in Egypt, but Fouad also complained about Halliburton, and repeated other Michael Moorish tropes. Halliburton employees have risked and sometimes lost their lives trying to help the Iraqi people. They are heroes!

"You have been listening to the American left," I told Fouad. "Don't believe them. They are idiots. They lie about everything. You did right to vote for Bush. We just need to keep supporting Iraq. Soon they will have peace and freedom. You will see."

"I hope you are right," he chuckled at my optimism. "I don't know. But I hope you are right."

Polygamy (*Director's Cut*)

Fouad is an impressive fellow: tall, trim, handsome, with genuine honesty and goodwill. I could tell from my efforts to contact him that he also has a doting wife. Probably better for him if she does not know that he tried to tempt me with Islam's allowance for up to four wives. He and I laughed together at the Western pretense of limiting a man to one wife, when in fact a man in America is allowed to have as many women as he wants, so long as he does not take responsibility for them.

I am actually on Fouad's side about polygamy, much as I am against other expansions of marriage, like the same-sex thing. Marriage is about supporting childbearing. John Stuart Mill had it right. A couple should not be allowed to have children until they are in a position to support them, which used to be effected by not allowing a couple to get married until they had secured the means to support a family. For most couples, that meant that the man had to be established in a career. As Mill put it:

The laws which, in many countries on the Continent, forbid marriage unless the parties can show that they have the means of supporting a family do not exceed the legitimate powers of the state; and whether such laws may be expedient or not (a question mainly dependent on local circumstances and feelings), they are not objectionable as violations of liberty.

J.S. Mill, *On Liberty*, chapter V, PP14 (1859)

The Koran also limits marriage to those who can afford children:

Let those who cannot afford to marry live in continence until
God shall enrich them from His own bounty.

Koran, Verse 24:33, Dawood Translation

Whether one comes by the principle of responsible childbearing logically or religiously, application of this principle suggests that men who can support more than one woman's children should be allowed to do so, as long as wife number one is agreeable, or at least agreed in *her* marriage contract that there may be other wives to follow. What is toxic is what is happening in Europe, where Muslims on the dole are fathering endless children, all supported by the state.⁵ According to the Koran, these men are not supposed to have *any* children!

When tied to individual responsibility, polygamy is something the West could learn from Islam, and given the plummeting reproductive rates in the West, it is something we may *have* to learn from Islam. Men of means who can find women that are agreeable to raising half-siblings should be encouraged, not discouraged. And what pro-choice feminist could possibly be against that freedom of choice?

Fouad and I also talked a bit about Christianity. "Show me where Jesus said he was God and I will become a Christian," Fouad challenged me, referring to Islam's affirmation of the Gospels. I was sorry I couldn't help there. As far as I know, Jesus only said that his *father* was God.⁶

The Crescent Mosque

"What would you think," I asked Fouad, "if you were to find out that the giant crescent in the memorial for Flight 93 is oriented on Mecca?"

He gave me a very suspicious look, as if I suddenly might not be what I had seemed. "I would not know about any such thing," he answered. "What are you telling me? Are you saying that this is real?"

I gave him the bad news: that I and many others had examined the precise orientation of the Crescent of Embrace, and found that a person facing directly into the giant crescent was facing within two degrees of Mecca.

"Would that make it a *mihrab*?" I asked.

COMMON GROUND AND HALLOWED GROUND

“No!” Fouad answered fiercely. “A *mihrab* is a spiritual construct: it is the mind of a believer, turning to face his God. A crescent shape does not make a *mihrab*.”

“But what if the architect *intended* to create the world’s largest *mihrab*?” I continued. “What if the Mecca orientation is not accidental? In fact, it is repeated many times throughout the design.”

Fouad’s countenance darkened with pain: “Then this is someone who hates Islam, and is trying to tar us all with the deeds of the terrorists.” He described the agony of local Muslims after 9/11, feeling that the terrorists had branded them all. “They hijacked us, too,” he said. When the crescent design for the Flight 93 memorial was first unveiled, animosity was stirred up again. Now this!

I told him how the design contained every typical mosque feature, all on the same epic scale as the giant crescent/*mihrab*. And not only was it to be the world’s largest mosque, but it was to be a terrorist-memorial mosque; with a separate Memorial Wall placed exactly as the star on an Islamic crescent-and-star flag; with forty-four memorial glass blocks emplaced along the flight path, exceeding the number of the murdered by the number of their murderers; and with the forty-fourth glass block creating an exact Mecca orientation for the giant crescent, tying the terrorists and Islam together into a multi-layered bin Ladenist embrace.

Fouad looked sick. Either I was telling the truth about these perversions, or someone who had seemed to him to be honest was telling him the meanest lies ever concocted. But there was also an upside.

“Don’t worry,” I said. “We are going to stop it, and you can help if you want.” He did want. He said that if these things I was saying were true, he would do whatever he could to fight it. When I told him that all would be exposed in a book I was writing, to be published later in the year, he brightened considerably. “Maybe it will be a bestseller!” he exulted.

That would be nice.

“Anything that hurts this country, or which hurts Muslims, it must be opposed,” Fouad concluded. He sees no contradiction between those loyalties, and neither do I, not for any Muslim who, like Fouad El Bayly, rejects the pre-Ten-Commandments Islam of the Islamofascists.

Israel

Through our wide-ranging discussion, I got a good idea of where Fouad's susceptibility to left-wing disinformation comes from. I asked him what it was like observing the latest outbreak of Arab-Israeli war from the vantage-point of Egypt, and we spent the next forty minutes talking about Israel.

With the terrorist group Hamas winning the 2006 Palestinian elections by a wide margin, the Palestinians can no longer say that the terrorists are renegades. As a people, the Palestinians have chosen war with Israel, which has been trying to live in peace and cooperation for fifty years. How to account for that choice? The Jews are the most entrepreneurial and technologically advanced people in the world. By cooperating instead of fighting, the Palestinians could quickly become the most prosperous people in the Arab world. Why not accept that offer?

In explanation, Fouad started listing obstacles to cooperation: that Arabs working for Jewish employers are not trusted; that the Jews continue to buy up Arab holdings and push Arabs out. "So what?" I asked. "Nobody is wronged by the buying and selling of land!" Private transactions of property and employment are what allow an economy to function. The reason the Arab world is penniless except for its oil wealth is its failure to protect economic liberty. In territory controlled by the Palestinian Authority, it is a death penalty crime to sell land to a Jew.⁷ Of course their economy is a corpse.

"Look at America," I offered. "This country is great because we allow anyone to buy-in and find their own way to make the most of our human and other resources. The more they are able to make of America, the stronger the country becomes. The Arab world could do the same thing. Why doesn't it?"

Fouad acknowledges that it is irrational for Arabs to fight Israel. He himself seems to have a history as an industrious advocate for peace, having helped to organize a number of inter-faith efforts to find common ground between Jews and the Palestinians. "Still," he explains, "people have their feelings. A lot of Palestinians lost their homes."

Feelings: that is exactly what a religion is supposed to take precedence over. People have all kinds of passionate reactions that need to be moderated by moral understanding. "Who is in greater error," asks the Koran, "than the man who is led by his desire, without guidance from God?" (Verse 28.50, Dawood Translation.)

COMMON GROUND AND HALLOWED GROUND

The great disaster is when feelings are used to justify partisan dishonesty. Failure to trust in truth unplugs the moral understanding that is supposed to reign in the feelings. The result is a people going forward blindly, divorced from moral reality, deluded as to where their actual interests lie. Nowhere is this more devastatingly demonstrated than with the Palestinians and their feelings-driven embrace of grievance against Israel.

The historical issue in Israel is no different than the current one. Voluntary transactions of property and employment are not grounds for grievance, and from the beginning the Jews established their position in Palestine through voluntary transactions. They bought their land.

When Palestine was under British control, the Arabs agitated not to let Jews come in and buy land, while Jews agitated to be allowed to come in and buy land. The process was grossly biased against the Jews, but in the end, after Europe murdered most of its Jews, sufficient survivors made it to Palestine to constitute a majority in the limited territory that would become Israel. No property was expropriated in the formation of Israel. Property rights simply came to be administered under a different government, one which promised to protect the rights of all of its people, Arab and Jew.⁸

When the surrounding Arab states attacked the newly formed state of Israel, further lands were confiscated in self-defense, pushing attackers back as necessary for national security. But the Jews were always far more restrained in pushing back their non-Israeli Arab neighbors than self-defense would have justified (which is the reason they have remained so insecure). Thus for the first time in history, a nation was formed by purely moral means, buying land and defending it, while never coming anywhere near to the limits of what self-defense would have allowed.

(Right and wrong in the Arab-Israeli conflict really is that simple, but only after the criterion of legitimacy has been clarified: that republicanism takes priority over democracy. See extended footnote here.⁹)

Palestinian Arabs Have Suffered Injustice, but not from Israel (*Director's Cut*)

In the Old Testament, Moses ordered his followers to conquer the Promised Land. The Jews of the Bible murdered, in order to steal.

Israel, in contrast, has been unjust to no one. This is not to say that the displaced Palestinians did not suffer injustice. At best, war replaces individual justice with group justice. When the Arab attacks on Israel were driven back, the Arabs as a group suffered the losses that they deserved, but as individuals, many of the Arabs who paid the heaviest price were innocent. It was the surrounding Arab states that attacked, but it was the local Arabs who were displaced.

That individual injustice was grave, but blame for it falls entirely on the aggressing Arab states, not on Israel, which did no wrong. To secure defensible borders, Israel *should* have pushed all non-Israeli Arabs back beyond the Jordan River and the Suez Canal. This is the territory controlled by Israel after the 1967 "Six Day War," which should never have been stopped at six days. What other country has ever been forced to relent while its attackers remained implacable?

The international community should have allowed the Israeli Air Force to bomb the military assets and the infrastructure of the attacking Arab states until their capacity to make war was destroyed and they agreed to take in and compensate all Arab refugees from the expanded Israeli territory. The present line-in-the-sand fifteen miles from the sea is not a defensible border. Neither is Gaza.

In allowing non-Israeli Arabs to stay, the Jews were trying to minimize individual injustice, even though it was not their responsibility. They offered mercy after mercy and for their trouble have reaped nothing but continued aggression and the total debasement of who they tried to spare, all because the Palestinians chose not to trust in truth.

After Palestinian Arabs lost territory to the Jews, the tendency of partisan dishonesty was to blame the Jews. If the Arabs wanted their land back, only a claim against the current stakeholder could advance that cause, so the Palestinians blamed Israel for the injustices they suffered, even though it was a lie. As a result, the Palestinians have become cannon fodder for the very Arab "brothers" who have dealt them injustice after injustice. They relentlessly attack who never wronged them, at the behest of those who destroyed them.

Two Cultures of Lies

Palestinian Arabs have been blaming Israel for their own crimes against Israel for so long that their culture of lies has become as thorough and complete as the manipulative dishonesty of the Western

COMMON GROUND AND HALLOWED GROUND

left. Inevitably, these two cultures of lies would come feed each other. Each embraces whatever interpretations it finds most convenient, and there is much they find convenient in each other.

Western socialists hate Jews because Jews are capitalists. This reached its peak with National Socialism, but is hardly less visceral today. The left rejects Israel's legitimacy precisely because the Jews bought their land and then defended it. To the Western left, property rights are the source of all evil. Thus the left sympathizes with Arab murderers, while Arabs are drawn to Western anti-capitalist ideologies because these ideologies confirm Arab scorn for Israeli property rights.

This union of postmodernism and pre-modernism has become commonplace. Michael Moore calls the terror bombers of Baghdad "freedom fighters" and Osama bin Laden includes references to Fahrenheit 9/11 in his videotapes from the cave.¹⁰ Together they attack modernism in general, and Israel in particular, from both sides. Western postmodernism and Islamic pre-modernism are both religions of false witness, and these two pre Ten Commandments religions are now in strategic alliance.

Because these two cultures of lies both put partisan dishonesty ahead of truth, neither has any clue where value actually lies in the world. Because they think backwards, protecting their presumptions about what is right from every evidence that their presumptions are wrong, their eyes are not open to positive possibility.

That the Arab-Muslim world has become dominated by a culture of lies does not imply that there is anything especially wrong with the group character of Arabs and Muslims, any more than Europe's present domination by the leftist culture of lies implies anything especially wrong with Europeans. Every society is made up of good people and bad people, and in every society, the good people face the same challenge of establishing institutions that will reward good and punish bad, so that good can prevail.

The basic requirements are liberty and responsibility, and the only way to maintain institutions of liberty and responsibility is by trusting in truth. Those who seek advantage in manipulative unreason corrupt the enterprise at every turn. Without the small "r" republican virtue of moral honesty, politics and public culture will always degenerate into moral blindness.

Submission

Religion is not the only possible source of republican virtue, but it is one possible source, and for any who accept Ten Commandments as God's law, it is enough. Fouad El Bayly's Palestinian sympathies make him susceptible both to blaming Israel for the injustices suffered by Palestinian Arabs, and to the lies of the left. At the same time, his religion has the potential to save him from this self-destructive fate, as it can save *all* Muslims who are willing to follow him in accepting the Ten Commandments as the founding stone of Islam.

All that is required is submission (*islam*). Feelings are not to weigh against God's law, and the law of the God of Abraham and Moses does not get more basic than the Eighth Commandment: "Thou shalt not steal." Israeli property rights must be respected. The morality of Israel's founding, buying the land, must be acknowledged, along with Arab blame for the injustices suffered by innocent Arabs when Israel was forced to defend itself.

"Thou shalt not bear false witness." It is not acceptable to the God of Moses to place blame wherever one finds most convenient. Honesty, in matters of victimization and due, is an absolute requirement. All other Islamic commands must be interpreted as conditional on these foundations, or Islam *has* no foundations.

Theft and refusal to recognize property rights is a core principle of Islamofascist ideology. When Anjem Choudary, who incites British Muslims to violent *jihād*, was interviewed by the BBC, he rejected all British property rights: "Who says you own Britain, anyway? Britain belongs to Allah. The whole world belongs to Allah."¹¹

The Koran does indeed declare looting lawful for Muslims (8.67-69), but to consist with the commandment not to steal, that allowance must be seen as conditional on circumstances of defensive war, where the property of aggressors is properly forfeit, so that confiscation does not constitute theft. Is there a Muslim who will say out loud that the Koran grants Muslims a more general exception from the Commandment not to steal? Let him say so explicitly, and we will see how many are willing to follow him into the fire.

For those who *do* submit to the Ten Commandments, their eyes will be opened. The Palestinians don't have to throw away their lives, and their souls, trying to commit murder. They can understand that it is their fellow Arabs who have wronged them, and look to the Jews as the forbearing friends they have always been, waiting for

COMMON GROUND AND HALLOWED GROUND

sixty years to help the Palestinians help themselves. Thus can exposure of Islamofascist truth suppression show the way to the very heart and source of Islamofascism's hold on the Muslim mind, and supply the antidote.

The Palestinians are not supposed to be a destroyed people. That came from putting their faith in seemingly-advantageous false witness instead of trusting in truth. All they need to do is submit to God's law—to stop seeking advantage in false witness—and by the grace of God, they will be freed from the pest-hole they have dug themselves into, free to take up the prosperous lives they were supposed to lead, in fellowship with their God's first chosen, in the place that the scriptures designate as the promised land of the Jews.

Or they can keep trying to murder who is trying to be merciful, and be destroyed utterly. The Jews may be pathologically forbearing, but America is not. As the moral blindness of the Palestinians spreads like a poison through the Muslim *umma*, we have already had to start cutting, and we will keep cutting, as far as we have to.

Sheik Taj Din al-Hilali (the Australian *imam* who says it is wrong to punish rape because Western women are "uncovered meat"), holds up attacks against Israel as the clearest case of Islamic propriety:

Jihad of the liberator of Palestine, that's the greatest and the cleanest and the highest...jihad which lifts our heads in pride...¹²

On the contrary, "jihad of the liberator of Palestine" is the lowest and dirtiest of all Muslim crimes, where the miserable state of the Palestinians is invoked to justify the most total collapse of moral responsibility.

What morality demands of the Palestinians appears difficult. Here are a people who have lived in misery for decades. They have suffered endless injustice, and are constantly having to deal from a position of humiliating weakness, yet morality calls upon them to give up still more. They must give up the partisan dishonesty which they have embraced as the only weapon available to them.

Lack of might does not make right. Misery does not justify sin, and sin only perpetuates misery. Partisan dishonesty is the downward path—into crime and self-destruction—that the Palestinians have been leading their co-religionists to follow.

Islam itself could yet prove to have the moral resources to reverse this course. Chapter after chapter of the Koran cites those societies of the Old Testament that were destroyed by God after scorning God's commands: the people of Noah, washed away by the flood; the people of Sodom, destroyed by a shower of stones; community after community, destroyed by earthquake, fire and disease for their disobedience.¹³

How ironic that the proclaimed followers of such a book would as a group so recklessly and systematically violate the most fundamental of God's laws: bearing false witness in order to murder and steal.

Fear Hell, as the Koran teaches, or love your neighbor, as Christianity teaches, but do one or the other. Those who love death, as the murder-cultists teach, will bring death and Hell to all of their kind.

Honoring Heroes

Writing about the war crimes trial of Adolf Eichmann after World War II, Hannah Arendt remarked on "the banality of evil." Eichmann saw himself as a well-meaning paper-pusher, as he arranged the shipment of hundreds of thousands of Jews to their deaths.

The Memorial debacle reveals the banality of the abetting of evil. Murdoch has been able to succeed in his plot to plant a terrorist-memorial mosque on the Flight 93 crash site thanks to the relentless truth-suppression of person after person all of whom simply assumed they were on the side of right. This book has documented the same behavior by Democrat-left elites on the full range of terror-war issues. They just assume that the most important priority is to defeat their domestic political opposition and have no qualms about using their near total control over America's news media for maximum manipulative advantage, oblivious in their divorce from moral and practical reality to the implications of their overt alliance with al Qaeda.

As importantly placed as these elites are, they are not representative of America, Democrat or Republican. Even the great Democrat middle, which gets all of its information from our radical leftist media, often votes counter to the mainstream media slant. For all of the world's deeply entrenched mechanisms of truth-suppression, there is also a broad and deep culture of love of truth, and love of humanity, running through all peoples, and especially, it seems, through America.

COMMON GROUND AND HALLOWED GROUND

No typology is needed here, no difference between blue or red. Truth and love are twinned, and create a common goodness. To have eyes open to what our fellows can teach us about merit and worth is to love everything that can be loved, and anyone whose eyes are open to that law of love knows that nothing but the truth matters. Our society fails this core of goodness and wisdom sometimes, maybe even a lot, but not when push comes to shove, as it did for the passengers and crew of Flight 93.

They are the only example we need. Faced with new information—that America was under attack—they comprehended the new reality that all of us are facing, and acted as love required. As much as our enemies are a relentless embodiment of lies and hate, the heroes of Flight 93 showed the power of those whose guiding light is to achieve as much as they can for the people and the world that they love.

By carrying that spirit of truth and love outward, we can win this war we did not choose, and maybe even save the Islamic world in the bargain. That will be our ultimate tribute to those who hurled their bodies into the path of murder, and saved our nation from a terrible blow. In the meantime, we must not neglect the spirit of Flight 93 at its first resting place.

The passengers and crew of Flight 93 did not hang up the phone when they learned that we on the ground needed them. They gave their all for us. Neither can we hang up the phone when we learn that Flight 93 has been re-hijacked, and now needs our help.

The truth of what Paul Murdoch has done is easily verified by anyone who bothers to look. How many will it take? Let those who sacrifice truth to presumption battle here, and let them be exposed here, along with Murdoch's mosque. In juxtaposition to those who distrust in truth, the spirit of Flight 93 will only beckon the brighter, a pure light, outshining all, yet as serene to behold as a once lonely field in Western Pennsylvania, now home to Heroes. Out of that light, a proper memorial will rise.

AFTERWORD

I N APRIL 2007, outspoken Muslim apostate Ayaan Hirsi Ali gave a talk in Johnstown Pennsylvania, promoting her new book *Infidel*. Imam El Bayly, whose mosque is in Johnstown, protested her talk, citing the traditional Islamic death penalties for apostasy and for maligning Islam.¹

I knew that El Bayly had not been pulling the wool over my eyes the previous July when he insisted that no legitimate interpretation of Islam can violate the Ten Commandments, but that did not mean that he had necessarily confronted the contradictions between traditional Islamic interpretations and the Ten Commandments.

I emailed Fouad and urged him to analyze whether these traditional Islamic interpretations can possibly be legitimate. The verses of the Koran that are used to support the death penalties for apostasy and for criticism are readily interpretable as conditional on circumstances of defensive war, which means they *must* be so interpreted, if the Koran's claims to self-consistency are to be respected.

The next week, Fouad wrote a letter to the *Pittsburgh Tribune-Review* renouncing his earlier affirmation of the death penalty for apostasy, and asserting broad principles of religious liberty:

Since that time I have come to realize that I was mistaken in my understanding of [apostasy in Islam]. I misspoke, and I apologize. After further deliberation, I have come to the conclusion that a person's religious choices are a personal matter and should not be subject to state or individual intervention.²

Whether Fouad was influenced by my particular urgings I do not know, and it does not matter. What does matter is that, where traditional Islamic interpretations conflict with the Ten Commandments, he

has proven that he can adhere to the priority for the Ten Commandments, as he insisted before that he must. This is all that the West can or needs to ask of Islam: just be true to this core of your own religion.

I hope that Fouad will stand publicly with me on this, but it is not on him in particular to do so. It is on all of us, Muslim, Christian, Jew and atheist alike. If we can stand together for the Ten Commandments as common ground, then none can stand against us. No American can say that acceptance of the Ten Commandments is not enough to prove Muslims worthy of every friendship and trust, and no Muslim who wants to use Islam to justify murder will be able to deny that the Koran forbids it.

A week after Fouad's renunciation of the traditional death penalty for apostasy, he was fired from the Johnstown Islamic center. The center explained that El Bayly had to be renounced because of his failure to adhere to Islamic principles of religious tolerance in the Hirsi Ali affair, but that explanation makes no sense. First there are no such principles in traditional Islam. Sharia law recognizes only three options for infidels: to convert to Islam, to pay protection money and submit to second class citizenship, or to die.³ Islamic groups often falsely declare that traditional Islam is tolerant, but they are engaging in *taqiyya*, or religiously sanctioned deception about traditional Islam's violently hegemonic nature. (The Koran and the hadiths give Muslims permission to lie about their beliefs, both for self protection, and as a stratagem of war.⁴)

When groups like CAIR declare Islam to be a religion of peace, they never acknowledge that traditional Islamic interpretations are violently imperialistic. What Fouad did is the opposite of *taqiyya*. First he acknowledged the violent nature of traditional Islam. (As Hirsi Ali put it: "This imam has been strikingly honest."⁵) Then he came around to the view that these traditional interpretations cannot stand up to Koranic scrutiny, which is unheard of for a traditional Imam.

Surely the directors of the Johnstown Islamic Center are aware of what an extraordinary step El Bayly took for religious liberty. *Everyone* at the center is aware, as indicated by Fouad's original explanation for why he was citing the traditional death penalty for apostasy in the first place: "I'm trying to control my people here. I don't want people to get hot and cause trouble." His followers know the tradition so he could not ignore it. Are the directors of the Johnstown center now pretending to be ignorant themselves?

AFTERWORD

To fire Fouad for religious intolerance after he took the most important possible step for religious tolerance--declaring traditional intolerant interpretations of the Koran to be invalid—is counterproductive. If the directors of the Johnstown center really believe in religious tolerance they should embrace El Bayly's apology and explain its importance, that this is exactly what Islam needs: to confront the contradiction between traditional Islamic intolerance and Islamic foundations and reject intolerant tradition.

NOTES

NOTES

Chapter Fourteen Notes

- 1 "Waiting for democracy," *The Last Word*, by Kevin Peraino, *Newsweek International*, May 16, 2006, <<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/7773681/site/newsweek/from/RL.5/>>. A fuller statement of Sharansky's second thoughts can be found in his *L.A. Times* op-ed, "Does democracy end tyranny?" March 5, 2006.
- 2 From Amnesty International's 1996 "Report on Pakistan," September, 1996, <<http://www.thepersecution.org/ai/amnst196.html#fn1>>.
- 3 "Christian charged with blasphemy released," by Qaiser Felix, *AsiaNews.it* August 10, 2005, <<http://www.asianews.it/view.php?l=en&art=3898>>.
- 4 National Commission for Justice and Peace (NCJP) counted sixteen extra-legal murders of people accused of blasphemy between 1996 and 2003. NCJP is a Pakistani human rights body and UN NGO created by the Pakistani Catholic Bishops Conference in 1985. See their report, submitted to the UN Commission on Human Rights, Working Group on Minorities, Justice and Peace, March 2003, available online at: <www.unhchr.ch/minorities/statements10/NCJP3a.doc>. NCJP has a website at: <<http://www.geocities.com/ncjppak/ncjpprofile.htm>>. Murders of those accused of blasphemy are also documented in the 1996 Amnesty International report, op cit.
- 5 1996 Amnesty International report, op cit. Emphasis in original.
- 6 From the 2003 NCJP report, op cit.
- 7 *Radical Islam's Rules: The Worldwide Spread of Extreme Sharia Law*, Paul Marshall, Rowman and Littlefield, 2005.
- 8 Amnesty International issued a report in 2000 on the pervasive secrecy of the Saudi criminal system: "Saudi Arabia: a secret state of suffering," March 27, 2000, <<http://web.amnesty.org/library/Index/ENGMDE230012000?open&of=ENG-SAU>>.
- 9 "Saudis sentence man to death for insulting religion," *Middle East News Line*, February 2, 2003, <http://www.menewslines.com/stories/2003/february/02_03_4.html>.
- 10 "Saudi Arabia: teachers silenced, blasphemy charges," *Human Rights Watch*, November 17, 2005, <<http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/WO0511/S00326.htm>>.
- 11 "Sharia in Kabul? A theological iron curtain is descending across Afghanistan," Nina Shea, *National Review*, October 28, 2002, <<http://freedomhouse.org/religion/country/afghanistan/Sharia%20in%20Kabul.htm>>.
- 12 *Human Rights Watch* discusses the case in "Karzai fails on press freedom," June 27, 2003, <<http://www.eariana.com/ariana/eariana.nsf/allDocsArticles/1190A3C43D40C33A87256D4F0007E355?OpenDocument>>. Quote is from "Blasphemy journalists released," by Rahimula Samander, *Institute for War and Peace Reporting*, June 28, 2003, <http://www.iwpr.net/?p=arr&s=f&o=153754&apc_state=hdriarr2003>.
- 13 "Editor goes on trial for blasphemy," *Committee to Protect Journalists*, October 11, 2005, <<http://www.cpj.org/news/2005/Afghan11oct05na.html>>.
- 14 "Journalist convicted of blasphemy in Afghanistan," By Abdul Waheed and Carlotta Gall, *The New York Times*, October 23, 2005.
- 15 "Ahmadi Muslims call for 'peaceful jihad'," Danielle Demetriou, *The Independent*, July 31, 2004, <http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/this_britain/article49804.ece>.

NOTES

- Hat tip Robert Spencer: "UK: Ahmadi Muslims call for 'peaceful jihad'," Jihad Watch, August 1, 2004, <<http://www.jihadwatch.org/archives/002705.php>>.
- 16 "Statement by Ibn Warraq on the World Trade Center atrocity," October 8, 2001, <<http://www.declaration.net/news.asp?docID=2385&y=2001>>. Islamofascists go even further, insisting that there is no such thing as a moderate Muslim, on the grounds that any attempt to moderate Islam constitutes blasphemy or apostasy. This position was recently articulated by Malaysian former prime minister Tun Dr Mahathir Mohamad: "Dr M: No such thing as a moderate Muslim," Sun2SurfNews, September 15, 2006, <<http://www.thesundaily.com/article.cfm?id=15480>>.
- 17 John Locke, *A Letter Concerning Toleration*, Macmillian 1988 (1689), p. 18-19.
- 18 "Pope tackles faith and terrorism," Jeff Israely, *Time Magazine*, September 13, 2006, <<http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1534640-1,00.html>>. Text of Benedict's speech here: "Faith, reason and the university memories and reflections," September 12, 2006, <http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2006/september/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20060912_university-regensburg_en.html>.
- 19 "Muslims assail Pope's remarks on Islam," Suzan Fraser, Associated Press, September 15, 2006, <<http://www.breitbart.com/news/2006/09/15/D8K592E00.html>>.
- 20 The first half of the Mujahedeed Shura Council statement was reported by the Associated Press: "Iraq al-Qaeda: Pope, West are doomed," September 18, 2006, <<http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3305450,00.html>>. The second half (with a similar beginning) was reported by SwissInfo (" 'Jihad' vowed over Pope's speech," September 18, 2006, <http://www.swissinfo.org/eng/international/ticker/detail/Jihad_vowed_over_Pope_s_speech.html?siteSect=143&sid=7074701&cKey=1158577062000>.
- 21 This is Pope Benedict's paraphrase of Emperor Paleologus' thesis, which he then goes on to quote. ("Faith Reason and the University," Pope Benedict, op. cit.)
- 22 "The Pope's Words," editorial, *The New York Times*, September 16, 2006.
- 23 From "Islam is not a religion of pacifists," by Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, 1942. A substantial excerpt from Khomeini's 1942 statement is quoted by Robert Spencer in *Islam Unveiled*, Encounter Books, 2002, p. 35.
- 24 Bat Ye'or, *The Dhimmi: Jews and Christians under Islam*, Preface by Jacques Ellul. Trans. from French by David Maisel, Paul Fenton and David Littman, Fairleigh Dickinson University Press/ Associated University Presses & London: AUP, 1985.
- 25 "Suspects from 'broad strata' of Canadian society," Canadian Press, June 4, 2006, <http://www.ctv.ca/servlet/ArticleNews/story/CTVNews/20060604/terror_suspects_060604/20060604?hub=Canada>; "Canadian Parliament 'was target of fertiliser bomb'," Tim Reid, *Times Online*, June 5, 2006, <<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,11069-2211228,00.html>>; "Canada man 'planned to behead PM'," *BBC News*, June 7, 2006, <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/5054198.stm>>.
- 26 Inside the story, this claim is attributed to an unnamed source. ("The ties that bind 17 suspects?" Surya Bhattacharya, Nasreen Gulamhusein and Heba Aly, *The Toronto Sun*, June 4, 2006. The lede was on the front page of the paper edition of the Star. Charles Johnson posted a scan of the paper edition in: "Toronto Star: hard to find a common denominator," *Little Green Footballs*, June 5, 2006, <http://littlegreenfootballs.com/weblog/?entry=20915_Toronto_Star_Hard_to_Find_a_Common_Denominator&only>.

NOTES

- 27 "Raid officers learned about Muslim traditions," Colin Freeze, *The Globe and Mail*, June 6, 2006.
- 28 "Ignoring the biggest elephant in the room," Christie Blatchford, *Globe and Mail*, June 5, 2006.
- 29 For a survey of the glut of speech laws strangling Europe today, see Gerard Alexander's "Illiberal Europe: the long and growing list of things you can't legally say," *American Enterprise Institute*, April 3, 2006, <http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.24145/pub_detail.asp>.
- 30 Ann Coulter has a round-up of the Islamofascist-washing news coverage in: "Media Muslim makeovers!" *Jewish World Review*, October 31, 2002, <<http://www.jewishworldreview.com/cols/coulter103102.asp>>. Michelle Malkin has a complementary roundup in: "Lee Malvo, Muslim hatemonger," *Townhall*, December 10, 2003, <<http://www.townhall.com/opinion/columns/michellemalkin/2003/12/10/160454.html>>.
- 31 "UNC attacker sought revenge," Karin Rives and Samiha Khanna, *News and Observer* (Raleigh, Durham, Cary, Chapel Hill), March 5, 2006, <<http://www.newsobserver.com/692/story/414855.html>>.
- 32 "Defendant Offers Details Of Jeep Attack at University," Brenda Goodman, *New York Times*, March 8, 2006. Hat tip Clay Waters: "After Wave of Pro-Muslim PR, NY Times Buries UNC Attack," *Newsbusters*, March 8, 2006, <<http://newsbusters.org/node/4345>>.
- 33 "Toy pigs must go at council," *Express and Star News*, October 1, 2005, <<http://www.expressandstar.com/cgi-bin/artman/exec/view.cgi?archive=32&num=81092>>.
- 34 "Citizenship class is taught to think like a terror cell," David Sanderson and Helen Nugent, *Times Online*, June 16, 2006, <<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2-2228908,00.htm>>1.
- 35 "Passport photo of girl, 5, banned 'in case it offends Muslims'," *Daily Mail*, August 15, 2006.
- 36 "Police to brief Muslims before terror raids," Abul Taher, *The Sunday Times*, September 24, 2006, <<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-2372471,00.html>>.
- 37 "Poll shows Muslims in Britain are the most anti-western in Europe," Julian Borger, *The Guardian*, June 23, 2006, <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/religion/Story/0,,1804078,00.html>>. This in spite (or because) of the collateral finding that the British are the most open to Muslims: "Public opinion in Britain is mostly favourable towards Muslims, but the feeling is not required by British Muslims, who are among the most embittered in the western world, according to a global poll published yesterday."
- 38 Of course there are the high profile cases, like Ayaan Hirsi Ali ("Death threat MP expected to leave Netherlands," Ian Bickerthorn, *Financial Times*, May 15, 2006, <<http://www.ft.com/cms/s/06b820f8-e458-11da-8ced-0000779e2340.html>>) and Wafa Sultan ("For Muslim Who Says Violence Destroys Islam, Violent Threats," John M. Broder, *New York Times*, March 11, 2006), but there are also plenty of medium profile cases, like UCLA law professor Khaled Abou El Fadl, who received death threats and was condemned by leading Muslim organizations after he spoke out against violent Islam ("Moral Hazard: The Life of a Liberal Muslim," Franklin Foer, *The New Republic*, November 18, 2002,

NOTES

<http://www.centerforsecuritypolicy.org/index.jsp?section=papers&code=02-F_41>) and Tarek Fatah, the communications director of the Muslim Canadian Congress, who resigned when his liberal views lead to threats against his family (“Fearing for safety, Muslim official quits,” *Globe and Mail*, August 3, 2006), and low profile cases, like Jamal Miftah, the patriotic Oklahoma Muslim who received death threats from members of his local mosque for writing a letter to the editor condemning the al Qaeda (“Why we rarely hear from moderate Muslims,” Charles Johnson, *Little Green Footballs*, November 27, 2006,

<http://littlegreenfootballs.com/weblog/?entry=23480_Why_We_Rarely_Hear_from_Moderate_Muslims&only>).

39 “Media draw the line on running cartoons,” by Peter Johnson, *USA Today*, February 7, 2006,

<http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/life/20060208/d_mediainmix08.art.htm>.

40 Borders and Waldenbooks both pulled the magazine *Free Inquiry* in March 2006 when *Free Inquiry* ran the cartoons. See “Borders, Waldenbooks Won’t Carry Magazine,” Carolyn Thompson, *Associated Press*, March 29, 2006,

<<http://www.breitbart.com/news/2006/03/29/D8GLIG600.html>>. Nevertheless, the cartoons are easily described. Of the three cartoons that are less than maximally deferential, one does not depict Muhammad at all, but includes a rhyme in that chides Muhammad in Danish: “Muhammad you crazy bloke, Keeping woman under yoke.” The remaining two depict Muhammad as supportive of the violence that is done in his name. One manages to depict both censorship and blind aggression by showing a scimitar-wielding Muhammad with a censorship bar across his eyes. The other put a lit fuse in Muhammad’s turban. It is odd that people who demand slaughter in Muhammad’s name can find it insulting to say that Muhammad justifies violence, but in any case, this was the extent of the affront.

41 “Negative perception of Islam increasing,” Claudia Deane and Darryl Fears, *The Washington Post*, March 9, 2006.,

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/03/08/AR2006030802221_pf.html>.

42 “Brit Hume: Muslim cartoon protests ‘a disgrace,’” Carl Limbacher and *NewsMax* staff, *Newsmax*, February 5, 2006,

<<http://www.newsmax.com/archives/ic/2006/2/5/124102.shtml?s=icp>>.

43 “Nascar riled by show seeking anti-Muslim bias,” by Tim Lemke, *The Washington Times*, April 6, 2006,

<<http://www.washingtontimes.com/national/20060406-124609-2450r.htm>>. Just before the five year anniversary of 9/11, ABC News ran a segment that continued the NBC theme, depicting poll results of growing negative attitudes towards Muslims as evidence of violent American tendencies rather than a reaction to violent Muslim tendencies. The segment made extravagant claims of bias against Muslims, but could not cite any actual examples. See “ABC Blames Bush, ‘Ignorant’ Americans for ‘Islamaphobia,’” Mark Finkelstein, *NewsBusters*, September 9, 2006,

<<http://newsbusters.org/node/7499>>.

Chapter Fifteen Notes

1 “Islamists post hit-list of ‘apostates,’” Dr. Rusty Shackleford, *The Jawa Report*, April 11, 2006, <<http://mypejawa.mu.nu/archives/169819.php>>.

NOTES

² Robert Spencer surveys some of the many traditional Islamic authorities that support the doctrine of abrogation in *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Islam*, Regnery, 2005, pp. 25-26.

³ The only translation I can find of any of these verses that could provide textual support for the doctrine of abrogation is Shakir's translation of 2.106: "Whatever communications We abrogate or cause to be forgotten, We bring one better than it or like it." But even here, the implication seems to be that what comes later is a refinement of the former, not a reversal. Thus if the earlier can be forgotten, according to this doctrine, it is not because it failed to express a correct principle, but because the expression of this principle has since been stated more completely.

⁴ The only things that are repeated more often are more general declarations that unbelievers and idolators will burn in Hell. Much of Chapter 2 of the Koran (the second longest chapter of the Koran) is accusations against the Jews for being unfaithful to the Mosaic scriptures. A capsule telling (in Muhammad's deified "We") of earlier covenants that Jews and Christians "forgot a part of" appears in Chapter 5, verses 12-16.

⁵ Yusuf Ali translation. Note that the first verse of the third chapter of the Koran also acknowledges the the Mosaic law and the Ten Commandments ("the Law of Moses") separately from "the Book."

⁶ "In Kabul, a test for sharia," Andrea Elliot, *The New York Times*, 3/26/2006.

⁷ "On apostasy and Islam: 100+ notable Islamic voices affirming the freedom of faith," Dr. Mohammad Omar Farooq, *Apostasy in Islam*, April 1, 2007, <http://apostasyandislam.blogspot.com/2007/04/apostasy-and-islamic-voices-affirming.html>.

⁸ Yusuf Ali translation.

⁹ Ibn Ishaq's canonical biography, *The Life of Muhammad*, pioneered the interpretive scheme where later Koranic revelations are seen not merely as explicating earlier revelations, but as granting new permissions that had been barred by earlier revelations, in a progression from passive tolerance, to defensive warfare, to imperialistic aggression. (See Spencer's *Truth About Muhammad*, op cit. p.76-78.) Defensive warfare is certainly consistent with the tolerant verses of early Islam, thus it is only the last step (to imperialistic aggression) where Ishaq invokes the principle of abrogation. Here Ishaq notes that: "Muhammad received a revelation saying, 'Fight them so that there be no more seduction' away from Islam and 'Until God alone is worshiped'." (*The Life of Muhammad*, translated by A. Guillaume, Oxford, 2002, p. 213.) Two verses of the Koran fit this characterization: 2.193 and 8.39. Both explicitly limit violence to defensive purposes. 2.193 is preceded by two verses instructing to fight only who fights you while 8.39 reads in full: "And fight with them until there is no more persecution and religion should be only for Allah; but if they desist, then surely Allah sees what they do." (Shakir translation.) There is no reason to think that this "persecution" that justifies violence includes mere insult of ideological opposition, and consistency with Al Furqan demands that it does not. Absent this violence-justifying "persecution," 8.39 holds in abeyance the command to wage war until "God alone is worshipped." By themselves, these limitations can be read in ways that still admit aggressive violence. They can be read, for instance, as terms for accepting surrender, rather

NOTES

than as conditions for starting a fight, but that would render them inconsistent with Al Furqan, which should rule out such readings. Thus Ishaq's aggressively imperialistic interpretation of the Koran fails to respect the available internal consistency of the Koran. The closest the Koran comes to straight out contradiction with Al Furqan's limits on violence is where its calls to wage jihad are not specifically qualified with limitations that can be readily interpreted as defensive. One glaring example is verse 9.29: "Fight those who believe not in Allah nor the Last Day, nor hold that forbidden which hath been forbidden by Allah and His Messenger, nor acknowledge the religion of Truth, (even if they are) of the People of the Book, until they pay the Jizya with willing submission, and feel themselves subdued." (Yusuf Ali translation.) But just because qualifications are not stated explicitly does not necessarily create contradiction with Al Furqan's explicit limits on justification for violence. Defensive qualifications can still be imputed, and must be, if the Koran's claims to be without contradiction are to be respected. Neither are such imputations ever very hard to justify, given that the Koran is replete with unspecified claims of persecution that can readily be interpreted as justifying legitimate self defense. For instance, verse 9.29 is part of a whole section of the Koran that amounts to a pep talk urging Muslims to get off their rear ends and: "wage war on all of the idolaters as they are waging war on all of you." (9.36, Pickthal translation.) Such claims of defensive necessity saturate the violent sections of the Koran. The problem is that traditional Islamic interpretation has not tried to achieve consistency with the peaceful verses of the Koran, but has sought instead to escape them. It is this escape which is logically difficult, which is why traditional Islam murders its critics. Only by banning thought can the traditional scheme of interpretation be maintained.

10 The criterion of right and wrong referred to in the first verse of al Furqan (translated variously as "the criterion of right and wrong" (Pickthal) or "the Furqan" (Shakir), is the Koran itself.

11 Robert Spencer's recent book, *The Truth about Muhammad* (Regnery 2006), relies heavily on the hadiths to tell the story of Muhammad's life. The hadiths (and the biography by Ishaq that is based upon them) are the primary available accounts, and as Spencer shows, they powerfully implicate Muhammad in the worst of Islam's crimes. Still, these are highly fallible reports, selected long after the death of Muhammad for being the most repeated out of hundreds of thousands of what were acknowledged to be mostly false reports, leaving plenty of opportunity for establishment figures to selectively affirm those reports that supported establishment desires for totalitarian power.

12 At the height of the cartoon jihad, the British jihad group Al Ghurabaa cited this hadith in calling for the killing of anyone who insults Muhammad, attributing it as "in the narration collected by Al-Haakim, upon the authority of Hussain Bin Ali (ra)." ("British jihadists: 'Kill all those who insult Muhammad'," Judy Apter Klinghoffer, *Deja vu*, February 2, 2006, <<http://hnn.us/blogs/entries/21268.html>>.

13 See, Robert Spencer, *The Truth About Muhammad*, op cit. Spencer (at page 8) lists 20 Koranic commands to "obey God and the Apostle" (3.32, 3.132, 4.13, 4.59, 4.69, 4.80, 5.92, 8.1, 8.20, 8.46, 9.71, 24.47, 24.51, 24.52, 24.54, 24.56, 33.33, 47.33, 49.14, 58.13, 64.12). Many of these are explicitly commands to be "believers," which throughout the Koran means to believe in Muhammad's asserted revelations.

"[b]elieve in God and the Apostle and obey," says verse 24.47, and all should quite obviously be read this way, even where they are not completely explicit, or else the

NOTES

words of Muhammad the man are treated the same as the words of God, which is inconsistent with the Koran's constant condemnation of idolatry.

Particularly interesting is verse 4.80, which begins: "He that obeys the Apostle obeys God." Taken out of context, as the Islamofascists always take these things, it sounds like a general command to obey Muhammad. In context, it is quite clearly a call to the non-believers to believe. The end of the verse even specifies the specific example that Muslims are called upon to follow when infidels reject the call to belief: "As for those that pay no heed, know then that We have not sent you to be their keeper." i.e. Leave judgment up to God, as the Koran specifies many times. Verse 42.48 elaborates: "If they pay you no heed, know that We have not sent you to be their keeper. Your only duty is to give warning." See also 16.82, 17.104, 24.54, 27.93, 38.65, 46.9 and 73.11. Thus it is particularly perverse when Muslims take the "obey God and the Apostle" verses as grounds for emulating Muhammad the man (as reported by the hadiths), and taking it upon themselves to execute the judgments that the very verses they cite leave for God alone.

14 In verse 33.21, Muhammad uses general language to offer himself as an example, but the context is quite specific. He is urging believers to follow his example in being willing to fight, and having faith that God will bring victory to the believers (with no specification of whether the fighting is offensive or defensive). In other words, what is to be emulated is Muhammad's belief in the revelations he has received. In verse 68.4, Muhammad exalts his own character specifically in support of the validity of his revelations, denying that he is mad.

15 Wikipedia has a "Qur'an Alone" page listing several groups that reject the subordination of the Koran to the hadiths. ("Qur'an Alone Groups," Wikipedia, <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Qur%27an_Alone>.) This page has links to Saudi fatwas against these groups, but the linked pages are in Arabic so I am not able to examine of vouch for them. As for Koran-alone reformists being placed on apostate hit-lists, see: "Jihadists post hit list of 'apostates'," Robert Spencer, Jihad Watch, April 12, 2006, <<http://jihadwatch.org/archives/010980.php>>.

16 The main schools of Islamic jurisprudence have all considered Koranic interpretation to be closed for centuries. See Robert Spencer, *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Islam*, Regnery 2005, p. 38.

17 "Free ride," Michael Graham, *Jewish World Review*, January 26, 2006, <<http://www.jewishworldreview.com/0105/graham012605.php3>>. For a fuller discussion of Zarqawi's theocratic critique of democracy, see: "Al Qaeda vs. democracy," James S. Robbins, *The Journal of International Security Affairs*, Fall, 2005, number 9, <<http://www.securityaffairs.org/issues/2005/09/robbins.php>>.

18 Robert Spencer, who was personally threatened in Gadahn's al Qaeda message, quotes this passage in his reply to Gadahn: "My invitation from al Qaeda," *Frontpage Magazine*, September 6, 2006, <<http://frontpagemag.com/Articles/Printable.asp?ID=24227>>.

19 The Koran is called the "eternal book" (Dawood translation) at the beginning of chapter 43.

²⁰ "And this is why they did it," Amir Tahiri, *Times Online*, July 8, 2005 <<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,1072-1684970,00.html>>.

Chapter Sixteen Notes

1 "Concerns over memorial grow," Kirk Swauger, *Johnstown Tribune-Democrat*, September 10, 2005,

NOTES

<http://www.tribune-democrat.com/local/local_story_253002557.html>.

2 An example is British Jihadist leader Anjem Choudhury, declaring on BBC television that “only Muslims are innocent.” (“British Muslim leader: only Muslims are innocent,” Robert Spencer, Jihad Watch, December 17, 2006, <http://www.jihadwatch.org/archives/014454.php>>.) As Spencer notes, this is how it is possible for Muslim groups to be in broad agreement that “Islam strictly condemns religious extremism and the use of violence against innocent lives,” (a fatwa issued by the Fiqh Council of North America), and why such declarations are meaningless until the definition of “innocent” has been specified.

3 A group called Iraq Body Count keeps a running estimate, tallying 38,000 to 43,000 through August 2006, plus a couple of thousand Iraqi policemen killed. (“Iraq Body Count: war dead figures,” BBC News, August 14, 2006, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/4525412.stm>. President Bush offered the 30,000 figure at a World Affairs Council speech in Philadelphia. (“President Discusses War on Terror and Upcoming Iraqi Elections,” White House press release, December 12, 2005, <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/12/20051212-4.html>>.) In October 2006, the British Medical Journal Lancet came out with its second very high estimate of Iraq war deaths, claiming that 650,000 more Iraqis have died than if there had been no war, but Lancet is hopelessly politicized and its claims have no credibility. Iraq Body Count, which is anti-war itself, but not politicized in its methodologies, compiled a thorough debunking of the Lancet estimate, noting for instance that Lancet’s car-bomb death estimate “corresponds to about 20 car bombs per day, all but one or two of which fail to be reported by the media. Yet car bombs fall well within the earlier-mentioned category of incidents which average 6 unique reports on them.” (“Reality checks: some responses to the latest Lancet estimates,” Hamit Dardagan, John Sloboda, and Josh Dougherty, press release, Iraq Body Count, October 16, 2006, <<http://www.iraqbodycount.org/press/pr14.php>>.)

4 Gerard Alexander cites a variety of sources to come up with a Saddam murder rate of 15 to 20 thousand a year, and cites UNICEF for the sanctions death estimate. (“A lifesaving war,” by Gerard Alexander, *The Weekly Standard*, March 29, 2004, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/Utilities/printer_preview.asp?idArticle=3889&R>. Higher Saddam murder rates are estimated by The Documental Centre for Human Rights in Iraq, which claims Saddam killed between 70 and 125 civilians a day on average over his reign (between 25 and 45 thousand a year). As of 2006, DCHRI’s documents are still only available in Arabic, but Iraq historian Stephen Cass provides a summary in his article “Iraq Watch: In Iraq, Civilian Deaths Have Fallen Since the Start of the War” (*Global Business Network*, April 2003, <<http://www.gbn.com/ArticleDisplayServlet.srv?aid=2400&msp=1242>>.

5 A long list of Britain’s highest profile Islamofascists are supported on the dole along with their wives and children. One famous example is Omar Brooks, who according to the *Daily Mail*: “described the 7/7 suicide bombers as “completely praise-worthy” and heckled Home Secretary John Reid in a high-profile confrontation.” Brooks, according to the *Mail*: “... has signed up to a Muslim marriage website. Although already married with three children and reportedly living off £700 a month in state benefits, the 31-year-old is seeking more wives, with the intention of fathering more than nine children. (“Wanted: three more wives for Islamist heckler,” *Daily Mail*, September 26, 2006, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/pages/live/articles/news/news.html?in_article_id=407055&in_page_id=1770>.)

6 Jesus was very careful how he spoke to this point, as well he should have been, since his unwillingness to deny divinity is what led to his crucifixion. Affirmative state-

NOTES

ments by Jesus about being the son of God in a way that others are not are always indirect, but some are still pretty strong, as in the Gospel of John:

“Therefore the Jews sought all the more to kill Him, because He not only broke the Sabbath, but also said that God was His Father, making Himself equal with God. Then Jesus answered and said to them, ‘Most assuredly, I say to you, the Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He sees the Father do; for whatever He does, the Son also does in like manner.’” (John 5:18-19, New King James) See also John 14:8-11.

7 The Freeman Center for Strategic Studies has a compilation of information on the Palestinian Authority death penalty for selling land to Jews, and its enforcement: “Palestinians murder Arabs who sell to Jews,” Arutz Sheva News Service, May 22, 1997, <http://www.freeman.org/m_online/jun97/arutz7.htm>. No Palestinian state should be allowed to come into existence on these terms, which is why I believe it was a terrible error for Israel to pull its settlements out of Gaza. See my article: “Any Palestinian state must include and protect Jews,” American Daily, June 4, 2003, <<http://www.americandaily.com/article/3975>>.

8 The sequence of different repressive policies by which the British tried to slow Jewish immigration to Palestine and Jewish land purchases (while leaving Arab emigration and land purchases unmolested) is documented in Mitchell G. Bard’s *Myths and Facts: a Guide to the Arab-Israeli Conflict* (American Israeli Cooperative Enterprise, 2002). On inter-war policy, see especially chapter 2.

⁹ The one complication for the claim that Israel was formed entirely by moral means is the question of whether, had the Arab states not attacked in 1948, the new state of Israel would have offered full political rights to the Israeli Arab population. At the behest of the attacking Arab armies, enough Arabs left the state of Israel during the 1948 war that Israel did not need to disenfranchise its Arab population in order to have, not just a Jewish majority, but unalloyed Jewish control. If the Arabs had not left, it is certainly possible that, in order to insure Jewish control, Israel would have disenfranchised its Arab population. The question thus arises whether the Arab attack could be justified as necessary to protect the equal political rights of Arabs living in Israel.

At one level, the question is merely academic, not because concerns about disenfranchisement were merely prospective. The prospect of disenfranchisement can weigh just as importantly as the fact of disenfranchisement, just as conspiracy to commit murder is as much a crime as murder. What makes concern about disenfranchisement academic is that it was not the Israeli Arabs who attacked Israel, and none of the attacking Arab states had any regard for political liberties. All were dictatorships. To the extent that they were concerned about the Palestinian Arabs, they were only concerned about them being in an inferior position to the Jews, which their Islamic religion instructs them to wage war to prevent.

But just because the possibility that Israeli Arabs might have been disenfranchised is academic does not mean it is unimportant. Could it be that the Israeli Arabs would have had a legitimate grounds to wage war, if it was the Israeli Arabs who did wage war? The answer is no, and the reason is profound, going to the priority of liberty over democracy. The criterion of morality for a state is not whether it is democratic, but whether it is *republican* in the American sense: does it secure a system of liberty under law? Democracy

NOTES

is only a means to this end. As the Preamble to our Constitution declares, our system of government is a means “to secure the blessings of liberty.” Where the founders saw democracy as advancing republicanism, they embraced it. Where they saw democracy as a threat to republican liberty, they held it in abeyance. This is most clearly seen in the limitation of the franchise.

When the United States was first founded, the franchise in most states was limited to propertied white males on the grounds that only men of property would be securely enough established to look beyond their private interests and act for the interests of the nation. That calculation may have been wrong, but the priority behind it is correct. Liberty, not democracy, is the criterion of legitimacy. A democratic majority that does not believe in liberty is just a tyranny of the majority, which the founders correctly held to be no better than tyranny by an autocrat. It was legitimate to move cautiously, and only over time expand the franchise as experience taught that such expansion would strengthen rather than weaken the system of liberty under law.

In the case of Israel, there were very good reasons to think that expanding the franchise to Muslim Arabs, many of whom would be religiously opposed to liberty, would be fatal to Israel’s attempt to build a republic. The proper thing to do in that circumstance is to disenfranchise the Muslims while protecting their liberties, trying to give the Muslims an opportunity to develop an appreciation for liberty sufficient to warrant entrusting them with enfranchisement. There is no reason to doubt that Israel would have followed such a path, and if the Arab Muslim population was unwilling to follow that path, they have no justification for war. If they do not believe in political liberty, they cannot claim that their political liberties have been improperly infringed. Neither is there any other legitimate grounds for war except defense of life and liberty.

With the advent of war, there actually was a swap of Arab land for Jewish land, but without the individual justice that accompanies voluntary transactions. Approximately 600,000 Jews were driven out of the surrounding Arab world and fled to Israel. Approximately 600,000 Arabs fled Israel at the behest of their Arab brothers. The injustice inflicted on the Jews by the Arabs was obviously greater. They were forced out. The Arabs were not. The individual injustice suffered by the displaced Jews was offset somewhat when the displaced Jews were succored by their co-religionists. The displaced Arabs, in contrast, were treated with hatred and contempt by their fellows. The Jews have no responsibility for that Arab failure of common humanity.

The priority of republicanism over democracy is no longer widely understood. We often muddle through, refusing for instance to recognize the legitimacy of democratically elected Islamofascists in Algeria, but there is no clarity about the morality of this course, and many people to get it wrong. One egregious example is Dutch Justice Minister Piet Hein Donner, opining in 2006 that Sharia law could be imposed democratically, if Muslims attain a majority in the Netherlands. (“Sharia could come via democracy: Dutch minister,” *Expatica News*, September 13, 2006,

http://www.expatica.com/actual/article.asp?subchannel_id=1&story_id=3301

NOTES

7.) Hein is outright declaring the willingness of the Dutch to submit to tyranny of the majority. Jimmy Carter is in the same camp. After Hamas fighters in Gaza massacred their Fatah co-terrorists for not being Islamic enough, Jimmy Carter attacked policy-makers in the U.S., Europe and Israel for not embracing the legitimacy of the democratically elected Hamas' movement. ("Carter: stop favoring Fatah over Hamas," Associated Press, June 19, 2007, <http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1181813074587&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull>.)

10 Charles Johnson has been keeping track of the romance between al Qaeda and Michael Moore. He posts a compilation of links in: "Moore's career takes off," Little Green Footballs, September 2, 2006, <http://littlegreenfootballs.com/weblog/?entry=22389_Moores_Career_Takes_Off&only>.

11 "Appeasing jihadists," Diana West, The Washington Times, July 7, 2006, <<http://www.washtimes.com/op-ed/20060706-085930-1585r.htm>>.

12 Sheik Hilali praises Iraqi Jihadists," Richard Kerbaj, The Australian, October 30, 2006,

<<http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,20867,20666914-601,00.html>>.

□ See for example chapter 11 (Hūd), which recounts a long list of Old Testament peoples supposedly destroyed by God. The stories are not identical to the Old Testament, but most of the warnings in the Koran are Biblical in nature.

Afterword Notes

¹ "Author braves Islam's wrath to speak," Robin Action, Pittsburgh Times-Tribune, April 18, 2007,

http://www.pittsburghlive.com/x/pittsburghtrib/news/cityregion/s_503268.html.

² "Apology of an Imam," Fouad El Bayly, Pittsburgh Times-Tribune, April 29, 2007,

http://www.pittsburghlive.com/x/pittsburghtrib/opinion/letters/s_504998.html

³ This comes from verse 9.29 of the Koran: "Fight against such of those who have been given the Scripture as believe not in Allah nor the Last Day, and forbid not that which Allah hath forbidden by His messenger, and follow not the Religion of Truth, until they pay the tribute readily, being brought low." (Pickthal translation.) There is no reason that this verse cannot be interpreted as conditional on circumstances of defensive war (as it was indeed an instruction issued in the midst of a particular war, the particulars of which cannot be known with any certainty).

⁴ The Koranic verses cited as justification for Islamic deception are 3.28 (that Muslims are not to befriend non-Muslims "except by way of precaution, that ye may Guard yourselves from them") and 16.106: "He who disbelieves in Allah after his having believed, not he who is compelled while his heart is at rest on account of faith, but he who opens (his) breast to disbelief-- on these is the wrath of Allah, and they shall have a grievous chastisement." In circumstances of defensive war, deception is certainly moral, and these verses

NOTES

are certainly open to such limitation, being stated in explicitly defensive terms.

⁵ Hirsi Ali quote is from John Gibson's radio show, April 24, 2007, posted at *Hot Air*: "Audio: Ayaan Hirsi Ali defends the imam who says she must be killed," *Hot Air*, April 25, 2007, <http://hotair.com/archives/2007/04/25/audio-ayaan-hirsi-ali-defends-the-imam-who-says-she-must-be-killed/>.