

Secrets of the Koran

Don Richardson

[Regal logo]
From Gospel Light
Ventura, California, U.S.A.

Published by Regal Books
From Gospel Light
Ventura, California, U.S.A.
Printed in the U.S.A.

Regal Books is a ministry of Gospel Light, an evangelical Christian publisher dedicated to serving the local church. We believe God's vision for Gospel Light is to provide church leaders with biblical, user-friendly materials that will help them evangelize, disciple and minister to children, youth and families.

It is our prayer that this Regal book will help you discover biblical truth for your own life and help you meet the needs of others. May God richly bless you.

For a free catalog of resources from Regal Books/Gospel Light, please call your Christian supplier.

All Scripture quotations are taken from the *Holy Bible, New International Version*®. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984 by International Bible Society. Used by permission of Zondervan Publishing House. All rights reserved.

All verses from the Koran are taken from N. J. Dawood's translation unless otherwise noted. Copyright © 1999 by Penguin Putnam, New York, NY. Used by permission.

Other versions of the Koran used:

M. M. Ali—Translated by Maulana Muhammad Ali. *The Koran*. Columbus, OH: Lahore, Inc., USA, 1998.

A. Ali—Translated by Ahmed Ali. *The Koran*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Arberry—Translated by A. J. Arberry. *The Koran*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996.

M. Z. Khan—Translated by Muhammad Zafulla Khan. *The Quran*. New York: Olive Branch Press, 1997.

Rodwell—Translated by J. M. Rodwell. *The Koran*. New York: Random House, 1993.

Shakir—Translated by M. M. Shakir. *The Koran*. Elmhurst, NY: Tahrike Tarsile Qur'ab, Inc., 2001.

© 2003 Don Richardson

All rights reserved.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Richardson, Don, 1935-

Secrets of the Koran : revealing insight into Islam's holy book / Don Richardson.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0-8307-3124-5

1. Islam—Controversial literature. 2. Koran—Controversial literature. 3. Koran—Criticism, interpretation, etc. 4. Islam—Relations—Christianity. 5. Christianity and other religions—Islam. I. Title.

BT1170 .R53 2003

297—dc21

2002015991

Any omission of credits is unintentional. The publisher requests documentation for future printings.

Rights for publishing this book in other languages are contracted by Gospel Light Worldwide, the international nonprofit ministry of Gospel Light. Gospel Light Worldwide also provides publishing and technical assistance to international publishers dedicated to producing Sunday School and Vacation Bible School curricula and books in the languages of the world. For additional information, visit www.gospellightworldwide.org; write to Gospel Light Worldwide, P.O. Box 3875, Ventura, CA 93006; or send an e-mail to info@gospellightworldwide.org.

Introduction

From Peace Child to the Koran

Those who know my previous works—*Peace Child*, *Lords of the Earth* and *Eternity in Their Hearts*—will recall that I love to find and document a very fascinating feature of human cultures. I call it “redemptive analogy.” Working as linguistic researchers, healers and educators among Stone Age tribes in West Papua, Indonesia, my wife, Carol, and I encountered native customs, legends and traditions that correspond, for example, with biblical accounts of Jesus’ life and teaching. A sensitive advocate may use these fortuitous cultural elements as *bridges* to persuade endangered minority peoples to abandon such things as tribal war, headhunting and cannibalism—before the national police and their AK-47s make the choice for them *very* traumatically.

My Search for Redemptive Analogies

In *Peace Child*, I tell how Carol and I befriended a tribe of 3,000 cannibalistic headhunters—the Sawi. We found them living remotely in one of West Papua’s vast swamps. We lived among them and learned their language. The Sawi were ravaged by malaria and other tropical diseases. Even more tragically, they were decimating their own population by waging almost constant warfare among themselves and with other tribes. As an alternative to that virtually genocidal violence, we urged the Sawi to find peace with God and with each other by believing the Christian message.

We hit a major barrier.

When I told the Sawi how Judas, one of Jesus’ disciples, betrayed Jesus *with a kiss*, they exalted Judas as the hero of the story! They even bestowed upon him the title *taray duan* (a master of treachery)! One of the Sawi said, “We never thought of *kissing* victims of *our* treachery at the moment of truth. That Judas outdid us. He is the sort of fellow any other man should be proud to promise a daughter to in marriage.”

My heart sank. I realized in that moment that treachery was the Sawi culture's "national pastime." What could I say to persuade them that Jesus was not a masterfully victimized dupe? How could I demonstrate that He, not Judas, was the hero?

As war raged on between two nearby Sawi villages, I repeatedly urged them to make peace, but saw little progress until Kaiyo, a father in one of the two villages, decided to honor my plea.

To make peace, Kaiyo made a sacrifice I could not imagine myself as a father ever being willing to make. He gave his son, Biakadon—his *only* child—to one of his enemies, a man named Mahor. Deeply moved, Mahor embraced little Biakadon as a "peace child." He then invited every man, woman and child in the village of Kaiyo's enemies to lay a hand on little Biakadon, thereby pledging no violence against Kaiyo's village as long as his peace child remained alive in Mahor's house. I gasped in awe, realizing that long ago God had placed within the culture of the Sawi people something analogous to His redemptive provision for mankind through the sacrifice of His Son, Jesus Christ.

I began proclaiming Jesus as *the Tarop Tim Kodon* ("the ultimate Peace Child") given by *Navo Kodon* ("the ultimate Father, God and Creator of everything").

This analogy proved to be more than just an eye-opener; it became a heartgripper. "If only you had told us that Judas's victim was a peace child," they assured me, "we would not have acclaimed Judas. To wrong a peace child is the most heinous crime possible." In faith, they began to *lay their hands* on Jesus, thereby pledging allegiance to God, the greatest peace-child giver of all. Headhunting ceased. Churches sprang up in every village. The Sawi learned to resolve misunderstandings through consultation rather than conflict.

Now they are healthier and happier, and their numbers are increasing.

Places of Refuge

Another tribe, the Yali—subjects of my second book, *Lords of the Earth*—had places of refuge. For them, Jesus became the *osowa ovelum* ("the perfect refuge"). In *Eternity in Their Hearts*, I record 25 more redemptive analogies from around the world. Not all of them are drawn from animistic cultures such as the Sawi and the Yali. For example, in China's 4,000-year-old pictographic script, a picture of a lamb above the first-person singular pronoun means "righteous." It actually

reads “I under the lamb—righteous!” It serves as a kind of cultural compass pointing Chinese people to Jesus, the righteousness-bestowing Passover lamb!

The Upside-Down Tree

To this day, almost everywhere I look I find more examples. An ancient text in India’s *Vedas* describes a tree that is *upside down*, not because it has been uprooted, but because it is rooted in heaven with branches spreading above the earth, yielding fruit for mankind. The trunk of the upside-down tree, moreover, has been *gashed*, and the sap flowing from it like blood is for the healing of mankind.

Islam—The Great Exception

Toward the end of our 15-year sojourn among the Sawi, Muslim immigrants from other more populous islands of Indonesia began bringing Islam to West Papua’s tribes. Islam in Indonesia counts nearly 175 million followers.¹

Gradually my attention shifted from the study of animistic cultures to the study of Islam. Eventually I traveled to various other Muslim nations: Malaysia, United Arab Emirates and Saudi Arabia. I have also encountered Muslims almost everywhere else I have traveled. Then came September 11, 2001. As I watched and read coverage of Islamic terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, I knew what my next mission in life must be. I had to research my way into the roots of Islam itself, beginning with its foundations in the Koran.

Could I—finder of redemptive analogies in India, China and among West Papua’s wild tribes—find them also in the Koran or in Islam’s other sacred writings? As a Sawi redemptive analogy served to turn Sawi away from tribal war, could a Koranic redemptive analogy, clearly identified, serve to turn radical Muslims away from terrorism?

I had already gleaned considerable knowledge about the Muslim world. Now I had to examine Islam’s own literary sources, and examine them closely. I read multiple translations of the Koran. I also perused Islam’s other body of sacred writings: the hadiths. I also read a shelfful of books to survey the findings of researchers before me.

What I discovered shocked me.

I learned that Islam is unique among non-Christian religions. It stands alone as the only religion that is designed to *frustrate* anyone who seeks to use the redemptive-analogy approach among its adherents. Here is what happens: Using Judeo-Christian terms, a Christian speaks to a Muslim about God only to find that Mohammed quite drastically *redefined* the concept of God for his followers about 1,400 years ago. For example, Judeo-Christianity's God *keeps* His promises. Quite frequently Islam's God abrogates (cancels) promises made earlier. He may even contradict a command he gave earlier, leaving everything he ever said open to question.

A Christian speaks to a Muslim about Jesus who, by His death, atoned for the sin of the world, providing redemption. But Islamic teachers have already informed Muslims everywhere that Jesus did *not* die and rise again. Further, the Muslim accuses Christians of worshiping three gods and teaching that God had intercourse with Mary, causing her to conceive Jesus. The concept of God requiring an atonement as His legal basis for absolving the guilty is not simply poorly understood in Islam, it is totally denied!

In addition, Islamic texts redefine Judeo-Christianity's heaven in a gross manner, as I explain later. Jesus' New Testament directive to "*give to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's*" (Matthew 22:21) approves the separation of religion from civil government. Islam, by contrast, seeks to bind religion and the state together with iron chains.

Mohammed, the founder of Islam, was obsessed with change. As you read this book you will see how he deformed every major Judeo-Christian teaching he touched.

I realized that when it comes to Islam the redemptive-analogy approach does not work. If we are to interact with Muslims on matters of faith, then something antithetical to redemptive analogies must be used. I felt like an attorney in court finding that he has no recourse but to ask the judge for permission to approach the witness as *hostile*.

I believe that God (the ultimate judge) heard my request and has granted permission.

This book is the result.

Note

1. "Islam Today." PBS. <http://www.pbs.org/empires/islam/faithtoday.html> (accessed August 9, 2002).

Preface

Every quote I use from the Koran has been compared with eight English translations, lest one translator's error would cause me to misread Mohammed's intent. Throughout this book I place direct quotes from the Koran in **bold** and citations from the Holy Bible in *italics*, so it is easy to tell which is which. I have chosen to use N. J. Dawood's English translation of the Koran as my primary text, but also quote from others as noted.

Various translations of the Koran differ slightly in how they *name* the chapters and how they *number* the verses. Thus it is best to focus on chapter *numbers* rather than the seemingly arbitrarily assigned names. Verse numbering in certain translations sometimes differs by one to three points. If the number I give for a particular verse does not correspond to what you find, look a little ahead or a little behind and you will find it.

In order to grasp the full original meaning of the Koranic text, I have in places put clarifications in brackets. This added information does not change the meaning or intent of the Koran, rather it identifies pronouns and provides context. Because this information is in brackets and not put in bold face, you can easily tell the difference between the Koranic text and the clarifications.

(Insert following here as a table)

Seven Versions of the Koran Studied for this Critique, Identified by Their Translator's Names

- Maulana Muhammad Ali (Columbus, OH: Lahore, Inc., USA, 1998); M. M. Ali adds comments numbered from 1 to 2,822.
- Ahmed Ali (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001)
- Muhammad Zafulla Khan (New York: Olive Branch Press, 1997).
- N. J. Dawood (New York: Penguin Putnam, 1999).
- M. M. Shakir (Elmhurst, NY: Tahrike Tarsile Qur'ab, Inc., 2001).

- J. M. Rodwell (New York: Random House, 1993).
- A. J. Arberry (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996).

Chapter 1

A Book of Peace?

Since September 11, 2001, the Koran (sometimes spelled Quran or Qur'an) has been a hot seller—not only in the Arabic world but also in Western nations. Why are Western readers suddenly so interested in a book that is the founding charter of the religion called Islam? Some Muslims (adherents of Islam) hope that this upsurge in sales in Western nations will result in more converts to their religion. In reality, many Western Koran buyers are simply bothered by nagging questions: What is it about this Koran that al-Qaeda and other up-in-arms Muslim revolutionaries think authorizes terrorism? Does the Koran in any way support their radicalism, or is it really, as some Muslims vociferously claim, a book of peace?

Western media commentators generally dismiss Islamic terrorists as fanatics who quote the Koran facetiously simply to legitimize anti-American and anti-Israeli political objectives. Not long after the attacks in New York and Washington, D.C., President George W. Bush declared that Osama bin Laden and his cohorts had “hijacked” a great religion for their own deranged private objectives.¹

At the same time, however, other media reporters informed us that members of Osama bin Laden's al-Qaeda do not just *read* the Koran, but they actually memorize large portions of it! Some, such as John Walker Lindh—an American citizen trained by the al-Qaeda—even memorize all 6,151 verses! Could it be that their intimate knowledge of the Koran is part of what inspires them to wage war? If al-Qaeda terrorists are exploiting the Koran only as a religious façade for primarily political goals, surely memorizing a few key verses would suffice.

The same media inconsistently report that Western embassies in Muslim nations issue frequent bulletins warning non-Muslims to shop and sightsee any day but *Friday*. This is not because Muslim shops are closed on Friday. Nor is it

because Islam has strict rules against meandering on its day of rest. *Islam has no day of rest.* Why then? Friday is when Muslims gather in mosques (during early morning hours or, in the tropics, during siesta) to pray and hear sermons from the Koran. Western embassies know that Muslims emerging from mosques—if incensed by having heard a particularly vitriolic sermon from the Koran—may sometimes attack Westerners bodily. If the Koran teaches Muslims to coexist *peacefully* with non-Muslims—as so many voices assure us it does—Friday should be the *safest* day for a non-Muslim to encounter crowds of Muslims in the streets of Islamabad, Karachi or Jakarta.

Anti-Western and Anti-Israel Only? Or Anti-Christian Also?

Attacks on America and suicide bombings in Israel are thoroughly reported, but other mounting evidences of radical Islamic rage rarely reach our television screens. On rare occasions, and never with comment, we see al-Qaeda trainees barging—AK-47s at the ready—into a large room where a *cross* is displayed on a wall. Obviously the trainees are practicing to kill Christians engaged in worship.

Does that perhaps signify hatred for *American* Christians, but not for Christians in other nations? I fear not! Radical Muslim gunmen on October 29, 2001, invaded a church service in Bahawalpur, Pakistan, killing 16 Pakistani Christian worshipers—not Americans—in cold blood. The Muslim government of Sudan is committing genocide upon Nubian Christians in the southern part of that nation. There are also dispatches from eastern Indonesia's Maluku Islands about Laskar Jihad—philosophical cousin of Osama bin Laden's al-Qaeda terrorist cult—using armed force to compel hundreds of Indonesian Catholics to convert to Islam or die.

What did terrified Indonesian Catholics have to do to convert to Islam? Both men *and* women had to be circumcised! Nonsterilized scissors served as instruments. Death was the only option for anyone who refused. Could they not feign conversion to Islam at the cost of a painful and humiliating mutilation and then revert to Catholicism? Of course they could, but under the same original threat of death!

Islam's Sharia law—rigorously applied by Laskar Jihad—has an embedded “catch-22.” Reverters are tagged as apostates, and the penalty for apostasy under Sharia law is death.

Instances of anti-American, anti-Israeli and anti-Christian violence erupting in so many parts of the Muslim world are increasing exponentially. We really have no choice. We must stop evading the question we would rather not ask. Since virtually all of those who are perpetrating that violence claim loyalty to and inspiration from Mohammed's Koran, could it in fact be true that *part* of the Koran was indeed written to inspire violence—a modern form of which could be interpreted as a call to crash jet aircraft transporting hundreds of passengers into buildings occupied by thousands of people?

If it is *not* true, then we non-Muslims need to do more than send troops to places such as Afghanistan. We need to help moderate Muslims—who commend the Koran as a book that inspires peace—in their mission to persuade radical Muslims to cease their damnable misinterpretation of that peace-inspiring book!

Conversely, what if the Koran *does* advocate peace, yes, but only on terms laid down by Islam? What if, in fact, the Koran—on any other basis—calls for *war* against all non-Muslims? In that case, what we naively think professedly moderate Muslim apologists mean when they speak of peace in the Koran is not what they really mean! What they call “peace” is then only a carrot dangling from a stick. Non-Muslim societies then are donkeys that are expected to plod after ever-receding “peace” carrots.

Moderate apologists for Islam within our borders *and* Muslim terrorists striking from outside then appear—perhaps unwittingly—as conspiring operatives in a good cop/bad cop stratagem.

Islam, in that scenario, is a hostile supremacist force seeking to grip Western civilization between opposite arms of a great Islamic pincer. We are viewed as criminals to be squeezed until at last we confess “the truth” of Islam.

Every medium constantly acknowledges the goals of al-Qaeda-type Muslim terrorists as twofold: politically anti-American and anti-Israeli. We must awaken to the fact that their goals are much wider. Abundant evidence reveals their goals to be just as viciously anti-Christian as well. And since Christianity is bigger than Judaism and, yes, even bigger than America, it is definitely the major target in the crosshairs of radical Islam's long-range planning.

There is more! Radical Islam claims authorization from the Koran to oppose not only Jews and Christians but also everyone who does not accept Mohammed as a prophet, the Koran as divinely inspired, Islam as the ultimate religion and Jihad as every Muslim's sacred duty. Thus Hindus, Buddhists, Taoists, New Agers, atheists, agnostics, materialists, secular humanists and even

truly moderate Muslims also stand in radical Islam's OK-to-kill corral. There can hardly be a more important concern in today's world.

If radical Muslim views of the Koran are correct, there will always be Muslims answering the Koran's call to violence. John Q. Public in every nation must be informed beyond mere concern for damage control and political expediency. Some voices seem concerned only to help Islam save face in the wake of the tragedies perpetrated on September 11, 2001. Is not preventing the loss of future victims a far greater concern?

Perusing the Koran

The next few chapters, guided by eight different English translations of Islam's Koran, peruse what all Muslims credit as *words* that God caused the angel Gabriel to dictate in Arabic through Mohammed—Islam's Arab founder—to various scribes in the early 600s. Later chapters trace how the Koran's teachings influenced relations between Muslims and non-Muslims during the 1,300 to 1,400 years since various recitations of the Koran were correlated into one book in the deserts of Arabia.

Did Mohammed (sometimes spelled Mohammad, Muhammad, Muhammed or Mahomet) really intend to inspire peace and goodwill to all men, as taught in the New Testament, or something quite opposite? What does the Koran itself and its influence in history reveal? Are radical Muslims such as Osama bin Laden in fact taking seriously what most Muslims simply *ignore* or do not understand in the Koran? If Mohammed returned today, would he praise Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda, or would he side with moderate Muslims?

The mere fact that more than 1 billion Muslims esteem the Koran as divinely inspired makes it an extremely important book. The Koran is second only to the Bible, honored by 1.6 billion people, for its potential to influence human affairs from a religious perspective.

Still, millions of Muslims credit the Koran with divine inspiration without actually perusing it (just as millions who call themselves Jews or Christians rarely read their own Tenach or Bible). A friend of mine asked an Iranian Muslim woman named Peri, "Have you ever read the Koran?" Peri replied, "Well, no, but everyone knows what's in it."

Do they?

Devotees who credit a book with something as important as divine inspiration—without *really* knowing its contents—leave themselves vulnerable to imposters. Unscrupulous teachers, misrepresenting what God requires in the revered but unread book, may induce sincere people to commit—in God’s name—crimes they would otherwise abhor.

Conversely, if a revered book actually *does* make criminal demands in the name of God, should not its devotees bless themselves and the rest of mankind by canceling their devotion to it?

We must ask ourselves: Are we talking about a book of peace or Mohammed’s *Mein Kampf*? The following quotes from the Koran and the summary of how they have influenced Muslim policy from the 600s until today are for both secular people and for those who are religious—Christians, Jews, Hindus, Buddhists and, yes, for Muslims, too. Muslims who, like Peri from Iran, think they know what is in the Koran but have not actually read it, owe it to themselves to be better informed. This is the serious quandary now faced by millions of sincere peace-loving Muslims.

Muslim apologists—some of whom may prefer that the world be left ignorant of certain parts of the Koran—will almost certainly accuse me of misquoting the Koran. I reply in advance: Anyone with a personal computer may easily confirm the accuracy of my quotations on their own computer screens. Simply call up a search engine—Google.com for example—and enter “Koran.” You can then choose any one of the several websites providing immediate access to every word of the Koran.

The War Verses

Readers will have heard apologists for the Koran acknowledge that, yes, there are war verses in the Koran, but *only a few*. Every Muslim apologist hastens to add that the Koran’s sparse number of war verses relate to just a few unavoidable military crises in Islam’s early history. They assure us that no war verse was ever intended to serve as a model inciting Muslims in general to hostility against resistant non-Muslims in all ages.

What is the truth of the matter?

In fact, there are at least 109 identifiable *war verses* in the Koran. One out of every 55 verses in the Koran is a war verse. War verses are scattered throughout

Mohammed's chapters like blood splatter at a crime scene. I will demonstrate from Mohammed's own words that he leaves readers in no doubt—he obviously intended his war verses to arouse Muslims to compel the conversion of non-Muslims to Islam, even by violence if necessary. Failing their conversion, Mohammed ordained that non-Muslims be killed, enslaved or—provided Islam is in full political control—heavily taxed for the advancement of Islam in perpetuity!

And yet I hesitate. Why? If I simply cite war verse after war verse after war verse from among 109 samples, many readers, seeing just the words on paper, may think it was just that—vengeful-sounding *words* that got written on paper but remain innocent because they did not lead to actual *deeds* of violence. Even Hitler's *Mein Kampf*—minus World War II—could be justified by some as Adolph's way of venting frustration. Thus I am obligated to quote Mohammed's war verses in the context of the actual violence they either described or inspired. Violent words that trigger violent deeds cannot be dismissed as *innocent ramblings*.

The tragic events I describe in the next few pages are all confirmed *from Muslim sources*. Readers may find it odd that perpetrators of such loathsome crimes would confess them so audaciously. In fact, the violence that Mohammed inspired in his followers was so pervasive that both he and they seem to have lost all sense of how villainous the recounting of their deeds would appear to non-Muslim readers in ages to come. As the following chapter shows, they virtually *brag* about murdering innocents.

Note

1. Steven Waldman, "A Great Moment for Muslims," *beliefnet*, www.beliefnet.com/story/90/story_9015.html (accessed July 29, 2002).

Chapter 2

The Wolf in the Fold

To understand the secrets of the Koran we must begin by learning something of the life of the man who, according to Islamic history, originated it. His name was Mohammed.

The most commonly accepted year for Mohammed's birth is A.D. 571. He was born in Mecca (sometimes spelled Makkah), a major center on a north-south caravan route roughly paralleling the Red Sea in western Arabia. Mecca also guarded the Ka'aba—a shrine sheltering 360 idols representing the 360 gods that various pagan Arab tribes worshiped.

Orphaned in childhood and raised by an uncle, Mohammed never became literate. Still, he worked his way up to managerial status in a Meccan caravan company owned by a wealthy widow, Khadija. He and Khadija married. Khadija was several years Mohammed's senior, yet she bore him four daughters.

Early in the 600s, Mohammed began to follow the ways of Arab seers seeking spiritual enlightenment. He resorted to a cave on Mount Hira, near Mecca. Soon he claimed to be experiencing visitations from Gabriel, an archangel mentioned by Jews and Christians. Gabriel, he said, appeared to him on behalf of the same God that Jews and Christians worshiped. Mohammed called that God Allah.

This entity identified as Gabriel began explaining what Mohammed must do as a servant for Allah. He had to oppose the idolatrous worship of pagan idols wherever they were found—especially the idols in Mecca's Ka'aba. Much to the displeasure of wealthy keepers of the Ka'aba, Mohammed proclaimed himself a prophet and began preaching vehemently against pagan idolatry. Eventually, in A.D. 622, Meccan hostility to his ardent monotheism forced Mohammed to flee with a few followers to Medina, another caravan stop located some 200 miles north of Mecca.

The few Meccans who fled with Mohammed were those who readily accepted, at face value, his claim that the God of the Jews and Christians had appointed him as a prophet for Arabs. Some Arabs who disbelieved Mohammed's message did so because they quite frankly preferred to worship

idols. Others simply demurred, saying in effect, “You claim to be a prophet like the prophets Jews and Christians believe in, but we Arabs have never had prophets like that, so we don’t know how to determine who is or isn’t [sent by God] to be that kind of a prophet. . . . But Jews know how to recognize that kind of a prophet. So if they confirm your claim, we will believe you. Otherwise, we retain our own beliefs.”¹

Wanting to win followers in Medina faster than was possible in Mecca, the center of Arabian idolatry, Mohammed found himself burdened with an urgent public relations need to have Jews affirm his claim to biblical prophethood.

The relatively few Jews who resided in Mecca—less literate than their better-read compatriots in Medina—apparently preferred to leave judgment regarding Mohammed’s claims to the latter. Jews in Mecca—a tiny minority in that city—understandably preferred not to become embroiled in the festering “Mohammed problem.”

Jews in Medina, however—much to their later regret, no doubt—did find themselves increasingly pressured by curious Arabs in Medina to voice their opinions regarding the so-called prophet from Mecca.

The Problem of Finding Support for Mohammed’s Claims

In Medina, Mohammed offered his services to the city as an arbiter of disputes. In that role, he constantly sought to ingratiate himself with fellow Arabs and, at first, with the city’s sizable Jewish population.

Watching him arbitrate disputes, the Jews also observed Mohammed closely, looking for any signs that he had received prophetic gifting from God. The ability to work miracles would have been one proof, but Mohammed could not offer a single physical miracle as evidence of prophethood. In fact, passages in the Koran express his dismay over people who kept demanding miracles as support for his claims. Sans miracles, what else could Mohammed offer?

Demonstrating prowess in offering revelations confirming the Old Testament was very likely Mohammed’s only other way of impressing Medinan Jews. However, the Koran itself shows that his knowledge of the Jewish sacred books was shockingly deficient. Even what he claimed to be divine inspiration could not compensate for Mohammed’s personal lack of knowledge of Scripture.

A Glaring Omission

If the first 89 chapters of the Koran, compiled years later, offer any clues to the content of Mohammed's early revelations, he probably treated the Jews in Medina to a narration he surely felt would spellbind them: the Exodus story! The Koran would later feature Mohammed's renditions of Moses' confrontation with the pharaoh, a ruler of ancient Egypt, 27 times in his first 89 chapters. In other words, Mohammed repeated that same story once every 3.3 chapters! It surely must have been one of his favorite pulpit pieces.

Alas, not even *once* in 27 tellings of the Exodus saga did Mohammed include *the* most integral component of the story: *the Passover*! How could the Jews accept as a prophet a man who—if he even knew about the Passover—had no sense of its importance?

More Gaps in Mohammed's Knowledge

Omitting the Passover from the Exodus story was not Mohammed's only lapse. The Koran would later reveal that he thought Adam and Eve sinned, not in an earthly garden, but in paradise. Mohammed had the erring couple cast to Earth only *after* they sinned (see Koran 7:19-24 or 7:20-25). Some Muslim translators try to veil his error by using the word "garden" instead of "paradise," yet even they let the truth out a few verses later, when God, *after* the test, said to Adam and Eve, "**Get you down . . . earth will for a while provide your dwelling**" (Koran 7:24).

Mohammed further taught that Haman, a Persian in the Bible's book of Esther, was an associate of the pharaoh in Egypt 900 years earlier in the days of Moses (see Koran 28:5-6,8). Of course to accept this Muslims must assume that a Persian name, Haman, was coincidentally also a male name in Egypt centuries later.

Mohammed also confused King Saul—mentioned in the Old Testament book of 1 Samuel—with Gideon who, in Judges 7:1-7, chose 300 warriors out of 10,000 men by observing how they drank water (see Koran 2:249 or 250).

Note to designer: the following paragraph should be set aside as a sidebar:

M. Z. Khan translated the Koran with English rather than Arabic forms for the names of biblical characters, yet strangely replaces

Saul with its Arabic spelling, Talut. Why? To hide Mohammed's error from non-Arab speakers? M. M. Ali, another Muslim writer, argues that there were two different parties of 300 men each. His basis: Gideon's men camped near a spring; Saul's army drank from a river. But Judges 6:33 reveals that the Jordan River was *nearby*. Would Gideon have waited upon 10,000 men to drink from a mere spring or from a river?

A Whimsical Legend Canonized

Somewhere Mohammed heard a curious Jewish legend. Whoever concocted it claimed that when God gave the Law to Israel at Mount Sinai, Israel initially refused to promise to receive it. How did God compel them to obey and open their eyes? He lifted the entire mass of Mount Sinai up from Earth and held it in the sky above the camp of Israel. Thinking God was about to drop the mountain on their heads, Israel quickly relented!

How startled Medinan Jews must have been to find Mohammed treating one of their legends as a valid part of Old Testament Scripture.² How could Mohammed expect Jews to accept his "revelations," riddled with these and numerous similar outright errors, as confirming the Old Testament? More to the point: How could he continue offering erroneous renditions of Old Testament stories in a city where literate Jews would be forever correcting his errors—probably even guffawing over them publicly?³

How did Mohammed respond to Jewish ridicule? He had three options: confess he was not a prophet, relocate to a city with no Jews or *purge all resistant Jews* from Medina. To his shame, Mohammed presaged the catastrophic choice another world leader would make centuries later—he chose to *purge the Jews*.

Troops of modern Muslim apologists, whitewash and brush in hand, strain their brains trying to justify the original minigenocide that Mohammed was about to unleash upon the Jews in Medina. They also try to disconnect his murders there from the numerous copycat atrocities that his followers, honoring his example, were to perpetrate down through the subsequent centuries of Islamic history.

I call them modern Muslim apologists because during most of the 1,400 years since Mohammed's time Muslims have enjoyed such total control in North Africa and the Middle East that few people ever dared ask them to justify anything. Times are different now, and Muslims are trying to develop apologetic

skills. But they have yet to encounter the full weight of critical investigation of which free Western minds are capable. In other words, the ground has just begun to warm up under Islam's feet.

Some apologists label the horrors that were about to occur in Medina as a just defensive war against the Jews. Could it have been that? Repeatedly in the Koran, Mohammed criticizes some Jews for dismissing his claims, others for selling bits of their Scriptures **"for a paltry price" (Koran 2:41)** or for hiding Scripture from Arabs. Yet nowhere in the Koran does Mohammed accuse the Jews of a single act of physical aggression against him. In fact, a larger collection of Islamic literature—the hadiths—discloses that Jews in Medina taunted, criticized or opposed Mohammed and his followers on intellectual grounds, but there is no mention of any Jew threatening physical action.

Arabs in Medina were asking Jews for their honest evaluation of Mohammed. Medinan Jews were freely offering their opinions. Little did they know that exercising the freedom of speech they had always enjoyed prior to Mohammed's arrival would seal the doom of many among them.

Still, before Mohammed could retaliate against Medinan Jews for causing him to lose face, he had to win the collusion of Medinan pagans, a majority of whom respected the Jews. To lull suspicion and buy time for plotting, Mohammed and the relatively few followers he had led from Mecca ratified a seemingly benign treaty with both pagans and Jews in Medina. It was called the Constitution of Medina. It granted to Mohammed the sole right to arbitrate disputes. It also bound all parties involved—Muslims, pagans and Jews—to peaceful coexistence.

Every rational person knew that someone—a Muslim, a pagan or a Jew—by accident, carelessness, human folly, drunkenness or in a fit of temper, would eventually do something that violated the treaty. When a breach finally happened, everyone would expect Mohammed, the arbiter, to step in, adjudicate the wrong and preserve the peace. Little did anyone guess that Mohammed would bide his time, awaiting the day when *a Jew* would finally be found guilty of abusing the treaty. When that fateful day came, Mohammed would suddenly show no interest in arbitration. Instead, he would immediately declare the constitution horribly violated and exploit the offense of one Jewish person as a *cassus belli* against an entire community of Jews. Thus his appointment as de facto keeper of the constitution—a seemingly benign pact—would actually

afford Mohammed leverage at a later time to avenge himself upon the Jews with an appearance of legality.

The fact that Medinan Jews signed the treaty confirms their willingness, at least at that stage, to trust Mohammed as an arbiter, if not as a prophet. They may even have hoped that keeping him occupied in politics might be good for *him*. Stir up a little political ambition, and maybe it would distract him from his other career, the one the Jews knew he was *not* cut out for: biblical prophethood.

But Mohammed was not about to devote more than a small portion of time to Medinan politics. Denied the public-relations advantage that Jewish endorsement for his claims would have brought—Mohammed turned to other enticements he was sure many pagan Arabs would relish: military prowess, plunder and *sex*.

Taking their swords, Mohammed and his band began venturing out from Medina as a base. They marauded caravans traveling between Mecca and Syria. For author Ibn Warraq, a former Muslim, Mohammed during this period was “no more than the head of a robber community, unwilling to earn an honest living.”⁴

Was Mohammed merely an Arabian Jesse James? Or was he something far more sinister? As quotes in the next chapter show, Mohammed distributed *women and girls* he captured on raids to be sex slaves for his male followers. He kept some for himself, of course.⁵ Otherwise reticent pagan men were thus enticed to become Muslims.

Of course some of Mohammed’s male followers would complain that if they were killed while marauding, they would not get to enjoy the promised extra sex. Unabashed, Mohammed was ready with a shameless retort that is still taken seriously by hundreds of millions of credulous Muslim men, even in today’s world.

In the Koran, he repeatedly redefines Judeo-Christianity’s *heaven* as an enormous God-owned bordello in the sky. In that heavenly brothel, loyal Muslim men—especially those paying the door price of martyrdom—would find a host of virgins, called *houris*, who would forever satisfy all their sexual cravings (see Koran 38:51; 44:54; 55:55-74; 56:22,34-36). In fact, sex with beautiful houris in heaven was guaranteed to be far more enjoyable than any sex Muslim men might miss by being killed while serving God or by trying to have promiscuous sex here on Earth.

If a follower complained sardonically that early martyrs would get to deflower all the virginal houris, leaving later Muslim martyrs with used goods, Mohammed had an answer for that as well. Rodwell's translation describes the houris as **"a rare creation . . . we have made them ever virgins"** (Koran 56:34-36). Ahmed Ali translates "God's" description of the houris in the same passage: **"Maidens incomparable. We have formed them in a distinctive fashion, and made them virginal."**

Muslim scholars tend to find a deeper meaning behind these words. One interpretation: heavenly houris are a rare, incomparable and distinctive kind of virgin precisely because, once deflowered, they become physically virginal again for the next sex act.

This gave Jews and any Christians living in Medina even more cause to feel appalled at Mohammed's claim to biblical prophethood. For a male in Judaism, marrying one wife is the ideal. The idea of promiscuous sex, in this life or beyond, is abhorrent. As a guide for Christians, Jesus taught that people welcomed into God's holy presence *"will neither marry nor be given in marriage; they will be like the angels in heaven"* (Mark 12:25).

What happens to a married couple's sense of the sanctity of their marriage if thoughts of future sex with houris keeps distracting the husband from cherishing his wife and the wife from enjoying her husband because she knows he's thinking about them? For anyone who takes the Koran seriously, there is probably nothing more corrosive to true marital bliss than this bit of mischief.

Interestingly, I have not found anything in either the Koran or the hadiths that denotes *angels* as sexual beings. Yet *fallen angels*, i.e., demons (called *jinn* in Arabic), are clearly described as capable of having sex with houris. For example, Ahmed Ali's translation of the Koran describes houris as **"undeflowered by man or by jinn"** (55:74).

How strange that Mohammed leaves Muslim men in heaven *below* the more exalted angelic state. Instead of blissfully worshiping God, casting their crowns at His feet, apparently Muslim men must spend eternity doing exactly what demons would do if given a chance: couple with one houri after another forever.

Ruthless enticement of the male sex drive, combined with the prospect of bountiful earthly plunder, soon brought a majority of Medina's pagan men to Mohammed's side. Indeed, the allurement of Mohammed's promise of eternal sensuous pleasure in paradise could have a strange effect on male followers.

Historian Maxime Rodinson recounts that an Arab man named Umayr Ibn al-Humam, hearing Mohammed promise immediate access to Paradise for anyone martyred in battle raging at the time, shouted:

“Fine! Fine! Have I only to get myself killed by these men to enter into paradise?” . . . Grasping his sword, [he] plunged into the thick of the battle and was soon killed.⁶

Umayr Ibn al-Humam was perhaps the first among uncounted thousands of death-courting Muslim martyrs who over centuries—and still today—mislay their faith on Mohammed’s pernicious fantasy. Thus do they waste the precious gift of life—their own and others’—even in suicide bombings.

Long-Term Side Effects of Mohammed’s Use of the Sex Lure

Islam’s strong cultural preference is to keep Muslim women and girls so completely covered that virtually nothing of their femininity is evident when they venture outdoors. In Saudi Arabia even a woman’s face and eyes must be veiled. *Newsweek* gave the world a shocking example of how rigid this obsession can be. For the full report, see *Newsweek* (July 22, 2002). Here is my summary:

In Mecca, a fire broke out in an intermediate school housing 750 Muslim girls. Every window was covered with iron bars to assure that no male prowler or lovesick boyfriend could ever steal in. Every door was locked. As girls rushed down a flight of stairs toward the only door that was used for exit/reentry, 15 were trampled to death and some 40 others injured. Alas, the one door was locked. The Muslim religious policeman who was supposed to be on duty to unlock the door in an emergency was off on an errand.

Finally, someone managed to open the door and hundreds of terrified girls rushed into the street to escape the suffocating smoke and encroaching flame. In their hurry to escape, however, they did not have time to go to their rooms to get the obligatory head coverings they needed to venture out-of-doors. A score of

Muslim religious policemen (called *Mutawas*), outraged at seeing bare-headed girls swarming openly in a public street, converged on the scene with one intent—to guard the decency of the community *by forcing the girls back into the burning building!*

Thankfully the civic police had more sense. But they had to beat some of the Mutawas senseless to keep them from pursuing their fanatic goal of pushing girls back into the burning building *just because males in the street might see their uncovered faces.*⁷

Granting that some other cultures allow excessive public exposure of the female form, something at Islam's beginning stimulated core Islam to its strong insistence on *total* covering. What could that have been?

Consider what must have been the social effect of Mohammed's constant bandying of the promise of increased sex with extra wives and female slaves in this life plus even more and better eternal sex with bebies of virgins in paradise. Understandably, pagan Arab men, snagged into Islam by this almost irresistible lure of sex, had sex on their minds even more than before their "conversions."

This presented a dilemma. No Muslim man wanted *his own* wives and daughters to become objects of so much increased male sexual desire in the general community. So Muslim men felt obliged to cover and even hide their wives and daughters from view even more than pagan Arab culture originally required. What began as a practical safeguard soon became an entrenched cultural imperative.

The Problem of Female Genital Mutilation

Islam's widespread practice of amputating the clitoris and sometimes part or even all of the vulva from the genitalia of Muslim women, affirmed in a *hadith* by Mohammed himself, most likely also traces back to the founder's deliberate abuse of sex to lure pagan males into his cult.⁸ The more the male sex drive is purposefully aroused, the more the female sex urge may have to be proportionately suppressed, lest orgiastic hell begin to spread.

Consider then what frequently happens when even a modestly clothed young Western woman walks alone in broad daylight down a street in, for example, a non-Westernized area of a city in Pakistan. Muslim men around her can see her face, hair and neck—maybe even her ankles. Some of them perceive that much exposure as intent on her part to arouse them. The fact that she is not

accompanied by a male relative confirms their suspicions. Knowing that she, a Western woman, has not been subjected to that cruel amputation which Islam forces upon millions of Muslim women, some males may even imagine that she must feel sexual desire for *them*.

They tend also to perceive themselves as not responsible to exercise decent social restraint. Rather *she* is responsible not to tempt them! Whatever lewd thing Muslim men around her say, do or feel as a result is regarded as her fault alone.

Little wonder that thousands of Western women in such situations have complained of being groped, leered at and insulted. In major cities of Malaysia and Indonesia, where cultures mix, such problems are less likely, but if *rioting* breaks out in Indonesia, the world's most populous predominantly Muslim nation, *anything* can happen, even in a major city.

During a major upheaval in Indonesia in the late 1990s, sex-crazed Muslim men gang-raped dozens of Chinese women in shops, homes and even in the streets, shouting in Arabic, "*Allahu Akbar!*" (God is great!).⁹

Author Jan Goodwin's *Price of Honor* exceeds even Betty Mahood's *Not Without My Daughter* in documenting the horrors that women frequently experience in the Middle East. Goodwin records hundreds of instances of Muslim women beaten into submission, harassed in their homes and even subjected to *public* molestation. For example:

Working women in Cairo have long complained of being sexually assaulted on buses by men who take the opportunity of rare proximity to the opposite sex to knead, rub and fondle female commuters. . . . Since being manhandled is so shameful [to report] decent women suffer in silence rather than be accused of having encouraged the man.¹⁰

Goodwin then writes of Shahinaz, a young woman *raped* on a bus in Egypt: "Fundamentalists began saying it was the girl's fault. She was wearing a skirt . . . not a *hijab*. The media also began to blame her. . . . Even women said it was her fault . . . she was working, not staying at home."¹¹ Still, Goodwin lacks the awesomely needed courage to lay the blame for such horrors right where it belongs—on *Mohammed, the Koran and Islam*. Millions of modern media people are like doctors describing horrible symptoms but failing to identify the virus.

Consider another symptom traceable to the same virus: The *Los Angeles Times*, July 4, 2002, on page A4, reported a strange example of the perception of justice in a Muslim tribal area of Pakistan. I summarize: A male youth was seen walking beside a girl from another tribe. A local tribal council ruled that this outrage had to be punished, but no one handed the young man over to Pakistan's civic police to be punished by civil law. No, this "crime" was deemed an offense against Muslim Sharia law and against the dignity of those offended. A local council of elders decided to punish the young man by decreeing that his 18-year-old sister be gang-raped. Apparently the sentence was carried out. Pakistan's civic police reportedly were seeking to arrest the rapists. There seemed to be no mention of arresting the elders who decreed the *boy's* punishment.

In later chapters I explain more of the dire effect Mohammed's teachings have had upon women. Now back to Mohammed's buildup for a day of vengeance against Jews in Mecca.

The Battle of Badr

The larger Mohammed's force became in Medina, the bolder he grew in shattering the previously existing peace by raiding caravans moving to or from Mecca. One day Mohammed, en route to raid a caravan, was intercepted by an armed force from Mecca near a well called Badr.

Mohammed's 330 fighters defeated the larger Meccan force, killing 49 men. Sir William Muir and Rodinson opine that the Meccans, recognizing some of their own clansmen in Mohammed's contingent, lost the battle because they did not have the heart to kill relatives.¹² Mohammed, on the other hand, constantly taught his followers that loyalty to Islam overrode all other human bonds (see Koran 9:23-24; 58:22-23). Thus his men did not hesitate in battle, even when swinging the sword at Meccans whom they recognized as relatives.

An omen of deepening moral darkness fell that day. Someone cast the severed head of a slain Meccan at Mohammed's feet. Ibn Warraq describes Mohammed's response: "It [the severed head] is more acceptable to me than the choicest camel in all Arabia."¹³

Researchers overwhelmingly agree: Mohammed's victory at Badr enhanced his ability to believe (some imply to feign belief) in his own claim to

prophethood. It also encouraged him to think that his plan to wage war against the sizable number of Jews in Medina was closer to fulfillment.

Having shattered the peace between Mecca and Medina, Mohammed next set out to destroy the commendable concord that Arabs and Jews in Medina had enjoyed for centuries.

The wolf was in the fold.

Mohammed knew he could not attack Medina's Jews without the complicity of Arabs who had long lived as their neighbors. Riding a wave of heightened prestige after his victory at Badr, he still needed a way to test if he could murder Jews without triggering a reaction of horror among Medinan Arabs. Arab public conscience, though pagan, was still too moral to be Mohammed's ally. It was an enemy he had to degrade.

Mohammed found a way to keep measuring how much mind control he had achieved among Medinan pagan Arabs. After the Battle of Badr, he began ordering a series of heinous assassinations of individual Arabs. If Arabs could bear to see a few of their own people slain for offending him, surely they were not far from consenting to the wholesale slaughter of *Jews* for the same reason.

The self-proclaimed prophet's first victim was a hapless Meccan named al-Nader—killed because “he had scoffed at Mohammed . . . and told better stories than the prophet himself.”¹⁴

His next prey was Ocba, a captive taken at Badr. Ocba, about to be slain, asked:

“And my little girl. Who will take care of her?”

“Hellfire!” exclaimed the Prophet; and on the instant the victim was hewn to the ground. “Wretch that thou wast!”

[Mohammed] continued, “and persecutor! Unbeliever in God, in his Prophet, and in his Book!”¹⁵

Al-Nader and Ocba were Arabs—from Mecca, not Medina. To see if he could order an actual citizen of *Medina* slain without triggering repercussions, Mohammed turned with lethal malice, not to condemn a man, but a woman.

An Arab poetess named Asma bint Marwan wrote couplets chiding Arab men of Medina for gathering like seduced women around the treacherous stranger from Mecca. She likened them to “men greedy for meal soup when it is

cooking,”¹⁶ perhaps referring to their hope of gaining plunder and sex slaves via Mohammed’s continuing raids. When her poem was read to him,

Muhammed said aloud, “Will no one rid me of this daughter of Marwan?” There was a man present who belonged to the poetess’s clan . . . Umayr ibn Adi . . . that very evening he went to the poetess’s house. She was sleeping with her children about her. The youngest, still at the breast, lay asleep in her arms. [Umayr] drove his sword through her, and in the morning he went to Muhammad. “Messenger of God,” he said, “I have killed her!”

“You have done a service to Allah and his Messenger, Umayr,” was the reply.¹⁷

Rodinson’s and Warraq’s sources have the murderer asking if he should fear retaliation. Mohammed, apparently knowing that Asma’s outnumbered clan could not risk a blood feud, assured Umayr that not even two goats would bother to butt heads over Asma’s murder.¹⁸

Outnumbered and apparently terrorized into abject submission, Asma’s entire clan, Banu Khatma, converted to Islam. In the history of Islam, Muslim teachers tend to interpret such a result as justifying the crime that led to it. This is one of radical Islam’s rationalizations for terrorism—slaughter a few; reap the conversion of many.

One month after Asma was murdered, another of Mohammed’s accomplices killed another Arab poet who had dared to criticize Mohammed: 100-year-old Abu Afak.¹⁹

The indefensible absence of Arab public protest to these outrages persuaded Mohammed that he could at last begin to move against Medinan Jews. Their knowledge-based criticisms stung him far more gallingly than intuition-based barbs from Arab poets. As keeper of the constitution mentioned earlier, Mohammed needed a default on the part of the Jews—a default he could use to justify retaliation.

A foolish Jewish goldsmith of the Banu Qaynuqa clan gave Mohammed exactly the excuse he needed. The goldsmith publicly embarrassed the wife of a Muslim. Another Muslim overreacted by killing the goldsmith. The Jews killed the Muslim who killed the goldsmith. What would arbiter Mohammed do to restore the peace?

Nothing.

The man who until then had served Medina as an arbitrator decided to drop the “arbi” and become just a traitor. In violation of his appointed duty, he in effect declared the Constitution of Medina no longer valid and attacked the Banu Qaynuqa Jews.

Why didn’t the arbitrator *arbitrate* instead of *laying siege*?

Scores of Muslim apologists—and some naive non-Muslim scholars who take Muslim scholars’ word on almost anything—claim that Medinan Jews were guilty of aggression against Mohammed and justly needed to be opposed. But they supply no examples—beyond the Jews’ very justifiable intellectual confrontation.

Some scholars claim that Jews were about to attack Muslims physically. Shouting in denial stand two striking facts: First is that Medina’s other two Jewish clans did not rush to take sides with the one that Mohammed chose to attack. Common sense would have dictated opposing him *in unison* if in fact it was their plan to physically oppose him at all.

Second, when an army from Mecca responded to Mohammed’s caravan raiding and to the loss at Badr by attacking Medina itself, several thousand Jews uprising within the city would have given Mecca the victory. That occasion—called the Battle of the Ditch—was a day of golden opportunity for the Jews if in fact they were plotting against Mohammed. Why did they not exploit it? Clearly they had no military plan. They were merchants who wanted peace.

Fifteen days later, cut off from supplies of food, the Banu Qaynuqa surrendered. Mohammed planned to slay every Jewish male, but a sufficient number of Medinan Arabs objected to so utterly cruel a plan. So Mohammed settled for evicting all Banu Qaynuqa families from their homes, even from their own hometown.

With only what they could carry, Qaynuqa Jews fled on camel or on foot toward Christian Syria. Muslim despoilers looted the goods that remained and claimed all Banu Qaynuqa homes and land. Mohammed himself took one-fifth of everything.²⁰

Next to die by assassination was another poet, Kab ibn al-Ashraf.²¹ Mohammed then ordered, “Kill any Jew you are able to kill.”²² Muhayyisa, a Muslim, responded by killing a Jew named Ibn Sunayna.

Victory over the Banu Qaynuqa brought Mohammed to a second phase of his plot to extinguish Jewish freedom of thought and speech in Medina. He

attacked, defeated and banished the wealthy Nadir. Their riches, houses and lands made Mohammed even *more* financially secure. Two years later and in another location Mohammed massacred the Nadir anyway.

Finally, Mohammed besieged the last major Jewish tribe in Medina, the Banu Qurayza. Warned that Mohammed *this time* wanted blood, not banishment, the Jews offered to surrender on condition that their fate be decided by the one group of Medinan Arabs that Mohammed had not yet totally seduced—the Banu Aws. At worst, the Jews must have thought they would be banished from their homes, as were the two other Jewish clans.

It was not to be.

How the Banu Qurayza must have regretted that they and the second clan expelled had not sided with the Banu Qaynuqa when Mohammed launched his first attack. Apparently there was no Winston Churchill-like leader to warn the three Jewish clans: “If we do not hang together, we will each hang separately.”

Refusing the Banu Aws as mediators, Mohammed feigned compromise by appointing Sa’d, an Arab who was secretly Mohammed’s accomplice, to decide the fate of the third Jewish clan. Sa’d waited until all the Banu Qurayza men gave up their weapons. Then, as Sa’d knew Mohammed required, he ordered every Jewish man beheaded.

Multiple unabashed Muslim sources varying describe Mohammed himself presiding over the beheading of at least 500 Jewish men, five at a time.²³ Their bodies were buried in a long ditch. Other Muslim sources place the number of Jewish men slain as high as 900. Their wives and daughters became sex slaves for Muslim men. Jewish boys not needed for labor (or old enough to perhaps desire later to avenge the fate of their parents) were sold for profit. Mohammed seized Rihana, widow of one of the Jews he had slain, and forced her to be one of his concubines.²⁴ Thus did Mohammed validate the Jews’ refusal to accept him as a prophet—then and forever!

These are just a few of the violent *deeds* that form the context of 109 war verses in the Koran. Historian Bat Ye’or asserts: “During his Medina period, Mohammed undertook no less than thirty-eight raids.”²⁵

Notes

1. Maxime Rodinson, *Muhammad* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1971), p 161.

2. I can only wonder if Mohammed's subsequent advocacy of *the use of force* to compel conversion to Islam, Koran 2:257 notwithstanding, can be traced back to his mistaking this peculiar legend for an accurate description of divine behavior.
3. Rodinson, *Muhammad*, p. 185.
4. Ibn Warraq, *Why I Am Not a Muslim* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1995), p. 92.
5. Rodinson, *Muhammad*, p. 196; Warraq, *Why I Am Not a Muslim*, p. 96.
6. Rodinson, *Muhammad*, p. 167.
7. Paraphrased from *Newsweek* (July 22, 2002), n.p.
8. Jean Sasson, *Daughters of Arabia* (London: Bantam Books, 1994), p. 207.
9. "Chinese Woman Forced to Watch Gang Rape and Burning Death of Her Sisters," June 1998, *colorq*, <http://www.colorq.org/humanrights/indonesia/Jakarta.htm> (accessed August 25, 2002).
10. Jan Goodwin, *Price of Honor: Muslim Women Lift the Veil of Silence on the Islamic World* (London: Warner Books, 1998), p. 339.
11. Ibid.
12. Rodinson, *Muhammad*, p. 167.
13. Warraq, *Why I Am Not a Muslim*, p. 93.
14. Ibid.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid., p. 94.
18. Rodinson, *Muhammad*, p. 174; Warraq, *Why I Am Not a Muslim*, p. 94.
19. Warraq, *Why I Am Not a Muslim*, p. 94.
20. Rodinson, *Muhammad*, p. 174; Warraq, *Why I Am Not a Muslim*, p. 94.
21. Warraq, *Why I Am Not a Muslim*, p. 94.
22. Ibid., p. 95.
23. Rodinson, *Muhammad*, p. 213; Warraq, *Why I Am Not a Muslim*, p. 96.
24. Rodinson, *Muhammad*, p. 213.
25. Bat Ye'or, *Islam and Dhimmitude: Where Civilizations Collide* (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 2002), pp. 36-37.

Chapter 19

Reviewing *Militant Islam Reaches America*

Dr. Daniel Pipes has written an epochal warning for America. Quotes from it may one day be inscribed in stone in a commemorative hall in Washington, D.C. Its title is *Militant Islam Reaches America*.¹

Dr. Pipes was formerly an instructor at the University of Chicago and Harvard University. He has also served with the U.S. State Department and the Department of Defense. The author of 10 prior books, he is now director of the Philadelphia-based Middle East Forum. He is also a columnist for both the *New York Post* and the *Jerusalem Post*.

First let me explain what Dr. Pipes does not attempt in his book. He does not critique the Koran, as I do. In all his 309 pages, I found only three phrase-length quotes from the Koran. Nor does he closely examine Mohammed's deeds and the evident motives behind them—with one exception. Dr. Pipes describes a dubious stratagem related to the breaking in A.D. 630 of a pact Mohammed had ratified 22 months earlier with the people of Mecca—the Treaty of Hudaibiya.

Dr. Pipes does not seem to see the importance of the Western world confronting radical Islam by publicly exposing Mohammed as a self-discredited prophet and the Koran as a self-discrediting book. What a shame if radical Islam's Achilles' heel—Mohammed and the Koran's weird self-discreditation—should be wasted as a means of self-defense by the world they threaten.

Nor does Dr. Pipes anywhere mention the tens of thousands of radical Muslim madrasas that are providing militant Muslim leaders with a wealth of manpower resources that moderate Muslims do not have and are not even interested in seeking.

Dr. Pipes seems not to have read Bat Ye'or. He praises the accomplishments of Islamic civilization in past centuries as if it was all one unified, well-governed Eden.² He seems unaware of the violence, the

kidnappings, the huge slave industry and the dire oppression through extortionary taxation of captive Jews and Christians during those hellish eras. He imagines that Islam became violently radicalized only in this century.

Dr. Pipes observes, “A militant Islamic state is almost by definition a rogue state, not playing by any rules except those of expediency and power, a ruthless institution that causes misery at home and abroad. Islamists in charge means that conflicts proliferate, society is militarized, arsenals grow, and terrorism becomes an instrument of state. . . . Islamists repress moderate Muslims and treat non-Muslims as inferior specimens.”³

Clearly Dr. Pipes does not realize that what he thinks describes only a *modern* Islamist state precisely describes innumerable Muslim caliphates and sultanates down through the centuries! When Dr. Pipes writes of “winning the war for the soul of Islam,”⁴ one must reply, “Please tell us, professor—exactly when and where did that ‘soul of Islam’ ever find political manifestation? We need to know so we can recognize and applaud it if it ever recurs.”

If Dr. Pipes’s “soul of Islam” means noble character in idealistic Muslim individuals, that is believable, but that is not a political accomplishment one can try to duplicate. The sad truth is that there has never been even one enduring Muslim government that can be cited as a role model for a benign “soul of Islam” kind of state—certainly not under Mohammed, nor under the caliphs, the sultans or any government of the 55 Muslim nations existing today.

Alas, the good professor’s vision of an ethereal yet somehow recoverable soul of Islam is only a pipes’-dream.

Yet in spite of the above omissions, Dr. Pipes strikes a thunderously loud gong. He documents the Islamic threat looming over America with startling quotes and lucid comments that swirl like snowflakes in a storm. In chapter 10, I cited Ibn Warraq’s quotes from Kalim Siddiqi, director of London’s Muslim Institute. Here are some of Dr. Pipe’s comments about the teachings of an *American* Muslim activist with a like-sounding but differently spelled surname—Shamim A. Siddiqi:

Siddiqi [in writings Pipes finds available on Islamic web sites] argues that Muslims taking control of the United States has more importance than such goals as sustaining the Iranian revolution or destroying Israel, for it has greater impact upon the future of Islam.⁵

Other Siddiqi opinions paraphrased by Pipes are:

To permit Islam to attain its rightful place requires that “the ideology of Islam prevail over the mental horizon of the American people.” . . .

Establishing militant Islam in America would signal the triumph of [militant Islam] . . . over its only rival, the bundle of Christianity and liberalism that constitutes Western civilization.⁶

Note that Siddiqi does not take Hinduism, Buddhism, Taoism, etc., as seriously as Christianity and Western liberalism when it comes to naming rivals Islam must overcome:

American Muslims . . . have the paramount responsibility of bringing Islam to power in their country.⁷

Siddiqi sees Islamists in power in Washington before 2020.⁸

Dr. Pipes names three primary means Islamists in America are counting on to achieve their dream of an Islamicized America: “immigration, reproduction and conversion.”⁹

Dr. Pipes quotes Siraj Wahhaj, an influential black convert to Islam, as saying to a Muslim audience in New Jersey late in 1992:

“If we were united and strong, we’d elect our own emir [leader] and give allegiance to him. . . . Take my word, if 6-8 million Muslims unite in America, the country will come to us.” If Muslims were more clever politically, Wahhaj told his listeners, they could take over the United States and replace the constitutional government with a caliphate.¹⁰

This from the first Muslim ever invited to offer an invitational prayer in the U.S. House of Representatives! Dozens of similar alarming quotes from American Muslims resound throughout Dr. Pipes’s chapters.

Introducing a chapter called “The U.S. Government: Patron of Islam?” Dr. Pipes writes, “It was one thing to hear individual [pro-Islamic] statements by

high government officials stretching back a decade and another thing to collect them, sort them, and ponder them. This latter task suggested a more cohesive and powerful message than had been evident from occasional remarks.”¹¹

Dr. Pipes adds that he and Mimi Stillman, coauthor of the chapter, wrote:

“By dismissing any connection between Islam and terrorism, complaining about media distortions, and claiming that America needs Islam,” we concluded, official spokesmen “have turned the U.S. government into a discreet missionary for the [Islamic] faith.” Assuming that is not their intention, the message of [the chapter mentioned] is that government officials should be much more careful when they speak about Islam.¹²

Dr. Pipes comments elsewhere,

It was not so long ago that Westerners could converse freely about Mohammed, Islam, Muslims and militant Islam, just as they still can about parallel Christian subjects. No longer. . . . Violence and intimidation have shut down the frank discussion of [Islam]. It has reached the strange point that, in a secular, Christian-majority country like the United States, a biographer of Jesus has freedom to engage in outrageous blasphemies while his counterpart working on Mohammed feels constrained to accept the pious Muslim version of the Prophet’s life. I present this silencing as . . . a potential first step toward the imposition of Islamic law [in America].¹³

Then comes Dr. Pipes’s sadly misplaced confidence that moderate Muslims are the knights who must somehow wage ideological warfare with radical Muslims for Dr. Pipes’s mythical “soul of Islam.” He admits, “Although the moderates appear—and in fact are—weak, they have a crucial role to play, for they alone can reconcile Islam with modernity.”¹⁴

Elsewhere Dr. Pipes concedes, “The Internet has hundreds of militant Islamic sites but few traditionally pious ones.”¹⁵ Sites operated by *moderate* Muslims, as distinct from militant or traditional ones, are not even mentioned! Do any exist?

At the end of his tome, Dr. Pipes recommends that Western democracies should pin their hopes on helping Turkey—most democratic of all Muslim governments—launch a propaganda blitz to offer itself as a model for the establishment of democratic governments everywhere in the Islamic world. He acknowledges that Turkey is far from asking to step into the role and may even refuse.

But even if Turkey accepted, even if radical Muslims everywhere dropped their militant agendas and accepted Dr. Pipes's major American-led proposal, the Koran would still be there to generate anti-infidel hostility in another generation. Mohammed's example of treacherous atrocity would eventually inspire future Osama bin Ladens to arise

We have no alternative. We must accept the solution that Mohammed himself unwittingly dropped in our very laps—use his own words, his own historical record to show that he discredited himself. We must learn to use quotes from his Koran to undermine Muslim confidence in him and his writings. Show them that turning away from Mohammed frees them to turn to God in truth. This calls for concerted efforts in winsome debate by millions of non-Muslims internationally. We in our millions must help millions of Muslims to see that what Islam loathes as “the House of War” is simply the human family of which they are an integral part!

Mohammed estranged them from us. Let us undo the estrangement. Win Muslims back into the human family under God!

Notes

1. Daniel Pipes, *Militant Islam Reaches America* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2002).
2. Ibid., pp. 4, 74.
3. Ibid., p. 13.
4. Ibid., n.p.
5. Ibid., p. 114.
6. Ibid., p. 114.
7. Ibid., p. 115.
8. Ibid., p. 122.
9. Ibid., p. 118.
10. Ibid., p. 112.

11. Ibid., p. xv.
12. Ibid., pp. xv-xvi.
13. Ibid., pp. xvii-xviii.
14. Ibid., p. xix.
15. Ibid., p. 15.