

*The Truth and Freedom Society  
presents*

**America's**

# Interfaith Dialogue

**With Muslims**

*A Guide in Due Diligence for Non-Muslims*

**NOTICE:** This guide may be distributed freely and displayed on websites and Internet servers throughout the world only in its current form. Any changes without the express written consent of the publisher will be a violation of international Copyright law.

# ***America's Interfaith Dialogue with Muslims: A Guide in Due Diligence***

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Introduction: For Whom and Why we Wrote this Guide

An Important Note about Sources

Understanding Interfaith Dialogue Categories

Exploring Possible Impediments to Real Interfaith Dialogue with Muslims

1. Is Islam Truly a *Religion* in the Judeo-Christian Sense of the Word?
2. Does the Koran Acknowledge the Authenticity of the Judeo-Christian Scriptures?
3. Is Genuine Debate (or Compromise) with Orthodox Muslims possible?
4. Does Islam Impose Scriptural or Legal Barriers to Free and Open Discourse?
5. Do “Moderate Islam” and “Moderate Muslims” Exist, and if so, Are They Relevant?
6. What is the Likelihood That Your Dialogue Partners are Affiliated with the Muslim Brotherhood?
7. Can You Completely Trust What is Told to You When Islamic Doctrine is in Play?

Utilizing Effective Dialogue Engagement Tools

1. The Pre-engagement Phase
2. The “Discovery” Phase
3. The Managing-the-“Dialogue” Phase

Conclusions

Ideas on How to Use This Guide

## INTRODUCTION: FOR WHOM AND WHY WE WROTE THIS GUIDE

**For whom?** This Guide was written to assist non-Muslims<sup>1</sup> who are contemplating, or have been invited to, engage in “*Interfaith Dialogue*” with Muslims. It is also intended to help those who are already involved in such activity and who are now developing doubts about the Muslims’ true agenda or who are not exactly thrilled with the results.

When we speak of Muslims in this Guide, we are referring in the main to **Orthodox Muslims**, i.e. those who adhere strictly to the principles laid out in the Islamic scriptures (*The Trilogy* – see *An Important note about Sources*). Engagement with **Secular (“cultural”) Muslims** (many of whom, we suspect, have come to the USA to escape the stifling constricts of Sharia law in their home countries) is also discussed in this Guide. We will help you determine whether you are in fact engaging with **Orthodox Muslims or with Secular Muslims**, as the difference is not necessarily obvious to the untrained observer.

**Why Muslims?** When deciding to engage in "dialogue" with members of other faiths, you have quite a smorgasbord from which to choose:

African-American Methodist Church	Agnostics	Amish	Assemblies of God
Atheists	Baha'is	Baptists	Chassidic Jews
The Christian Congregation	Christian and Missionary Alliance	Christian Scientists	Church of the Brethren
Church of the Nazarene	Churches of Christ	Conservative Jews	Deists
Episcopalians	Evangelical Free Church of America	Greek Orthodox Church	Hindus
Humanists	International Church of the Foursquare Gospel	International Pentecostal Holiness Church	Jainists
Jehova's Witnesses	Jews for Jesus	Lutherans	Mennonites
Messianic Jews	Methodists	Mormons	Native American religion followers
Neopaganists (Wiccans, Druids)	New Age practitioners	New Thought Movement members	Nonreligious/Secular people
Orthodox Church	Orthodox Jews	Pentecostal Church of God	Presbyterians
Quakers	Reconstructionist Jews	Reform Jews	Reformed Church in America
Religious unaffiliated	Roman Catholics	Russian Orthodox Church	Scientologists
Secular Humanist Jews	Secular unaffiliated	Seventh-day Adventists	Sikhs
Spiritualists	Taoists	Theravada Buddhists	Tibetan Buddhists
Unitarian Universalists	United Church of Christ	Wesleyans	Zen Buddhists

<sup>1</sup> Note that the spelling of Muslims/Moslems, Koran/Qur'an, Sharia/Shariah/Shari'ah, Muhammad/Mohammed etc. varies according to the material consulted.

Yet you choose to consider engaging with, or are already engaged, in dialogue with *Muslims*, who in a recent survey made up less than 2 percent of Americans.<sup>2</sup>

**Why Muslims?** Your most likely response is that they, like us, are *followers of one of the three great Abrahamic faiths*. The **shallowness of this reasoning** is amply exposed in this Guide, as are other arguments used by proponents of "dialogue" with Muslims. In doing so, we aim to **plant the seeds of doubt in your mind** as to the wisdom of engaging in this seemingly heart-warming exercise.

Why should you have doubts about **Muslims** in particular? Unlike dialogue with members of other denominations, "dialogue" with Muslims is fraught with real and mostly unimagined pitfalls and dangers. *At the risk of sounding alarmist*, the chief reason **why we wrote this Guide** is that, by engaging with Muslims whose hidden agenda you could be blinded to, **you may be aiding and abetting those who seek to destroy our Constitutional freedoms**. Much more about this further on in our Guide.

**We also want to sound a warning about the potential danger that our good nature as a people poses:** The warmth and hospitality of the American people are legendary. We exhibit an openness expressed in a willingness to embrace immigrants and visitors of any and all ethnicities and cultural backgrounds to our shores and institutions. The need for religious tolerance and respect is taken for granted. Regrettably, this passion for fair play and accommodation all-too-often goes hand-in-hand with a measure of **naiveté on our part that leads to an uncritical acceptance of whatever the newcomer brings to the table**. This good-heartedness has the potential to *backfire* on us in unexpected ways, and it is this dangerous and increasingly looming pitfall that this Guide addresses.

An important **document, *Christian Witness in a Multi-Religious World***,<sup>3</sup> recently released by a group of major Christian religious bodies, includes several **recommendations pertaining to interreligious dialogue**. While we are certainly in agreement with the basic principles laid out in this landmark paper,

---

<sup>2</sup> Is Islam the fastest growing religion in America? The answer may surprise you:

[http://wikiislam.net/wiki/Fastest\\_Growing\\_Religion](http://wikiislam.net/wiki/Fastest_Growing_Religion)

<sup>3</sup> World Council of Churches, Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue, and World Evangelical Alliance: *Christian Witness in a Multi-Religious World. Recommendations for conduct.*

[http://www.oikoumene.org/fileadmin/files/wcc-main/2011pdfs/ChristianWitness\\_recommendations.pdf](http://www.oikoumene.org/fileadmin/files/wcc-main/2011pdfs/ChristianWitness_recommendations.pdf)

we find that certain important practical issues remain incompletely addressed. We believe our Guide succeeds in providing these **missing ingredients**. Among these are:

- The pitfalls of “interfaith dialogue” confined to discussion of commonalities.
- Practical tools that enable one to probe the truth regarding the core beliefs and practices of the group with which you are engaged in dialogue.
- A primer on the all-too-often overlooked *political* component of Islam, including its violent aspects and intolerance of apostasy.

***We assume that you are sincere in your good intentions*** to reach out and engage Muslims in dialogue. We ask, however, that you keep an open mind and look objectively at the facts laid out in these pages, *many of which may surprise, or even shock or offend, you. You will be exposed to firmly-established facts regarding Islam that the politically-correct mainstream media studiously avoid mentioning,*<sup>4</sup> and of which the average American is blissfully unaware.<sup>5</sup>

## AN IMPORTANT NOTE ABOUT SOURCES

Unless you and those engaging in the “dialogue” process with you are well-read regarding Islam, you will fall among the large majority of Americans who, for decades, have been fed a steady diet of ***carefully-filtered and slanted information by the left-leaning mainstream media and the educational institutions of America***. In fact, ignorance of the true nature of Islam is fostered at every level of our education system, from kindergarten through university, where all-too-many departments of Middle East or Islamic studies are funded by the Saudi government to promote the propagation of the extremist Wahhabi ideology.<sup>6,7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.jihadwatch.org/2012/06/as-far-as-editorial-content-is-concerned-print-media-in-the-united-states-is-very-pro-muslim.html>

<sup>5</sup>

[http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2012/07/egyptian\\_reformists\\_alarmed\\_by\\_hillary\\_and\\_obama.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2012/07/egyptian_reformists_alarmed_by_hillary_and_obama.html)

<sup>6</sup> Lee Kaplan: The Saudi Fifth Column On Our Nation’s Campuses, *FrontPage Magazine*, April 5, 2004:

<http://archive.frontpagemag.com/readArticle.aspx?ARTID=13551>

<sup>7</sup> Walid Phares: *Future Jihad*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Indoctrination at the school level is reflected in the biased and blatantly erroneous way in which Islam is dealt with in history and social studies textbooks.<sup>8</sup>

If this is the knowledge base you are bringing to the “dialogue” table, you are ***ill-equipped to deal with the ideas presented to you by your Muslim “dialogue” partners***. Overcoming this hurdle requires hard work on your part – in-depth study of Islam – or, for your Muslim counterparts, “dialoguing” with you will be like “shooting fish in a barrel.” In this guide we attempt to provide you with a head-start in your quest to become truly “***Islam-savvy***.” Unless armed with this information, you are certain to fall easy prey to those who would beguile you with falsehoods in furtherance of their cause.

The ***truly important sources***, on which we base this Guide, and which we strongly recommend you adopt as your own are (in order of importance):

1. **The Islamic Trilogy**
2. **Manual of Shari’ah Law - *Reliance of the Traveller***
3. **Internet Resources - Credible websites**, which, in turn, can direct you to other valuable websites, books, articles, and videos.

Let’s take a look at each of these sources in turn:

## 1. The Islamic Trilogy

The Islamic Trilogy consists of three parts: the ***Koran***, the ***Hadith***, and the ***Sira***.

The ***Koran (Qur’an)*** is considered by Muslims to be the immutable word of God, as revealed to Muhammad. It is divided up into chapters, or surahs, arranged from the longest to the shortest with the result that *the chronology is lost to the reader*.<sup>9</sup> The surahs are subdivided into verses.

---

<sup>8</sup> This is meticulously exposed in the 229-page report, *Education or Indoctrination? The Treatment of Islam in 6<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> Grade American Textbooks* (2011), down-loadable at the [www.ACTforAmericaEducation.org](http://www.ACTforAmericaEducation.org) website.

<sup>9</sup> An exception is the very short first Sura, the *Fatiha*, discussed under Impediment #1.

## **Two Korans – Meccan and Medinan**<sup>10,11</sup>

Muhammed preached the religion of Islam in Mecca for 13 years and gained 150 followers. The Koranic surahs “revealed” in Mecca have a generally religious tone. Then Muhammed moved to Medina and became a politician and warrior. The Koranic surahs “revealed” in Medina are political in nature and very violent.<sup>12</sup> So there are two Korans - the Meccan Koran and the Medinan Koran. The Medinan Koran **abrogates** the Meccan Koran. (See *The Doctrine of Abrogation* in the section *Managing-the“dialogue” Phase*).

### **Is the Koran an original work?**

There are only two new facts in the Koran, **a derivative work**.<sup>13</sup> The first new fact is that Muhammed is the prophet of Allah, and the second new truth is that if you don't believe he is prophet of Allah, you can be killed.<sup>14</sup>

The two remaining parts of the Trilogy, the Hadith and the Sira, are *collectively* called the **sunnah** – the life and example of Muhammad.<sup>15</sup>

The **hadith** are the words and deeds of Muhammad as recorded by his devout early Muslim companions. The Koran (as we have mentioned) is believed by Muslims to be the unaltered word of God, but figuring out just what Allah meant can often be quite vexing. To divine Allah's intention, Muslims turn to the hadiths (in much the same way Jews turn to the Talmud for clarification of what is in the Torah). The hadiths draw much of their authority from accounts of the Prophet Muhammad's life. By observing how Muhammad interpreted Allah's word, a Muslim can better figure out just what the Koran is saying. The most authoritative hadiths are those compiled by Sahih Al-Bukhari and Sahih Muslim.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.politicalislam.com/blog/submission-and-duality/>

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.jihadwatch.org/cgi-sys/cgiwrap/br0nc0s/managed-mt/mt-search.cgi?search=meccan+medinan+koran&IncludeBlogs=1&limit=20>

<sup>12</sup> The Medinan surahs are numbers 2-5, 8, 9, 22, 24, 33, 47-49, 57-66, and 98.

<sup>13</sup> The Koran is derived from a wide variety of sources. These include the Pentateuch and Psalms, the Apocrypha, the Talmud, Midrashic literature, the Zohar, the Gnostic Gospels, Samaritan, Sabaeen, Zoroastrian, Hanafi, Hindu and Pagan beliefs and customs, and the Egyptian Book of the Dead.

<http://debate.org.uk/topics/books/origins-koran.html>

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.politicalislam.com/blog/you-can-never-awaken-a-man-who-is/>

<sup>15</sup> Sunni Muslims, who constitute the vast majority of Muslims in the world (around 90%), derive this name from their devout adherence to the sunnah. Shia Muslims form the second largest group.

<sup>16</sup> Jamal al-Banna, a younger brother of Hassan al-Banna (founder of the Muslim Brotherhood) has published a book in which he argues that 653 of the hadiths of al-Bukhari and Muslim are

The *sira*, the earliest pious Muslim biographies of Muhammad, also play a role in figuring out the chronology and meaning of the Koran. The most authoritative compilations are by Ibn Ishaq and al-Tabari.

**The language of the Trilogy:** It is also helpful to know something about the language in which the Koran is written. Occasionally, the taunt “***Do you know Arabic? - You have to read the Koran in the original Arabic to understand it fully***” may be hurled at you by your Muslim “dialogue partners”. The following extract from the first of a three-part series *How to Debate a Muslim*<sup>17</sup> by the heroic and piercingly insightful ex-Muslim Ibn Warraq addresses this question (Emphases added):

***"You do not need to know Arabic to criticize Islam or the Koran.***  
.....You only need a critical sense, critical thought and skepticism.  
Second, there are translations of the Koran, by Muslims themselves, so Muslims cannot claim that there has been deliberate tampering of the text by infidel translators. Third, the majority of Muslims are not Arabs, and are not Arabic speakers. So a majority of Muslims also have to rely on translations. Finally, the language of the Koran is some form of Classical Arabic which is totally different from the spoken Arabic of today, so even Muslim Arabs have to rely on translations to understand their holy text. Arabic is a Semitic language related to Hebrew and Aramaic, and is no easier but also no more difficult to translate than any other language. Of course, there are all sorts of difficulties with the language of the Koran, but these difficulties have been recognized by Muslim scholars themselves. The Koran is indeed a rather opaque text but it is opaque to everyone. Even Muslim scholars do not understand a fifth of it.”

When you do debate with a Muslim ***make sure you are armed with all your references from the original Arabic sources.*** The major sources (the three parts of the Islamic Trilogy, and the Manual of Sharia Law) are all available in reliable English translations.

---

incorrect and should not be accepted. This suggests that there is indeed a great deal of dissent among the many sub-sects of Islam itself as to who has the correct interpretation.

<http://www.jihadwatch.org/2009/01/muslim-scholar-argues-that-653-hadiths-in-sahih-bukhari-and-sahih-muslim-are-false.html>

<sup>17</sup> <http://www.jihadwatch.org/2004/12/ibn-warraq-on-how-to-debate-a-muslim-part-i.html>

<http://www.jihadwatch.org/2004/12/ibn-warraq-on-how-to-debate-a-muslim-part-ii.html>

<http://www.jihadwatch.org/2004/12/ibn-warraq-on-how-to-debate-a-muslim-part-iii.html>



## 2. Manual of Sharia Law

Islamic law (Sharia law) is **derived from the Islamic Trilogy** (the Koran and Sunnah.)

**Reliance of the Traveller.**<sup>18</sup> **The Classic Manual of Islamic Sacred Law (Umdat al-Salik)**<sup>19</sup> was compiled by the renowned Muslim jurist Ahmad ibn Naqib al-Misri in the 14th century. It is the most authoritative source on the subject of Sharia (Islamic law), having been certified by al-Azhar University in Cairo — the font of Sunni learning — as conforming “to the practice and faith of the orthodox Sunni community.” In fact, when an English edition of *Reliance* (now available through Amazon.com) was published in 1994, it won gushing praise from the government of Saudi Arabia (where Sharia is the only law), as well as the governments of Egypt, Jordan, and Syria, all of which incorporate Sharia in their legal systems. This 1251-page book is surprisingly readable and reflects the astounding way in which Islamic law micromanages literally every aspect of the lives of adherents to Islam.

Sharia Law is a **barbaric legal system** that flies in the face of Western norms. It outlaws free speech, stones adulterers, amputates thieves' hands, mandates death for apostates - those who choose to leave Islam - (the infamous *Redda* law), sanctions the killing of homosexuals, outlaws alcohol and most music, and institutionalizes complete and total subjugation of non-Muslims and women (**No “wine, women and song” in Islam!!**).

"Allah did not create man so that he could have fun. The aim of creation was for mankind to be put to the test through hardship and prayer. An Islamic regime must be serious in every field. There are no jokes in Islam. There is no humor in Islam. **There is no fun in Islam.** There can be no fun and joy in whatever is serious."<sup>20</sup>

**Ayatollah Khomeini, 1979**

---

<sup>18</sup> There are actually two l's in the word.

<sup>19</sup> Ahmed ibn Naqib al-Misri: *Reliance of the Traveller ('Umdat al-Salik')*: A Classic Manual of Islamic Sacred Law, translated by Nuh Ha Mim Keller. Amana Publications, 1999.

<sup>20</sup> [http://granitegrok.com/blog/2006/12/notable\\_quote\\_ayatollah\\_khomeini\\_1](http://granitegrok.com/blog/2006/12/notable_quote_ayatollah_khomeini_1)

***Sharia stands in stark contrast to The American Constitution, and the Declaration of Independence, which lists Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness as Unalienable Human Rights***<sup>21,22,23</sup>

***Isn't it your patriotic duty as an American to fight Sharia with all the energy you can muster?***

Concluding thoughts on the Trilogy and Sharia Law: The actions and words of Muslims are based upon the Trilogy. There is sure and certain knowledge about Islam. Every Muslim agrees that there is no god but Allah and Muhammad is his prophet. The basis for Islamic knowledge comes from Allah (the Koran) and Muhammad (the Sunna, found in the Sira and the Hadith). The next best true source of Islam is the Sharia. If it is in the Trilogy or Sharia, it is Islam. ***If it is not in the Trilogy or Sharia, it is not Islam.***<sup>24</sup>

### 3. Internet Resources

A good starting point for anyone wishing to learn about Islam and its impact on the lives of Americans and other Westerners is our own website, [www.SneakyIslam.com](http://www.SneakyIslam.com). Links to this Guide and others - all entirely original - can be found on its home page.

A great number of other excellent websites on Islam exist. Two outstanding ones are ***Jihad Watch*** (Robert Spencer) and ***Political Islam*** (Dr. Bill Warner). These present the concept that Islam is a purely political construct and should not be cloaked in claims of religiosity.

- Among the many features available on the **Jihad Watch** site are at least 200 links to other recommended websites, a section listing recommended books, a summary of what Islam is all about (Islam 101), and Robert Spencer's complete commentary on the Koran (" Blogging the Qur'an"). Jihad Watch features daily updates on important events relating to the Islamic Jihad, as well as scholarly essays on Islam-related topics.

---

<sup>21</sup> <http://catchkevin.com/islam-not-protected/>

<sup>22</sup> <http://www.jihadwatch.org/2012/09/james-m-arlandson-should-the-west-tolerate-islam.html>

<sup>23</sup> <http://www.politicalislam.com/blog/the-mosque-a-state-within-a-state/>

<sup>24</sup> *Can we Talk? A Manual of Persuasion about Islam*, downloadable from the Political Islam website of esteemed expert on Islam, Dr. Bill Warner. You are encouraged to read this 60-page booklet in its entirety – it is well worth the effort! <http://www.politicalislam.com/pdf/WebSitePDF/CanWeTalk.pdf>

- **Political Islam** presents a refreshingly original slant on Islamic scripture and history, presenting the real picture of Islam apart from its cloak of religiosity, with statistical analysis of the Islamic holy texts that reveal startling insights. Among the most highly recommended essays on this website are “Can we Talk?”, “Statistical Islam”, “Statistics and the Meaning of Islam”, and the three-part essay “What is the Truth About American Muslims [?]”. Also available through this website are several excellent books, including versions of the Koran in which the verses are arranged in proper chronological order, shortened versions of the Koran, and a brief introduction to Sharia law.

Most websites provide free updates to your anonymous e-mail address. Our Guide makes extensive use of these internet resources (which we here gratefully acknowledge), and provides links to articles and essays where appropriate.

## **The internet: A double-edged sword – *Jagged 85* and the problems at Wikipedia**

A Wikipedia Report explains:<sup>25</sup>

“At Wikipedia, Islam-related articles are severely compromised by Muslim editors. An example of this is a 2010 incident where an editor with over 67,000 edits was caught intentionally inserting false information into articles. *Jagged 85* had been editing there for 5 years, and his/her inaccurate edits and articles have been reproduced all over the net by other websites which use Wikipedia as a source.

.....we've learn't that *Jagged 85* is the main contributor to the many inaccurate Islam/Science/Golden Age articles which are still being copied and pasted all over the internet by Muslims.....

With contributions to over 8,100 separate articles, it is unlikely that all of Jagged 85's edits will ever be fixed. And even if they were, these Wikipedia articles have already been reproduced all over the net by other sites which use Wikipedia as a source.

While Wikipedia can be a great resource for general knowledge and a decent starting point in the research of Islam, this and the other examples cited above, highlight the constant problems that Wikipedia faces for Islam related articles.”

---

<sup>25</sup> [http://wikiislam.net/wiki/Islam,\\_Science\\_and\\_the\\_Problems\\_at\\_Wikipedia](http://wikiislam.net/wiki/Islam,_Science_and_the_Problems_at_Wikipedia)

***With the Trilogy, Sharia, and reliable Internet resources as its foundation, our Guide will enable you to***

- ***Distinguish between Real, Constructive Interfaith Dialogue, Sham Interfaith Dialogue, and mere Schmoozing.***
- ***Pre-empt fruitless engagement exercises, including those which have real potential to become argumentative, heated and divisive, and which, at best, will almost certainly lead nowhere.***
- ***Counter the many arguments thrown at you by Orthodox Muslims (if you are already engaged in such “dialogue”)***

## **UNDERSTANDING INTERFAITH DIALOGUE CATEGORIES**

### ***What is dialogue?***

The Merriam-Webster online dictionary provides three definitions that are applicable to Interfaith (or better, Interreligious) Dialogue:

a : a conversation between two or more persons

b : an exchange of ideas and opinions

c : a discussion between representatives of parties to a conflict that is aimed at resolution.

The first two definitions are all-encompassing. It is the third definition that we think embodies the intent of real dialogue.

We have characterized “Interfaith Dialogue” between Non-Muslims and Muslims as falling into three broad categories: ***Real, Constructive Dialogue, Schmoozing, and Sham Dialogue.*** Let’s discuss each in turn:

1. ***Real, constructive dialogue*** is the first of three forms of dialogue that we identify. This form, aimed at resolving points of conflict that separate Islam and other religions is, for all practical purposes, ***impossible***. The fact of this impossibility is amply demonstrated throughout our Guide. Recognition of the facts as we present them should lead to an awareness that this, the highest and most genuine form of dialogue, is a *dangerous myth*.

**No less a person than Pope Benedict XVI, in calling for discussion on the practical consequences of religious differences, stated that "[A]n interreligious dialogue [between Christians and Muslims] in the strict sense of the word is not possible"** <sup>26</sup>

2. **Schmoozing**: Most actual cases appear to represent social get-togethers *where points of commonality between Islam and other religions*<sup>27</sup> **are emphasized**. While likely to prove (at least superficially) friendly and heart-warming, "getting to know you" discussions of this type, aside from forming possible "friendships",<sup>28</sup> actually **accomplish very little of substance**. This class of intercourse is not truly deserving of the designation "dialogue", and is more aptly termed "**schmoozing**." Merriam-Webster online dictionary defines schmoozing thus: **to converse informally; to chat in a friendly and**

---

<sup>26</sup> *New York Times*, November 24, 2008:

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/24/world/europe/24pope.html>

<sup>27</sup> Links to points of commonality:

<http://christianityinview.com/xncomparison.html>

[http://www.religionfacts.com/islam/comparison\\_charts/islam\\_judaism\\_christianity.htm](http://www.religionfacts.com/islam/comparison_charts/islam_judaism_christianity.htm)

<http://www.slideshare.net/ZAKIR/s-i-m-i-l-a-r-i-t-i-e-s-b-e-t-w-e-e-n-i-s-l-a-m-c-h-r-i-s-t-i-a-n-i-t-y>

<http://www.academon.com/Comparison-Essay-Similarities-and-Differences-Between-Judaism-and-Christianity/57466>

<http://www.americancatholic.org/Messenger/Apr2002/Feature2.asp>

<sup>28</sup> Pay heed to the following Koranic verses regarding friendships with non-believers:  
Koran (Medina) 4:144: Ye who believe! Take not for friends unbelievers rather than believers: Do ye wish to offer Allah an open proof against yourselves?  
Koran (Medina) 5:51: Ye who believe! Take not the Jews and the Christians for friends. They are friends one to another. He among you who taketh them for friends is (one) of them. Lo! Allah guideth not wrongdoing folk.

***persuasive manner*** especially so as to gain favor, business, or connections. It is the kind of “dialogue” that might have been carried out between, say, Hitler and leaders of German Jewry in the late 1930’s. They would likely have agreed that German history and culture were meaningful and inspiring, and that German food, wine and music were wonderful. So what? There are certainly points of commonality between Islam and other (especially the “Abrahamic”) religions (See Impediment #2) but, given the ***abrasively earth-shattering differences*** between Islam and (other) religions, they are somewhat superficial and relatively meaningless “in the greater scheme of things.” **Points of commonality** include:

- Abraham is often cited as a point of commonality. However, as pointed out in Impediment #2 (see further on), this argument has many “holes” in it.
- Monotheism (strict or, as in Christianity, Trinitarian)
- The greeting “Peace be upon you”
- Entreaties for divine assistance in prayer
- Recognition of holy places
- Prostration when praying
- Modesty of female dress
- Circumcision
- Belief in angels and demons
- Daily prayer and weekly worship
- The Moon in religious symbolism and observance (Judaism and Islam)
- Almsgiving
- Fasting
- Prohibition against eating pork (Judaism and Islam)

In regard to the latter “commonality”, it is important to point out that *halal* meat and *kosher* meat are not equivalent. There are important and ***disturbing differences*** between Islamic and Jewish methods of ritual slaughter.<sup>29</sup> The cited reference includes links to graphic video clips that could be upsetting to the viewer.

The following opinions regarding the ***futility of “dialogue” focusing purely on commonalities*** are from scholars and clerics of a variety of backgrounds (Emphases added):

“Most of the time we go to great lengths to avoid conflict.....And most of the time we are satisfied with mouthing a few noble, often-repeated sentiments.....Nothing is wrong with these sentiments....I believe in them

---

<sup>29</sup> <http://www.barenakedislam.com/2012/10/04/the-new-french-resistance-against-islamization-is-alive-and-well/>

all. But if we don't dig beneath the surface and focus on substance rather than rhetoric, they mean very little.....***meaningful dialogue happens when the conversation turns to our religious differences.***<sup>30</sup>

- ***“One of the most painful things is to watch ministers and rabbis go to interfaith dialogues with Muslims.....Christians, Jews, Hindus and Buddhists.....become useful idiots for Islam.*** They find two or three things that seem to align with their doctrine and hope this makes everything all right.”<sup>31</sup>
- “Inter-faith dialogues should continue to be encouraged; however, not to stress (often strained) commonalities, but to honestly and openly question differences.”<sup>32</sup>
- “As part of his ongoing effort to move the dialogue from the superficial level of cordiality to the hard issues of theological difference, he says that the fact that the Qur’an does not accept the crucifixion of Jesus is “the one irreducible ‘fact’” separating Christianity and Islam.....Nasr says that the apparently irreconcilable matter of the crucifixion is “a fact which in reality was placed there providentially to prevent the mingling of the two religions.” ***“In the long run,” he said, “I believe that it is only members of the two communities who believe that salvation is NOT limited to their own faith who can carry on fruitful dialogue with each other.***<sup>33,34</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Rabbi Eric H. Yoffie, President of the Union for Reform Judaism, in an essay titled Why Interfaith Dialogue Doesn't Work – And What We Can Do About It. [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/rabbi-eric-h-yoffie/why-interfaith-dialogue-d\\_b\\_867221.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/rabbi-eric-h-yoffie/why-interfaith-dialogue-d_b_867221.html)

<sup>31</sup> <http://www.politicalislam.com/pdf/WebSitePDF/CanWeTalk.pdf>

<sup>32</sup> Raymond Ibrahim: *Strategies For Countering Radical Islamist Ideologies: Overcoming Conceptual Difficulties*. Testimony to House Armed Services Committee, February 12, 2009. We highly recommend your reading the full testimony, which is a brilliant overview of Islamic beliefs and practices. <http://www.raymondibrahim.com/8266/strategies-for-countering-radical-islamist>

<sup>33</sup> In reference to comments by Seyyed Hossein Nasr of American University. In Jane Idleman Smith: *Muslims, Christians, and the Challenge of Interfaith Dialogue*, Oxford University Press, 2007, p.138.

<sup>34</sup> *Muslims, Christians, and the Challenge of Interfaith Dialogue* (Oxford University Press, 2007) is one of the more recent and comprehensive works on the subject. The author is Jane Idleman Smith, Professor of Islamic Studies and Co-Director of the Macdonald Center for the Study of Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations, Hartford Seminary, Hartford, Conn. While admirably presenting a broad spectrum of opinion regarding dialogue with Muslims, it does reflect an apologetic stance in dealing with Islam. For example, the expression “religion of peace” is mentioned uncritically (p. 102), reference is made to the “Holy” Qur’an (p. 111), and abrogated verses are quoted without mention of the doctrine of Abrogation (pp. 122-124, 132-133, and 139). Frequent mention is made of involvement in “dialogue” of organizations, such as ISNA, ICNA,



The numerous **points of friction** between Islam, Judaism, and Christianity, underscored by the dualistic nature of Islamic (Sharia) law – one set of standards for Muslims, and another for everyone else - are amply dealt with elsewhere in this Guide.

3. **Sham dialogue**: The third form of Interfaith Dialogue is that where one party is attempting, in all likelihood in subtle and deceptive ways, to **foist its ideas on the other party with the aim of demonstrating the superiority of its creed, or of recruiting converts (dawa)**. This kind of “dialogue” will, in the eyes of the aggressive party, be deemed to be successful if the passive party is (as we have mentioned) ill-informed about the true nature of the opposing party and its ideas and, because of their ignorance and gullibility, is easily duped by them. **If both parties come to the table well-versed in the principles and practice of their own respective beliefs, as well as those of the other, there is likely to be conflict, as different religious beliefs are, by their very nature, irreconcilable.** Nowhere is this more true than between Islam and other religions. We call this class of intercourse *Sham Dialogue*.

**More about dawa**: Generally, Muslim rhetoric in the West about decreasing the gap between Muslims and non-Muslims and building bridges between the two camps is just thinly-veiled proselytizing, as the premier Muslim Brotherhood theorist, Sayyid Qutb, made clear in *Milestones*:<sup>35</sup> **"The chasm between Islam and Jahiliyyah is great, and a bridge is not to be built across it so that the people on the two sides may mix with each other, but only so that the people of Jahiliyyah (the time of pre-Islamic ignorance) may come over to Islam."**

And beware of “**Muslim Outreach**.” This is nothing but **thinly-disguised dawa**. In the words of Sheik Abu Saqer, leader of Gaza's Jihadia Salafiya Islamic outreach movement, in response to the Pope's invitation to Muslims to dialogue: "The only dialogue we will accept is when all other religions agree to convert to Islam."<sup>36</sup>

---

and the Muslim Students Association, with strong Muslim Brotherhood ties; admittedly, though, the book's publication preceded the Holy Land Foundation trial, in which their connections to terrorism funding were revealed.

<sup>35</sup> <http://majalla.org/books/2005/qutb-nilestone.pdf>

<sup>36</sup> <http://www.jihadwatch.org/2006/09/the-only-dialogue-we-will-accept-is-when-all-other-religions-agree-to-convert-to-islam.html>



Since interfaith dialogue is a form of *dawa*, and *dawa* is a part of *Jihad*, **if you engage in interfaith dialogue with Muslims you are actually promoting Jihad!**<sup>37</sup> Case closed.

## THREE EXAMPLES OF IN-YOUR-FACE SHAM “DIALOGUE” WITH WORLD-FAMOUS MUSLIMS

There is probably no better way to highlight the fallacy of true, constructive Interfaith Dialogue with Muslims than to expose the facts regarding **three recent high-profile and much-touted “Interfaith Dialogue” initiatives** – those of the Saudi Monarchy, the international Gulen Movement, and the main figure behind the Ground Zero Mosque initiative:

- **The King of Saudi Arabia’s Interfaith Dialogue Initiative**

The Saudis have been pushing for more dialogue between Muslims and non-Muslims. At the most recent inter-faith conference in Madrid in July 2008, King Abdullah asserted: "Islam is a religion of moderation and tolerance, **a message that calls for constructive dialogue among followers of all religions.**"

Subsequently, in October, 2008, Saudi Arabia inaugurated the King Abdullah Bin Abdulaziz International Center for Interreligious and Intercultural Dialogue in Vienna. It has now received official approval from the Consultative Assembly of Saudi Arabia (The Shura Council).<sup>38</sup>

The fact that this Center represents nothing but an outpost for dawah, or Islamic proselytizing, and deception, is **forcefully demonstrated in an interview with the former Saudi Information Minister in which he explained the purpose of the “dialogue.”**<sup>39</sup>

“We say to them: ‘You’ve changed it, and you know that the books you have are not the divine gospel and the divine Torah [because of the false

---

<sup>37</sup> McCarthy, A.C.: The Grand Jihad. NY, London, Encounter Books, 2010, chapter 5.

<sup>38</sup> <http://www.themuslimtimes.org/2012/02/religion/islam/shoura-oks-abdullah-center-for-dialogue>

<sup>39</sup> This was published by MEMRI – the Middle East Media Research Institute, May 25, 2008. Link: <http://www.memri.org/report/en/print2776.htm>

argument that over time our Judeo-Christian scriptures have been abrogated, whereas those of Islam have not.] You have changed them. You yourselves admit that your books were written by priests and others who altered them. We want to bring you back to the original religion.”

Saudi Arabia closely follows Sharia. For instance, the Saudi government will not allow the construction of churches or synagogues on its land; Jews are not permitted to travel within its borders; Bibles are banned and burned. Christians engaged in any kind of missionary activity are arrested, tortured, and sometimes killed. Muslim converts to Christianity can be put to death in the kingdom.

The **hypocrisy** of the Saudis in establishing this Center is indeed breathtaking.

- **Fethullah Gulen’s Interfaith Dialogue Movement**

Gulen<sup>40</sup> and his movement consider Outreach and Interfaith Dialogue an important part of their mission. The hollowness of Fethullah Gulen’s vision of Interfaith Dialogue can be gauged from a reading of his seminal article, ***The Necessity of Interfaith Dialogue: A Muslim Perspective***.<sup>41</sup> This essay is suffused with willful religiously-sanctioned deception - *taqiyya* and *kitman* (see Impediment #7) - as well as breathtakingly blatant hypocrisy. The deceptively disarming *People of the Book* concept (see Impediment #2) is thrust forward as a vehicle of commonality. The following quotes are extracts from this lengthy essay. Our italicized comments follow in brackets.

“...practically and historically, the Muslim world has a good record of dealing with the Jews: there has been almost no discrimination, and there has been no Holocaust, denial of basic human rights, or genocide.” [*The Muslim Brotherhood worked closely with Hitler in implementing the Final Solution. One of the key and amply-stated aims of the world-wide Islamist movement is to continue where Hitler left off.*]

“.....Islam’s being perceived by conservatives and some intellectuals as an ideology of conflict and reaction and a political system, rather than as a

---

<sup>40</sup> ***Who is Fethullah Gulen?*** He is a Turkish Islamist imam who controls a worldwide \$25 billion network of media, financial institutions, associations, foundations, and schools. In 1998, Gulen escaped to America to avoid being questioned about his attempts to overthrow Turkey’s government and transform Turkey from a secular state into an anti-US, anti-Israel Islamist theocracy, an effort that has been hugely successful to date. Secular Turks have compared him to Khomeini and fear that his return to Turkey might turn Ankara into another Tehran.

<sup>41</sup> *Fountain*, Volume 3, Issue 31, 2000, pp. 4-9. Link:  
<http://www.interfaithdialog.org/reading-room-main2menu-27/124-the-necessity-of-interfaith-dialogue-a-muslim-perspective>

religion primarily addressing one's heart, spirit, and mind.....caused Islam to be misunderstood." [*Islam has a large and critically important political component, designed with the ultimate goal of world domination.*]

"Muslims..... are remembered everywhere as symbols of safety and security. The present, distorted image of Islam... the fact that in American universities Islam is not taught as a religion in theological schools, but as a political system in the political science or international relations departments." [*The concept of Political Islam quite deliberately does not appear to have penetrated the ranks of the numerous Saudi-funded departments of Middle Eastern and related studies at US universities!*]

"Islam literally means "peace," "security," and "well-being." (Islam means "submission.") Naturally based on peace, security, and world harmony, it sees war and conflict as aberrations to be brought under control.....Islam has always breathed peace and goodness. ...." [*This is so outrageous, it requires no comment.*]

"Those who want to reform the world must first reform themselves." [*Look in the mirror, Mr. Gulen!*]

Shortly before leaving Turkey, Gulen, a master of *taqiyya*, had this to say in a secretly-recorded sermon for the Islamic takeover of the secular Turkish state:<sup>42</sup>

"You must move in the arteries of the system without anyone noticing your existence until you reach all the power centers... You must wait for the time when you are complete **and conditions are ripe, until we can shoulder the entire world and carry it...**"

"You must wait until such time as you have gotten all the state power, until you have brought to your side all the power of the constitutional institutions in Turkey ... Now, I have expressed my feelings and thoughts to you all in confidence. Know that when you leave here — as you discard your empty juice boxes, you must discard the thoughts and the feelings that I expressed here."

- **Imam Feisal Abdul Rauf – The Cordoba Initiative and the Ground Zero Mosque**

Rauf<sup>43</sup> is the chairman of what has been called the Cordoba Initiative, the aim of which has been to build an Islamic supremacist mega-mosque at Ground Zero in

---

<sup>42</sup> <http://www.theblaze.com/stories/is-muslim-cleric-running-secret-radical-islam-group-from-home-in-pa/>

Lower Manhattan. The leaders of this Initiative insist that **central to their objective is dialogue with people of other faiths** and healing of the wound jihadists inflicted upon New York and the nation on September 11, 2001. In his op-ed piece, *Building on Faith*,<sup>44</sup> Rauf states that

“...the project will amplify the multi-faith approach that the Cordoba Initiative has deployed in concrete ways for years.”

**However, under Islam, non-believers are prohibited from praying in a mosque except when invited for dawah (proselytizing).**<sup>45</sup>

In the same NY op-ed piece, Rauf states:

“Our name, Cordoba, was inspired by the city in Spain where Muslims, Christians and Jews co-existed in the Middle Ages during a period of great cultural enrichment created by Muslims. Our initiative is intended to cultivate understanding among all religions and cultures.”

However, **the Ground Zero Mosque is clearly a symbol of Muslim triumphalism** akin to those mosques built smack on the Temple Mount, or in Damascus out of the Church of St. John the Baptist, or Istanbul, where the Hagia Sophia was turned into a mosque. Those mosques were symbols of military conquest. Cordoba, itself, was the seat of the caliphate established in what is now modern Spain after the Islamic invasion from North Africa in the 8th century C.E. **The Cordoba mosque was built to celebrate the victory of Muslims over the Spanish “infidels.”**

Imam Rauf's **urging to incorporate Sharia law into the legal systems of Europe and the U.S.:** In his own book, *Islam: A Sacred Law—What Every Muslim Should Know About Sharia*<sup>46</sup> he wrote:

"And since a Shari'ah is understood as a law with God at its center, it is not possible in principle to limit the Shari'ah to some aspects of human life and leave out others."

---

<sup>43</sup> A detailed analysis of Rauf and his background can be found at the following link:

<http://pjmedia.com/blog/the-ground-zero-mosque-developer-muslim-brotherhood-roots-radical-dreams/2/>

<sup>44</sup> <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/08/opinion/08mosque.html>

<sup>45</sup> Koran (Medina) 9:17

<sup>46</sup> Feisal Abdul Rauf: *Islam: A Sacred Law—What Every Muslim Should Know About Sharia*. Threshold Books, 2000, p. 58.

An essential element of this interweaving of cultures, he says, will have to be the *incorporation of Sharia law into the legal systems of Europe and the US. Thus, Rauf supports and justifies Sharia law, and calls for restrictions on free speech in America.*

A supreme example of deception, taqiyya, can be found in another book by Rauf, ***What's Right with Islam: a New Vision for Muslims and the West.***<sup>47</sup> In it Rauf claims that

“the Constitution is based on Sharia principles and [that] Islam is based on the Golden Rule.”

(The fact that there is *no Golden Rule in Islam* is discussed in Impediment #1, below).

The Arabic translation of this book is a call to conversion from the pile of human remains at Ground Zero, disturbingly entitled, *A Call to Prayer from the World Trade Center Rubble: Islamic Dawa in the Heart of post 9/11 America.*

The *Toronto Star* has an interview with Rauf<sup>48</sup> in which he says

"Given that we are in this society, my position is that we should *practice our faith in a way that makes us seem as if we belong to this society.*"  
[This is a bald-faced ***admission of taqiyya!***].

## EXPLORING POSSIBLE IMPEDIMENTS TO REAL INTERFAITH DIALOGUE WITH MUSLIMS

The problems associated with conducting real, constructive Interfaith Dialogue with Orthodox Muslims come into focus when one discovers that there are ***at least seven Major Possible Impediments*** to this kind of “dialogue”, any single one of which could be sufficient, on its own, to call into question whether attempts at “dialogue” with Orthodox Muslims make any sense, or whether it is even simply possible. All seven, taken together, suggest that attempts at real dialogue with Orthodox Muslims could prove frustratingly futile.

---

<sup>47</sup> Feisal Abdul Rauf: *What's Right with Islam: a New Vision for Muslims and the West.* HarperCollins, 2004, reissued as *What's Right with Islam Is What's Right with America* (HarperCollins, 2005)

<sup>48</sup> <http://www.thestar.com/news/world/article/1176669--ground-zero-mosque-imam-speaks-out?bn=1>

The seven possible Impediments, which we pose as questions worthy of serious exploration, are

1. Is Islam Truly a *Religion* in the Judeo-Christian Sense of the Word?
2. Does the Koran Acknowledge the Authenticity of the Judeo-Christian Scriptures?
3. Is Genuine Debate (or Compromise) with Orthodox Muslims possible?
4. Does Islam Impose Scriptural or Legal Barriers to Free and Open Discourse?
5. Do “Moderate Islam” and “Moderate Muslims” Exist, and if so, Are They Relevant?
6. What is the Likelihood That Your Dialogue Partners are Affiliated with the Muslim Brotherhood?
7. Can You Completely Trust What is Told to You When Islamic Doctrine is in Play?

## **Impediment #1?: Is Islam Truly a Religion in the Judeo-Christian Sense of the Word?**

***Could Islam be a Supremacist Ideology? The Koran teaches the following:***

"Fight against them until idolatry [worship of any god other than Allah] is no more and [Allah's] religion [Islam] reigns **supreme**"<sup>49</sup>

***Could Islam be considered a Political Ideology?***

Ali Sina, an Iranian ex-Muslim living in Canada, states:

"Islam...is a **political ideology** of imperialism and domination in the guise of religion."<sup>50</sup>

The reason that the idea that Islam is purely a religion has been kept alive for so long is that, for most of Islam's history, the doctrine of Islam, along with its texts, has been **hidden from general view and has thus evaded scrutiny**. The decision to suppress critical thinking and questioning of the “religion” within Islam was made many years ago to keep the clerics in power. Non-Muslim populations were told that Islam was beyond their capacity to understand. Muslims knew that if the truth were revealed, it could not stand critical examination. However, the

---

<sup>49</sup> Koran (Medina) 2:193

<sup>50</sup> <http://www.faithfreedom.org/oped/sina51007.htm>

renewed *Jihad* on the West and the large-scale importation of Islam to the West in recent years through mass immigration have prompted the desire by non-Muslims to revisit the true tenets of Islam. In this regard, access to the Internet has been a real game-changer.

Islam is, in fact, treated primarily as a political ideology, ***not a religion, by Italy***, which has denied Islam religious status for tax purposes.<sup>51</sup> More recently, and closer to home (Detroit, Michigan), it has been argued in court by government officials that ***Islam is “political”!!***. The Detroit Transit Authority (SMART), a government entity, argued before the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals in July, 2012, that freedom fighter and activist Pamela Geller's organization's "Leaving Islam?" ad was political because Islam is political.<sup>52</sup>

Rebecca Bynum,<sup>53</sup> American writer, political analyst and researcher, has devoted an entire book (*Allah is Dead: Why Islam is Not a Religion*) to this subject. She focuses on the question: Does Islam qualify? Her conclusions to the contrary make for interesting reading and are summarized by Janet Levy in her review of the book.<sup>54</sup>

The following statements in support of the idea that Islam is primarily a political ideology are excerpted from Dutch Member of Parliament and champion of free speech Geert Wilders's very compelling book, *Marked for Death: Islam's War Against the West and Me*.<sup>55</sup> (The emphases are ours):

“Islam as a whole, says Darwish, [Nonie Darwish is a celebrated Egyptian-born ex-Muslim writer and commentator] is ‘a political and legal system of totalitarian control.... The most glaring evidence that Islam is hardly a ‘religion’ is in its ***apostasy law***—the order to kill those who leave it. *That immediately moved Islam from the realm of religion to the realm of totalitarian political ideology.*”

---

<sup>51</sup> [http://atlasshrugs2000.typepad.com/atlas\\_shrugs/2010/08/italy-islam-not-recognized-as-a-religion-denied-religious-tax-status.html](http://atlasshrugs2000.typepad.com/atlas_shrugs/2010/08/italy-islam-not-recognized-as-a-religion-denied-religious-tax-status.html)

<sup>52</sup> <http://www.wnd.com/2012/07/government-argues-that-islam-is-political/>

<sup>53</sup> Rebecca Bynum, Publisher and Sr. Managing editor for the popular Anglo-American web magazine, *New English Review*, is an American writer, political analyst and researcher. She currently serves as Secretary of World Encounter Institute. Formerly News Editor and Board member of Jihad Watch.

<sup>54</sup> <http://www.ruthfullyyours.com/2011/08/15/what-defines-religion-a-review-of-rebecca-bynums-book-by-janet-levy/>

<sup>55</sup> **Geert Wilders: Marked for Death: Islam's War Against the West and Me**<sup>55</sup> (Regnery Publishing, Inc., Washington, DC, 2012, pp. 68-70).



“It is crucial for the West to understand **why Islam is not a true religion**—it is because Islam rejects the principle of voluntarism that is common to all authentic religions. Whereas Christianity and *other religions lay obligations only on their own members who have voluntarily joined the faith, Islam levels commands even at non-Muslims and orders them to submit.*”

“Darwish also points to another characteristic of authentic religions that Islam lacks: **it does not teach the golden rule**—that we should treat others as we would have them treat us. Instead, Islam institutionalizes inequality, sanctioning discrimination against certain groups of people such as women and non-Muslims.”

“Overall, Islam fails four major tests that religions should fulfill:

1. Adherence to the religion must be a personal choice.
2. No religion should demand that those who leave it be killed.
3. A religion must never mandate the killing and subjugation of those who choose not to belong.
4. A religion must be in accord with basic human rights.”

## ***The Golden Rule***

Every child with a Jewish education knows the great Jewish sage Hillel’s version of the ‘Golden Rule’ common to most religions. Asked by a Roman, a prospective convert to Judaism, to teach him the entire Torah “while standing on one leg”, Hillel responded, “**Do not do to others what would be hateful if done to you.** That is the whole of the Torah. All the rest is commentary. Now go and study.”<sup>56</sup>

***To Islam, The Golden Rule is blasphemy.***<sup>57</sup>

The absence of the Golden Rule is expressed most blatantly by **the obsessive focus on the Kafir (Infidel), in Islam’s Holy Texts**. Islam does not, unlike Judaism and Christianity, subscribe to the notion of brotherly love and the equality of Man. *Throughout the Trilogy, a very sharp distinction is drawn between Muslims and non-Muslims (Kafirs, or infidels), the latter being considered inferior to Muslims and treated accordingly in Sharia law.* The extreme importance accorded to the *Kafir* in the Trilogy is reflected in the enormous amount of verbiage accorded this subject. *The percentages of the text of the Trilogy devoted to the Kafir, listed by Dr. Bill Warner in his article Statistical Islam,*<sup>58</sup> *are indeed staggering:*

<sup>56</sup> Babylonian Talmud, Shabbat 31a

<sup>57</sup> <http://www.politicalislam.com/blog/you-can-never-awaken-a-man-who-is/>

<sup>58</sup> [http://www.cspipublishing.com/statistical/pdf/Statistical\\_Islam.pdf](http://www.cspipublishing.com/statistical/pdf/Statistical_Islam.pdf)



- **Koran: 64%**
- **Hadith: 37%**
- **Sira: 81%**
- **Trilogy as a whole: 60%**

There is simply no other religion on earth that draws such sharp distinction between its own members and others, or devotes as much time of its holist text toward condemning and dehumanizing those who merely choose not to follow its dogma. Thus: ***The dualistic nature of Islamic scripture and law.***

***The Koran is peppered throughout with verses that underpin this hierarchy.***

To quote them all would require a book 64% the length of the Koran. We need look no further, however, than the very first sura of the Koran, the ***Al-Fatiha***. Al-Fatiha is as central to Islamic devotion as the Lord's Prayer is to Christians and is *recited at least 17 times a day as part of daily Muslim prayers.*<sup>59</sup> Often described as a blessing, Al-Fatiha has a sting in its tail. After introductory praises, it ends with these words:

“Keep us on the right path. The path of those upon whom Thou hast bestowed favors. ***Not (the path) of those upon whom Thy wrath is brought down, nor of those who go astray.***”<sup>60</sup>

*Who are the ones who are said to be under Allah's wrath or to have gone astray from his straight path?* According to the revered commentator Ibn Kathir, Muhammad gave the answer: "Those who have earned the anger are the Jews, and those who are led astray are the Christians." So, according to Muhammad himself, this prayer ***castigates Christians as misguided and Jews as objects of Allah's wrath.***

This duality is also reflected in the ***Hadiths***. For example: While a Muslim may be punished with death for murdering a fellow Muslim,<sup>61</sup> ***no Muslim can be put to death for killing a non-Muslim.***<sup>62</sup>

Compelling as the foregoing arguments are – that Islam is primarily a political ideology – they pale in comparison to its ***long and bloody history***, driven by its supremacist, expansionist – indeed, imperialistic – ***Jihadist imperative:***

---

<sup>59</sup> *Al-Fatiha* is recited 2 times in the morning pray, 4 times at midday pray, 4 times in the afternoon, 3 times at sunset, and 4 times at night.

[http://numerical19.tripod.com/al-fatiha\\_omer.htm](http://numerical19.tripod.com/al-fatiha_omer.htm)

<sup>60</sup> Koran (Medina) 1:6-7

<sup>61</sup> Bukhari 83:17

<sup>62</sup> Bukhari 83:50

According to the Koran, it is the duty of every Muslim who is able to wage war to make Islam supreme in the world. The Koran, in fact, contains numerous passages that command relentless war against non-Muslims, everywhere and for all time. No comparable commands or exhortations exist in either the Jewish or Christian scriptures. In fact the ***Koran contains no fewer than 164 Jihad verses.***<sup>63</sup>

- Probably the most notorious Jihad verses are those found in Surah 9. The key verse is the ***Verse of the Sword***,<sup>64</sup> that commands Muslims “*to fight and slay the Pagans wherever ye find them, And seize them. Beleaguer them, And lie in wait for them in every stratagem (of war)...*”, until they convert to Islam.
- *The Koran commands Muslims to make war upon “People of the Book [Christians and Jews], Until they pay the Jizya<sup>65</sup> With willing submission, And feel themselves subdued.”*<sup>66</sup>

While the Koran does contain verses that refer to spiritual striving, it makes clear that ***“fight[ing] in the cause of Allah” is the highest form of jihad.***

- The Koran states: “Not equal are those believers who sit (at home)...[a]nd those who strive and fight in the cause of Allah....Allah hath granted a grade higher to those who strive and fight...than to those who sit (at home). *Unto all (in faith) hath Allah promised good: But those who strive and fight hath He distinguished above those who sit (at home) by a great reward.*”<sup>67</sup>

Whereas the word jihad has throughout the centuries simply meant armed warfare on behalf of Islam, in recent years ***American students have been taught the Sufi interpretation of jihad*** – Sufis make up perhaps one percent of the Islamic world and are often seen as heretics<sup>68</sup> with aberrant interpretations – which portray jihad as a “spiritual struggle” against one’s vices.<sup>69</sup> This is also frequently used as a talking point by Muslims in “interfaith dialogue” to paint jihad as benign. However, *Using a simple counting method shows that 3% of the*

---

<sup>63</sup> [http://www.answering-islam.org/Quran/Themes/jihad\\_passages.html](http://www.answering-islam.org/Quran/Themes/jihad_passages.html)

<sup>64</sup> Koran (Medina) 9:5

<sup>65</sup> The **Jizya** is the tax imposed on non-Muslims in countries run by Muslims.

<sup>66</sup> Koran (Medina) 9:29

<sup>67</sup> Koran (Medina) 4:95

<sup>68</sup> The vehemence with which Sufi Islam is denied validity by mainstream Islamic groups is illustrated in this report of the near-demolition of a Sufi shrine in Libya:

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-19380083?print=true>

<sup>69</sup> <http://www.meforum.org/3182/history-muslim-conquests>.

*hadiths are about the inner struggle, whereas, 97% of the hadiths are about jihad as war.*<sup>70</sup>

## **A CLOSER LOOK AT THE PURELY “RELIGIOUS” COMPONENT OF ISLAM:**

### ***Can the purely “religious” aspects of Islam truly be separated from the political component?***

Islam does contain rituals of worship – the so-called **Five Pillars of Islam**. These duties do not require, nor do they promote, moral development. Those who confine their observance to the Five Pillars are what some in the West call ‘moderate’ Muslims.

The Five Pillars of Islam are:

1. Faith (iman) in the oneness of Allah and the finality of the prophethood of Muhammad (indicated by the declaration - the **Shahadah** - that, "There is no God but Allah and Muhammad is the messenger of Allah").
2. Keeping of the five scheduled daily prayers (**Salat**).
3. Almsgiving (**Zakat**).
4. Fasting (**Sawm**) during Ramadan.
5. Pilgrimage to Mecca (**Hajj**) for those who are able.

The second through fifth pillars - prayer, almsgiving, fasting, pilgrimage - are aspects that, in general, are shared by many religions. However, those in Islam differ in important respects from those in other religions, and are **not all as benign as they would seem to be**. For example:

- Demands are made by Muslims for **special accommodations in the workplace** that are disruptive and entail taking time off from work to pray or go on the *Hajj* (This aspect is dealt with fully in our companion Guide, *Workplace Accommodations for Muslims in America: An Employer’s Survival Guide*, retrievable from the home page of [www.SneakyIslam.com](http://www.SneakyIslam.com).)

---

<sup>70</sup> <http://www.politicalislam.com/blog/statistics-and-the-meaning-of-islam/>

- There is the aggressive practice adopted by some Muslim communities to carry out their prayer rituals in the streets of predominantly non-Muslim towns in Great Britain and Europe, **blocking traffic**; the call to prayer by the *muezzin* from the minaret creates **noise disturbances** where mosques are built in such environments.<sup>71</sup>
- More disturbingly, if one takes **a closer look at zakat**,<sup>72</sup> one finds that: Muslims are taught that charity means Muslims aiding Muslims, for the purpose of fortifying and extending the ummah (the global Muslim community) until all the world is Islam's domain. "Of their wealth, take alms," instructs Allah in the Koran (9:103), "that so thou mightest purify and sanctify them." Thus, **zakat may be given only to Muslims**.

**Beware: Zakat is not "charity" as Westerners understand that term. Zakat is only for Muslims, and is used to finance Jihad**

".....**an essential purpose of zakat is to underwrite jihad**. Americans see it as a dangerous fraud when Islamic charities are used as fronts for terrorist organizations. In mainstream Islam, however, there is no fraud at all — not if your understanding of "charity" is *zakat*.

It is obligatory," according to *Reliance of the Traveller*, "to distribute one's *zakat* among eight categories of recipients, one-eighth of the *zakat* to each category." The manual goes on to describe these categories, the seventh of which is "those fighting for Allah, meaning people engaged in Islamic military operations for whom no salary has been allotted in the army roster."

---

<sup>71</sup> <http://www.cbn.com/cbnnews/world/2010/August/Islamization-of-Paris-a-Warning-to-the-West/>

<sup>72</sup> <http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/265509/zakat-not-charity-concept-understood-west-andrew-c-mccarthy#>

## ***How many principles consistent with Judeo-Christian precepts of morality are actually in the Koran?***

***Does the Koran subscribe to the Ten Commandments?*** Craig Winn,<sup>73</sup> in his monumental work, *Muhammad - Prophet of Doom*, answers this question for us (emphases added):

"Curiously, ***the Islamic god's guidance has failed to include any of the Ten Commandments*** - odd in that he claimed to have written the Torah. In fact, his messenger would systematically violate all of them. He placed Allah before Yahweh. He turned a graven image, a Black Stone, into a god. He bowed down, prostrating himself to the former idol. He created a false doctrine. He renounced the Sabbath. He rebuked his father and mother and severed family ties. He committed murder and adultery countless times. Stealing became his passion; he called it booty. He bore false witness and became one of history's most egregious cons. Coveting money, power, and sex drove him to create Islam. ***Muhammad couldn't have done more violence to the core teaching of the Torah if he had tried.***"<sup>74</sup>

Dr. Bill Warner expands on this further.<sup>75</sup>

*"If you have read the Koran, you are already better informed of its contents than the majority of Muslims. Indeed, many Muslims have been genuinely surprised when I have apprised them of the verses preaching war, intolerance, hatred of Jews and Christians, misogyny, cruel punishments, etc. When you do read the Koran, read it with a highlighter in hand, and mark or underline the passages which preach intolerance, or which reveal injustice, cruelty and violence, absurdities, insults to women, contradictions, anti-Semitism, homophobic attitudes, superstitions, and, to be scrupulously fair, passages which teach morally acceptable principles. Someone has already undertaken just such a task:<sup>76</sup> "Our diligent skeptic found 511 passages of injustice, 384 of intolerance,*

---

<sup>73</sup> Craig Winn is an American author and former businessman. He has self-published six books, including several on terrorism and Islam, each of which has been made available free on the internet. After the events of September 11th, Winn began a research project with colleague Ken Power to "uncover the roots of terrorism."

<sup>74</sup> Craig Winn: *Muhammad - Prophet of Doom. Islam's Terrorist Dogma In Muhammad's Own Words*. Cricketsong Books, 2004, p. 205. This book is also down-loadable from the Internet:

[http://prophetofdoom.net/Prophet\\_of\\_Doom\\_Islams\\_Terrorist\\_Dogma\\_in\\_Muhammads\\_Own\\_Words.Islam](http://prophetofdoom.net/Prophet_of_Doom_Islams_Terrorist_Dogma_in_Muhammads_Own_Words.Islam)

<sup>75</sup> <http://www.politicalislam.com/pdf/WebSitePDF/CanWeTalk.pdf>

<sup>76</sup> <http://www.skepticsannotatedbible.com/quran/int/long.html>

*320 of cruelty and violence, 46 insults to women and just 60 passages of morally acceptable principles.” [Less than 5% of it!]*

The perception in today’s politically-correct Western world, that Islam is, in its essence, but a *peaceful religion*, stifles criticism of Islam in the mainstream media. As Dr. Bill Warner puts it:

“People do not think of Islam as a political system, but a religion. **You cannot criticize religion, so you cannot criticize Islam.** This gets Political Islam off the hook.”

### ***Could Islam be considered a Domsday Cult?***

A **doomsday cult is defined as** the cult-following of a leader who has tendencies to announce that the end is nigh, or a group of people who, using any of the fallacies above, have come to the group decision that the world will end on a specific date or just plain soon.<sup>77</sup> Michael Shermer has an excellent definition of a cult that we will borrow from for clarification of the term.<sup>78</sup> The characteristics include the veneration, inerrancy, and omniscience of the leader; the person is the best and never wrong, about anything. *The group employs persuasive techniques to gain and retain membership. They have hidden agendas and employ deceit and often include exploitation of group members including financial resources and sexual favors.* A final component of these groups is that they have discovered, as a whole, absolute truth and morality.

***Why would you choose to “dialogue” with people whose scripture (almost two-thirds of it!) is focused on your wickedness and inferior worth as a person?***

This crucial question brings us to a discussion of possible Impediment number 2:

### **Impediment #2?: Does the Koran Acknowledge the Authenticity of the Judeo-Christian Scriptures?**

<sup>77</sup> This aspect dovetails in with the global belief of the imminent return of the Mahdi.

<sup>78</sup> Shermer, M.: *Why People Believe Weird Things*. NY, W.H. Freeman & Co., 1997, 119-120.

If such an Impediment to genuine dialogue indeed exists, it could truly be said to be one of Biblical proportions. How, you might ask, could such an assertion be true, considering ***the commonality of the Abrahamic faiths***,<sup>79,80</sup> the idea that ***we all worship the same god***, and the fact that Muslims call us (Jews and Christians) the ***People of the Book (Ahl al Kitab)***.

The evidence for the denial by Islam of the authenticity of the Judeo-Christian scriptures is actually very strong. Let us explore this:

The key points relating to Impediment #2 are clearly stated by Dr. Bill Warner:<sup>81</sup>

“The concept of ***the commonality of the Abrahamic faiths is purely an Islamic assertion, without evidence***. Judaism and Christianity share the Hebrew Bible as being valid scripture. ***Islam denies the validity of the Hebrew Bible.***”

## ***Islam an Abrahamic religion?***

***Not in the way you think.....***

The Medinan Koran (3:67) tells us that ***Abraham was a Muslim. Thus, according to Islam, all the “Abrahamic religions” are offshoots of Islam:***

“Abraham was neither a Jew nor a Christian, but he was an upright man, one inclining toward truth, a Muslim [submitting to Allah].”

Dr. Bill Warner gives us another explanation of ***why the Abrahamic Religions concept in regard to Islam is flawed:***

“The story of Abraham and Ishmael is told by Christians and Jews to

---

<sup>79</sup> The idea of the commonality of the “Abrahamic faiths” has spawned organizations such as *The Daughters of Abraham*, established shortly after 9-11, and which meets in cities across the US and Canada. This is, no doubt, a decidedly “schmoozy” organization!

<sup>80</sup> The myth of the commonality of the so-called Abrahamic faiths has spawned delusional books such as *Three Testaments*, a veritable textbook for “schmoozers.” (Brown, BA: Three Testaments: Torah, Gospel, and Quran. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2012.)

<sup>81</sup> <http://www.politicalislam.com/pdf/WebSitePDF/CanWeTalk.pdf>



authenticate Arabic culture and give it a tie-in to Kafir culture. it is usually a weak form of dhimmitude<sup>82</sup> akin to the Abrahamic religions myth. The core of the myth is told in the Koran about how Adam built the Kabah at Mecca. It was the first house of worship. Then Abraham brought Ishmael to Mecca, prepared to perform the sacrifice demanded by God. Ishmael was left in Mecca with his mother, Hagar. Mohammed uses this myth to tie in the Arabs to the Jews. It was part of his early attempt to prove his prophethood by his being an inheritor of the Jewish tradition. But the story of Arabs being the children of Ishmael and Abraham does not match with actual history. We find in the Sira a very detailed history of Mecca at the time of Mohammed right down to the names of individuals, their children and wives. Arabs were very keen on family relationships. A person's very name gave you his father's or son's name and a chain of relationships. One of the things that infuriated the Meccans about Mohammed was that he said their ancestors were in hell because they were not Muslims. There must be a thousand names in the Sira and not a single person in Mohammed's Arabia is named Abraham, Ishmael, or Hagar. Not one. Why? They had no knowledge about any relationship between the Arabs and Abraham. The Arabs were deeply into genealogy and they knew of the Jews and Abraham, but they made no claim of kinship with their names. It was **Mohammed who created the myth that all Arabs had blood ties to the Jews through Ishmael.** Only after Mohammed did Jewish names become common amongst Arabs."<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> **Dhimmitude:** The Islamic system of governing populations conquered by *jihad* wars. After the jihad concludes in a given area with the conquest of infidel territory, the *dhimma*, or treaty of protection, may be granted to the conquered "People of the Book" -- historically, Jews, Christians, and Zoroastrians. The *dhimma* provides that the life and property of the infidel are exempted from jihad for as long as the Muslim rulers permit, which has generally meant for as long as the subject non-Muslims -- the *dhimmi* -- prove economically useful to the Islamic state. The Koran spells out the payment of the jizya (poll- or head-tax; Sura 9:29), which is the most conspicuous means by which the Muslim overlords exploit the *dhimmi*. Islamic law codifies various other restrictions on the *dhimmi*, all of which derive from the Koran and the Sunnah. *Dhimmis* are prohibited (among other things) from building churches, raising the cross in an Islamic assemblage, displaying banners on their own holidays, bearing arms, or keeping them in their homes.

Should the *dhimmi* violate the conditions of the *dhimma* -- perhaps through practicing his own religion indiscreetly or failing to show adequate deference to a Muslim -- then the jihad resumes. By refusing to convert to Islam and straying from the traditional constraints of the *dhimma*, the *dhimmi* has implicitly chosen the only other option permitted by the Koran: death.

<sup>83</sup> <http://www.politicalislam.com/pdf/WebSitePDF/CanWeTalk.pdf>



## ***Islam an Abrahamic religion?***

***Genesis provides an unflattering and prophetic picture of Ishmael, son of Abraham, and the supposed progenitor of the Muslims:***

Genesis 12: He [Ishmael] will be a wild donkey of a man; ***his hand will be against everyone and everyone's hand against him, and he will live in hostility toward all his brothers.***

The true legacy of Abraham, that of the Covenant, runs through the offspring of ISAAC and JACOB, on through the house of DAVID.

“Islam appropriates the Biblical prophets and Jesus and claims that they were Muslims who taught Islam, and that their followers wickedly rejected the truth and twisted and hijacked their teachings to create Judaism and Christianity. The Qur'anic view is that Judaism and Christianity are thus ***illegitimate, renegade, false religions*** arising from the corruption of the true messages of Moses and Jesus. This reflects a common Islamic supremacist tendency to deny any achievement and even any history to the Infidel, and to recognize the legitimacy only of Islam.”

**Regarding Bible Corruption:** Christians may well ask:

How do Muslims know that the Christian revelation is corrupted? ***Where is the evidence to support that statement?*** Christians have always believed Jesus to be the Son of God, who died on the cross, and rose again in three days. This was accepted and believed by Christians before, during and after Mohammed's time. So where exactly did the alleged "corruption" take place, and what form did it take?

***Do we “all worship the same god”?*** Again, Dr. Bill Warner effectively answers this question:

“The Koran repeatedly says that the scriptures of the Jews and Christians are corrupt and filled with errors. **The Koran defines Allah. The Hebrew Bible defines the Jewish God.** Allah condemns, rails against and curses the Jews, but the God of the Hebrew Bible loves the Jews. The Christian God is defined by the New Testament and loves humanity. Allah does not love humanity, but hates the *Kafirs* (non-Muslims) and only loves Muslims. The Koran insists that Jesus was not divine, was not crucified and was not resurrected. The Koran says that the Christian Trinity is God, Mary and Jesus and then adds that there is no

Trinity. The Koran rejects every principle of Christianity. The Jesus of the Koran is called Isa. Isa is not Jesus. And in the same way, the Musa of the Koran is not the Moses of the Torah. Every single 'prophet' of the Koran that has a Jewish name is not actually the same prophet of the Torah."

*The name Allah is a reconstruction of the word Al-ilah or the god. The only god Mohammed knew anything about was the moon god Hubal, worshipped by him and his tribe, the Quraysh, along with the black stone, still in situ, for Muslims to venerate or kiss, as practiced by the prophet of Islam.*<sup>84</sup> Mohammed elevated his god to be the one god of the Kaaba, giving it the same "feel" as the Christian and Jewish God, but in reality was not. Only Muslims worship at **the Kaaba. It has no religious significance at all with Jews or Christians, when it should have, if Allah were the same god.** Why is a pre-Islamic pagan idol still there in the Kaaba, when according to Islamic thought, pagan practice is totally forbidden?

Chapter 9 of the Koran is the one place where Muslims are directed explicitly to make war against and subjugate Jews and Christians – the "**People of the Book**," who once subjugated enter the dhimma, the protection of the Muslims, and become dhimmis, protected (or guilty) people:

"Fight those who believe not in Allah nor the Last Day, nor hold that forbidden which hath been forbidden by Allah and His Messenger [i.e. Islamic law], nor acknowledge the religion of Truth [i.e. Islam], from the people of the book [i.e. Jews and Christians], until they pay tribute with willing submission, and feel themselves utterly subdued."<sup>85</sup>

So, we see that the designation People of the Book is anything but a "term of endearment." The People of the Book are addressed in the Koran as **non-believers**.<sup>86</sup>

*The following extracts taken directly from **Reliance of the Traveller** are **direct evidence** for the existence of what we have raised as a possible 2<sup>nd</sup> Impediment to real dialogue with Orthodox Muslims:*

".....printing the Torah or New Testament, which is invalid because the Jews and Christians have altered the texts and interpolated spurious material,...."<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup> Craig Winn: Muhammad - Prophet of Doom. Islam's Terrorist Dogma In Muhammad's Own Words. Cricketsong Books, 2004, p. 120.

<sup>85</sup> Koran (Medina) 9:29

<sup>86</sup> Koran (Medina) 3:65-66

<sup>87</sup> Reliance of the Traveller k30.6(6)

“Previously revealed religions were valid in their own eras, as is attested to by many verses of the Holy Koran, but were abrogated by the universal message of Islam, as is equally attested to by many verses of the Koran.”<sup>88</sup>

### ***Now, what does Islam consider the greatest sin of all?***

Could it possibly be that Orthodox Muslims not only deny the authenticity of Jesus as portrayed in the New Testament, but also find it **offensive in the extreme**? In fact, they find it so offensive that it has been labeled as the **greatest sin of all**. The name for this sin, that is elevated above all others in Islam, is called **Shirk**.<sup>89,90,91,92</sup> **Shirk is the association of partners with Allah** – i.e., calling Jesus the Son of God. This is expressed in a Hadith from Bukhari:

Narrated 'Abdullah:

I or somebody, asked Allah's Apostle "Which is the biggest sin in the Sight of Allah?" He said, "That you set up a rival (in worship) to Allah though He Alone created you."<sup>93</sup>

Worse still: Shirk is not only unforgivable, it is **the ONLY unforgivable sin**:

"And invoke not besides Allah any that will neither profit you nor hurt you, but if (in case) you did so, you shall certainly be one of the polytheists and

---

<sup>88</sup> Reliance of the Traveller w4.1 (2)

<sup>89</sup> <http://www.scribd.com/doc/100244896/Explaining-Shirk-the-Greatest-Sin-Shaikh-Muhammad-Ibn-S%28%81ih-al-Uthaym%28%ABn>

<sup>90</sup> <http://www.missionislam.com/knowledge/Shirk.htm>

<sup>91</sup> <http://sinsinislam.wordpress.com/2011/12/28/the-greatest-sin-shirk-with-allaah-by-abu-hafsah-kashiff-khan/>

<sup>92</sup> <http://islam44.blogspot.com/2011/08/shirk-is-biggest-sin-in-islam.html>

<sup>93</sup> Sahih Bukhari: Volume 6, Book 60, Number 284

wrong doers. And if Allah touches you with hurt, **there is none who can remove it but He**; and if He intends any good for you, there is none who can repel His favors which He causes it to reach whomsoever of His slaves He wills. And He is the Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful"<sup>94</sup>

"Verily **Allah forgives not** setting up partners in worship with Him. But He forgives whom He pleases, sins other than that (shirk)"<sup>95</sup>

"Verily whosoever sets up partners in worship with Allah, then **Allah Has forbidden paradise for him and the fire will be his abode**"<sup>96</sup>

### ***Is Christianity sanctioned by the Koran?***

"...infidels are they who say Allah is one of three,"<sup>97</sup> [in reference to the Christian concept of Trinity.]

"[i]nfidels are they who say Allah is the Christ, son of Mary."<sup>98</sup>

"[T]he Christians say the Christ is the son of Allah ... may Allah's curse be upon them."<sup>99</sup>

***Christians believe that Jesus was one with God and died on the cross. How could we, your proposed dialogue partners, be the "worst of mankind" – even more so than those who commit genocide of millions?***

***Why would you choose to "dialogue" with people whose scripture disfigures - indeed corrupts - yours and denies its authenticity? At a minimum, wouldn't you want to verify that your prospective dialogue partners recognize***

---

<sup>94</sup> Koran (Mecca):106-107

<sup>95</sup> Koran (Medina) 4:116

<sup>96</sup> Koran (Medina) 5:72

<sup>97</sup> Koran (Medina): 5:73

<sup>98</sup> Koran (Medina) 5:72

<sup>99</sup> Koran (Medina): 9:30

***your religion as legitimate before embarking on your “dialogue” exercise?***

### **Impediment #3?: Is Genuine Debate (or Compromise) with Orthodox Muslims possible?**

***An examination of Muslim Psychology provides answers to these questions:***

Noted Danish psychologist and author, Nicolai Sennels, points out major differences between people brought up as Muslims (whether in Muslim countries or as expatriates outside the Muslim world) and those who are brought up as Westerners).<sup>100</sup> These differences make ***discussion or debate with orthodox Muslims a potentially very uncomfortable and frustrating experience*** – one enough to raise one’s blood pressure:

Westerners are brought up to think of anger as a sign of weakness, powerlessness and lack of self-control. In Muslim culture, anger is seen as a sign of strength. To Muslims, ***being aggressive is in itself an argument*** and a way of gaining respect. Among Westerners it is seen as a sign of strength if people are able to meet criticism calmly and with logical arguments and knowledge, while Muslims see it as honorable if they meet criticism with aggressive and even violent behavior. They see non-aggressive responses to this as a sign of a vulnerability that is to be exploited. ***They do not (as Westerners do) interpret a peaceful response as an invitation to enter into a dialogue, diplomacy, intellectual debate, compromise or peaceful coexistence. Muslims have very fragile egos and are very vulnerable to criticism.***

***“.....Islam has no compromises to make. Islam is perfect and has nothing to learn or adopt from Kafir civilization. The Islamic positions are perfect because they are based upon the Sunna of Mohammed. A compromise with Kafirs is a compromise with evil and ignorance.”***<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup> <http://www.jihadwatch.org/2012/04/robert-spencer-interviews-nicolai-sennels-muslims-are-taught-to-be-aggressive-insecure-irresponsible.html>

<sup>101</sup> <http://www.politicalislam.com/pdf/WebSitePDF/CanWeTalk.pdf>

***There is no word for compromise in Arabic as understood in Western culture.***

***Why would you choose to “dialogue” with people to whom true compromise is anathema?***

***Without the possibility of compromise, productive interfaith dialogue with Orthodox Muslims is a pipe-dream.***

An interesting interchange between two prominent intellectuals on the concept of compromise in Arab/Muslim culture illustrates this point.<sup>102</sup>

Intimately linked with Muslim psychology and the lack of compromise in Muslim culture is the ***impossibility of genuine debate with Orthodox Muslims***, another major impediment to real interfaith dialogue.

The following is from internationally-respected scholar of Islam, Robert Spencer's, Jihad Watch:<sup>103</sup>

“Although in this post I recount personal experiences, it isn't really a personal story. Virtually every non-Muslim who has ever engaged an Islamic supremacist in discussion or debate will have the same experience. The Islamic supremacist will:

- Charge the non-Muslim with ignorance.
- Charge the non-Muslim with dishonesty.
- Engage in often quite vicious personal attacks against the non-Muslim.
- Repeatedly fail to restate or summarize the non-Muslim's position accurately.
- Never actually prove his claims either about the non-Muslim's arguments, or about Islam itself.

"It has long been established that Islamic supremacists and their Leftist allies will not debate me.....They know that what I say about Islam and jihad is true, and don't want that fact to be illustrated to a wider audience.

---

<sup>102</sup> Does the Concept of “Compromise” Exist in the Arab Psyche? – A Personal Observation, by David Elazar (Rishon LeZion, Israel, June 2002):

<https://sites.google.com/site/mtevansco/Home/arab-palestinian-conflict-with-israel/compromise-and-the-arabs>

<sup>103</sup> <http://www.jihadwatch.org/2012/01/why-cant-muslims-debate-again.html>

"Why can't Muslims debate? Because the truth is something they don't generally wish the Infidels to know. **So they do all they can to shut down those Infidels by other means.**"

This leads us to another reason why Muslims can't debate - our next **Impediment**, the injunction against critical thinking as enshrined and codified in Sharia law.

## **Impediment #4?: Does Islam Impose Scriptural or Legal Barriers to Free and Open Discourse?**

**The answer to this question comes directly from Islam's holy texts. They plainly show that *Islam doesn't encourage critical thinking.***

Islam has no natural theology, only a series of laws declared by fiat. In some contemporary forms of Islam, hardly any premium is put on reasoning -- after all, ***the Koran itself warns Muslims not to question:***<sup>104</sup>

"O believers, question not concerning things which, if they were revealed to you, would vex you; yet if you question concerning them when the Koran is being sent down, they will be revealed to you. God has effaced those things; for God is All-forgiving, All-clement."

The fact that Islam is more a political ideology than a religion also explains why theology (the study of religion) is not popular in Islam. ....at al-Azhar University, the **teaching of philosophy is explicitly forbidden** because it 'leads the faithful astray from the right path of faith.' In Islam, theology and philosophy are widely rejected, as are rationalism and the spirit of free inquiry."

Dr. Bill Warner in *Can we Talk?*<sup>105</sup> "Common sense" or "universal opinion" has little to do with **Islam's notions of right and wrong**. Only what Allah (through the Quran) and his prophet Muhammad (through the Hadith) have to say about any given issue matters; and how Islam's greatest theologians and jurists – collectively known as the ulema, literally, "they who know" – have articulated it.

Luckily, because all of the bad stuff in the Koran has been interpreted in the Sharia, we don't need to worry about interpretation. The Sharia says that the verses about fighting in Allah's cause means killing Kafirs. There is no "bad stuff"

---

<sup>104</sup> Koran (Medina) 5:101

<sup>105</sup> <http://www.politicalislam.com/pdf/WebSitePDF/CanWeTalk.pdf>

in the Koran. The Koran is crystal clear in its nature. The fact that violence is repeatedly preached in the Koran does not make the Koran bad.

Everything in the Koran is pure Islamic goodness. Jihad is part of that Islamic goodness. **Indeed, the entire concept of “good” and “bad” is un-Islamic.** In contrast, Islam is based upon what is permitted and not permitted.”

**Beware the Semantic Trap: Islam defines words differently than the rest of us!**

An example is the yawning gap between Western and Islamic concepts of **freedom**, which is **hurriya** in Arabic. *Hurriya means “perfect slavery” – following Islamic law slavishly throughout one’s life.*<sup>106</sup>

Another example is the concept of "**innocents**." You are innocent if you are a Muslim. Then you are innocent in the eyes of God. If you are not a Muslim, then you are guilty of not believing in God. **Non-Muslims are never innocent**, they are guilty of denying Allah and his prophet."<sup>107</sup>

What does Islam mean by **peace**? Islam is a religion of peace that will come when everyone is Muslim or at least subject to the Islamic state. And **to establish that peace, Muslims must wage war.**<sup>108</sup>

### Enshrined in Islamic Law:

**The following direct quotations from Reliance of the Traveller further emphasize Impediment #3:**

“The good is not what reason considers good, nor the bad what reason considers bad. *The measure of good and bad, according to this school of thought, is the Sacred Law, not reason.*”<sup>109</sup>

“Unlawful knowledge includes: (2) philosophy (discussion in w10.0: “.....attempts to solve ultimate questions about man, God, life after death, and so forth, without the divinely revealed guidance of the Koran and sunna.)”<sup>110</sup>

<sup>106</sup> <http://pjmedia.com/blog/spring-time-for-sharia-in-araby/>

<sup>107</sup> <http://www.jihadwatch.org/2008/04/uk-imam-non-muslims-are-never-innocent-they-are-guilty-of-denying-allah-and-his-prophet.html>

<sup>108</sup> Spencer, R.: The Politically Incorrect Guide to Islam (and the Crusades). Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing Co, 2005, p. 42.

<sup>109</sup> Reliance of the Traveller p. 2 a1.4

<sup>110</sup> Reliance of the Traveller p. 14 a7.2



“to deny any verse of the Koran or anything which by scholarly consensus belongs to it, or to add a verse that does not belong to it;”<sup>111</sup>

“The man most hated by Allah is the obstinate arguer.”<sup>112</sup> and “**Arguing over the Koran is unbelief.**” (An enormity is defined as “...any sin entailing either a threat of punishment in the hereafter explicitly mentioned by the Koran or hadith, a prescribed legal penalty (hadd), or being accursed by Allah or His Messenger....”)<sup>113</sup>

“The Prophet.... Said, “Whoever speaks of the Book of Allah from his own opinion is in error.”<sup>114</sup>

“Never explain a verse of the Holy Koran by your own opinion,....”<sup>115</sup>

***Why would you choose to “dialogue” with people whose scriptures and code of law forbid free and open discourse?***

## **Impediment #5?: Do “Moderate Islam” and “Moderate Muslims” Exist, and if so, Are They Relevant?**

### ***Is Moderate Islam a Mirage?***

Let us review the evidence:

The following quote is from no less a person than the Islamist Prime Minister of Turkey.<sup>116</sup>

Speaking at Kanal D TV’s Arena program, Erdogan commented on the term “moderate Islam”, often used in the West to describe AKP (the Turkish Justice and Development Party) and said

---

<sup>111</sup> Reliance of the Traveller, Section entitled ACTS THAT ENTAIL LEAVING ISLAM - 08.7 (7)

<sup>112</sup> Reliance of the Traveller, chapter on “Enormities”: Section p64.2(1)

<sup>113</sup> Reliance of the Traveller, chapter on “Enormities”: Section p64.2(3)

<sup>114</sup> Reliance of the Traveller r14.1

<sup>115</sup> Reliance of the Traveller t3.9

<sup>116</sup> [http://www.thememriblog.org/turkey/blog\\_personal/en/2595.htm](http://www.thememriblog.org/turkey/blog_personal/en/2595.htm)

“These descriptions are very ugly, it is offensive and an insult to our religion. **There is no moderate or immoderate Islam. Islam is Islam and that’s it.**” (Source: Milliyet, Turkey, August 21, 2007)

*It would be naïve to expect anything “moderate” to emerge from a doctrine that openly and literally calls for slaughter, lying, deceit, cheating, hatred, enmity, terror, war, destruction, slavery, male supremacy, cruelty, stoning, maiming, religious persecution, and suppression of the most fundamental human rights. Yet that is the moral code of Islam, in its own words. There is only one Islam. There is not a “moderate” Islam and a “radical” Islam. There is only one Koran. There is not a “moderate” and a “radical” Koran. There is not a “moderate” Muslim and a “radical” Muslim.*

**What of the often-used term Islamism?** The idea that there is an “Islamism” that is some sort of variant of or deviation from or corruption of Islam proper, which in this view is a religion solely, enjoining peace and universal brotherhood and having no political or supremacist agenda, is a fiction born of Western wishful thinking and ignorance.<sup>117</sup>

**What about Dr. Zuhibi Jasser**, frequently cited by the conservative media as an example of a “moderate” Muslim? Jasser’s main thrust is that **Islam can be reformed, which it cannot.** Robert Spencer sums up this argument in these words:<sup>118</sup>

“Because it [the Koran] is without doubt, and because it is entirely Allah’s word, without any human element whatsoever, and because he guarantees its preservation, it cannot be questioned [or changed]. Historically this has made the words of the Koran – on wife-beating, the treatment of non-Muslims, and much more – a virtually insurmountable obstacle to reform within Islam. **Reformers are immediately branded as heretics or apostates....**”

*In reality, reforming Islam would require expunging around 60% of the Islamic Trilogy! And Nonie Darwish makes the compelling argument that “without Jew-hatred Islam would self-destruct.”<sup>119</sup>*

In the article *Dr. Jasser’s Panglossian Koranic Gloss*, quoted below, Dr. Andrew Bostom, noted scholar of Islam, draws attention to glaring deficiencies in Dr. Jasser’s argument:<sup>120</sup>

---

<sup>117</sup> <http://pjmedia.com/blog/an-interview-with-robert-spencer/>

<sup>118</sup> Spencer, R: *The Complete Infidel’s Guide to the Koran*. Washington DC, Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2009, p. 24.

<sup>119</sup> <http://www.jihadwatch.org/2012/08/nonie-darwish-why-muslims-must-hate-jews.html>

“Dr. Mohammed Zuhdi Jasser has just released his first book, *A Battle for the Soul of Islam: An American Muslim Patriot's Fight to Save His Faith* [Simon and Schuster, Threshold Editions, 2012.]

Dr. Jasser's book is epitomized by his summary comments on the Koran which glibly dismiss multiple verses that sanction the jihad conquest of non-Muslims, including their subjugation and justified humiliation for a myriad of so-called "offenses."

The Qur'an...is not actually a text that was written with the idea of conquering those of other faiths. Throughout the Qur'an, the debt to Christians and Jews, for their teachings and prophets, is acknowledged over and over again in their common origin from the God of Abraham.” [This idea is thoroughly debunked in Bostom’s paper and in Impediment #2.]

Bostom concludes:

*“Mohammed Zuhdi Jasser's grossly inadequate understanding, or deliberately bowdlerized rendition of foundational, living Koranic doctrines disqualifies him as a serious discussant regarding the drastic reforms required of mainstream, institutional Islam.”*

Canadian author and journalist **Irshad Manji** is another “voice in the wilderness” crying out for reform of Islam.<sup>121</sup>

*What evidence is there that a Moderate version of Islam exists?* One answer to this question comes from an essay titled *On assertions without evidence*.<sup>122</sup>

“.....Ibn Warraq is correct when he says that there are moderate Muslims, but there is no moderate Islam. This bears repeating: *there are moderate Muslims, but there is no moderate Islam.*

"What I have encountered again and again, however, has been the flat assertion that peaceful Islam (not just peaceful Muslims) exists and is the Islamic mainstream, and that I am dishonest or malicious for denying this. But **no**

---

120

[http://www.americanthinker.com/printpage/?url=http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/./2012/06/dr\\_jassers\\_panglossian\\_koranic\\_gloss.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/printpage/?url=http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/./2012/06/dr_jassers_panglossian_koranic_gloss.html)

<sup>121</sup> <https://www.irshadmanji.com/The-Trouble-with-Islam-Today>

<sup>122</sup> <http://www.jihadwatch.org/2006/05/on-assertions-without-evidence.html#more>

**evidence is ever presented for the existence of this Islam**, and in all the years that I have been studying Islamic texts and Islamic history, I have never found it. Again and again and again people throw up to me the assertion without evidence.

"Accordingly, I have asked for this evidence again and again here, because I am only interested in the truth, and if such evidence exists, I have no interest in denying it. ....I have asked here many times for people to send me examples of Islamic religious scholars rejecting, on Islamic grounds, jihad violence against non-Muslims; rejecting the idea that Sharia law should be instituted in the Muslim and non-Muslim world; and teaching the idea that non-Muslims and Muslims should live together indefinitely as equals. Send me rejections of the ideas that women should not enjoy full equality of rights with men. **Send me information that shows that those who write such rejections are not lone voices crying in the wilderness**, with the wolves of Islamic orthodoxy ready to pounce upon them, but that they represent broad traditions within Islam and have large followings."

### ***Do Moderate Muslims exist?***

To address this frequently-asked question, we first need to ask: What kinds of Muslims are there?

There is a broad spectrum of Muslim belief and practice:

At the two extremes are confessed, violent Islamic Jihadists and outspokenly ex-Muslims.<sup>123</sup> In-between, there is a big grey area, and so-called Moderate Muslims fall into this portion of the spectrum.

There is no general consensus as to what constitutes a "Moderate Muslim". Depending on whom you read or listen to, Moderate Muslims can be any of the following:

- Members of supposedly more peacefully-inclined Muslim sects, including Ismailis and Sufis
- Groups, such as Jasser's, and followers of Irshad Manji, who advocate for reform of Islam<sup>124</sup>
- Non-violent Islamic Jihadists (we would call these *Stealth Jihadists*)

---

<sup>123</sup> Prominent outspoken ex-Muslims include Nonie Darwish, Ibn Warraq, Walid Shoebat, Wafa Sultan, and Ayaan Hirsi Ali, among others.

<sup>124</sup> Unfortunately, as Zuhdi Jasser (the most quoted 'moderate Muslim') clearly states about these folks, "they have no platform".

- Secular Muslims (those who pay varying degrees of lip service to Islam, but are not really interested in following orthodox Muslim practices)

***It has also been argued that Moderate Muslims do not exist at all.***<sup>125</sup> One line of reasoning is as follows:

- 1) As discussed above, There is no Radical or Moderate Islam. As Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan states, “Islam is Islam”. This is generally agreed to by most observers and nearly all Islamic scholars.
- 2) The definition of a Muslim according to Wikipedia and Merriam-Webster Dictionary is “an adherent of Islam”.
- 4) The definition of “adherent”, according to Merriam-Webster is “able or tending to adhere”
- 5) The definition of “adhere”, according to Merriam-Webster, is
  - a. to bind oneself to observance
  - b. to give support or maintain loyalty, therefore
- 6) If, I adhere to, give support to, maintain loyalty to or bind myself in observance to Islam (*which decidedly has no moderate component*), and I claim to be a Muslim, then
- 7) Since Islam literally means “submission”, as a proclaimed Muslim, I must submit to Islam (*not some contrived interpretation that is unsupported by the Islamic community*), therefore
- 8) If, as a Muslim, I submit to Islam (*without trying to claim that it is something that it clearly is not or attempting to re-interpret the “holy” books in a way which is not accepted by any Islamic Scholars*) then
- 9) I am a part of Islam, therefore
- 10) Since there is no Moderate Islam, I can not be a Moderate Muslim because

---

<sup>125</sup> <http://www.familysecuritymatters.org/publications/detail/andrew-mccarthy-and-patriotic-muslims>

- 11) There is no such thing as a Moderate Muslim – however
- 12) **If I insist that I AM a Moderate Muslim, then I am not a follower of the Islamic Holy books, as interpreted by Islamic Scholars, therefore**
- 13) **I am not a follower of Islam, but instead,**
- 14) **I am someone that has fallen away from the real faith, as given clearly by all Islamic Scholars and therefore**
- 15) **I am really just a Muslim in name only, which really means that**
- 16) **I am simply an Apostate and not really a Muslim at all.**

### ***Beware the Double-edged Scimitar!***

The two, seemingly disconnected factions of Islam – the moderates (“good” Muslims) and the extremists (“bad” Muslims) – are ***single-minded in their quest for world-wide Islamic supremacy***. This is the classic ***Good Cop, Bad Cop*** tactical approach, applied in warfare since time immemorial.

### **Good Muslims, Bad Muslims – *Good Cop, Bad Cop!***

Everyone is probably familiar with the age old police theme when questioning a suspect utilizing the ***good cop bad cop approach*** where one threatens while their partner attempts to befriend by feigning to protect the suspect from his overly vehement counterpart. The Islamic approach to conquest has seemingly adopted a similar tactic with the so-called totally separate groups, one the Muslim extremists which includes the terror groups and more militant components and the other the political Muslims (“***moderate***” ***Muslims***) who preach coexistence, cooperation, and “dialogue”. Though appearing to operate completely independently from each other, the two arms manage to form ***a double-sided attack which threatens on one side while attempting to excuse and sooth from the other***. The Islamic extremists claim that they are on a Grand Jihad and will conquer the world by the sword or any other means that prove necessary. The political Islamics decry every attack by the terrorists assuring those who were the victims that the terrorists do not truly represent the entirety of Islam while also warning all not to overreact by striking back at innocent Muslims.<sup>126</sup>

<sup>126</sup> <http://beyondthecusp.wordpress.com/2012/03/17/islamic-method-good-muslim-bad-muslim/>

## **Our alternative, somewhat cynical, but (sadly!) realistic take on “Moderate” Muslims:**

If there are moderates, they are very, very few, and in the end analysis, they are irrelevant. The “tiny minority of Muslims” you always hear about are not the extremists – they are the moderates who are outcasts in their own communities and are more afraid than anyone of radical (Orthodox!) Muslims. The rest are sympathizers and silent cheerleaders, deceivers or fence-sitters waiting to see which way the wind will blow. ***In the end, the fence-sitters will side with the extremists.*** Why? Because the strongest force they have ever faced in their lives is the power of Islam that was beaten into them daily when they were young. It is the tie that binds – the very root of being. They are the collective. They are the *Ummah*. Just as 96% of blacks voted for Obama in 2008 simply because he is black, for the same reason the “moderates” will turn toward Islam as Islam gains more and more power and success begins to look like a real possibility. Since they generally isolate themselves to associate only with Muslims, they have no other real place to go.

**Conclusion:** Since “Moderate” Muslims may be difficult – even impossible – to identify with certainty, we think it prudent to ***proceed with extreme care.*** Make liberal use of our Guide, and do not jump to unfounded conclusions!

***How Can Moderate Muslims Practice Islam?*** For an answer to this question, read our essay on this topic retrievable under the *Learn* tab on [www.SneakyIslam.com](http://www.SneakyIslam.com).

***Why would you choose to “dialogue” with people who pretend there is a moderate version of Islam when none exists?***

## **Impediment #6?: What is the Likelihood That Your Dialogue Partners are Affiliated with the Muslim Brotherhood?**

The Muslim Brotherhood<sup>127,128</sup> was founded in Egypt in 1928 by Hasan al-Banna, an admirer and supporter of Adolf Hitler, who had *Mein Kampf* translated into

---

<sup>127</sup> Robert Spencer: Muslim Brotherhood in America. David Horowitz Freedom Center, 2012. (This publication is down-loadable from the internet).



Arabic in the 1930s. Al-Banna's disciple, Haj Amin al-Husseini, the mufti of Jerusalem, was also a Muslim Nazi<sup>129</sup>; he spent World War II in Berlin recruiting Muslims for Hitler's legions and laying plans to open gas chambers in the Middle East. His plans were thwarted only by Rommel's defeat at El-Alamein.

The Muslim Brotherhood's goals and strategy are clearly stated in a memorandum that came to light during the 2007 Holy Land Foundation trial.<sup>130</sup> This trial took place in federal court in Dallas, Texas, and revolved around the Foundation's misuse of charitable funds for jihad. In the memorandum, authored by a top Brotherhood operative in the United States, it is explained that the Brotherhood "must understand that their work in America is a kind of grand Jihad in **eliminating and destroying the Western civilization from within** and 'sabotaging' its miserable house by their hands and the hands of the believers so that it is eliminated and Allah's religion is made victorious over all other religions."

The Muslim Brotherhood has been active in the United States for decades. **It is the moving force behind ALL the mainstream organizations of Islam in America**, which (as revealed in a US Department of Justice document presented in evidence at the Holy Land Foundation trial) include, among many others<sup>131,132,133,134</sup>

- The Islamic Society of North America (ISNA)
- The Islamic Circle of North America (ICNA)
- The Muslim American Society (MAS)

---

<sup>128</sup> The Evils of the Muslim Brotherhood: Evidence Keeps Mounting, by Raymond Ibrahim, Investigative Project on Terrorism, June 25, 2012

<http://www.meforum.org/3272/muslim-brotherhood-evils>

<sup>129</sup> The history of the connections and collaboration between the Muslim Brotherhood and the Nazis is meticulously documented in Professor David Patterson's book, A Genealogy of Evil. Anti-Semitism from Nazism to Islamic Jihad. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

<sup>130</sup> At the time of the trial, the Holy Land Foundation had been the largest Islamic charity in the United States. The trial ended with it being convicted for funneling charitable donations to the Brotherhood-spawned Hamas.

<sup>131</sup> P. David Gaubatz and Paul Sperry: Muslim Mafia. Inside the Secret Underworld That's Conspiring to Islamize America. WND Books, 2009, p. 235.

<sup>132</sup>

[http://www.currenttrends.org/docLib/20090411\\_Merley.USBROTHERHOOD.pdf](http://www.currenttrends.org/docLib/20090411_Merley.USBROTHERHOOD.pdf)

<sup>133</sup> Robert Spencer: Muslim Brotherhood in America. David Horowitz Freedom Center, 2012. (This publication is down-loadable from the internet).

<sup>134</sup>

[http://www.currenttrends.org/doclib/20090411\\_merley.usbrotherhood.pdf](http://www.currenttrends.org/doclib/20090411_merley.usbrotherhood.pdf)

- The Muslim Students Association (MSA) (*at least 600 chapters on campuses nationwide!*)<sup>135</sup>
- The Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR)
- The International Institute for Islamic Thought (IIIT)

Its influence and tentacles stretch far and wide, and it has even infiltrated to the very highest levels of our federal government.<sup>136,137</sup>

***The likelihood that the Islamic body that you are choosing to “dialogue” with is not allied to the Muslim Brotherhood is infinitesimally small.***

***Why would you choose to “dialogue” with people from organizations that are almost certainly linked to the seditious Muslim Brotherhood?***

## **Impediment #7?: Can You Completely Trust What is Told to You When Islamic Doctrine is in Play?**

***This impediment trumps all the others.***

In Islam, there are at least four **Doctrines of Deception**. They cast a pall over any and all discourse with Muslims – they are perpetually lurking in the background.

***Taqiyya***. This is the best-known of these four doctrines. The following are extracts from Raymond Ibrahim’s superb review, *Islam’s Doctrines of Deception*.<sup>138</sup>

“According to sharia, in certain situations, deception – also known as ‘taqiyya’, based on Quranic terminology, – is ***not only permitted but sometimes***

<sup>135</sup> <http://www.academia.org/msa-watch/>

<sup>136</sup> <http://pjmedia.com/andrewmccarthy/2012/08/09/our-government-and-the-muslim-brotherhood-my-speech-in-washington/>

<sup>137</sup> [http://www.shoebat.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Abedin\\_Affairs\\_with\\_AI\\_Saud\\_081312.pdf](http://www.shoebat.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Abedin_Affairs_with_AI_Saud_081312.pdf)

<sup>138</sup> <http://www.meforum.org/2095/islams-doctrines-of-deception>

**obligatory.** For instance, contrary to early Christian history, Muslims who must choose between either recanting Islam or being put to death are not only permitted to lie by pretending to have apostatized, but many jurists have decreed that, according to Quran 4:29, Muslims are obligated to lie in such instances.

According to the authoritative Arabic text, *Al-Taqiyya Fi Al-Islam*: "Taqiyya [deception] is *of fundamental importance in Islam*. Practically every Islamic sect agrees to it and practices it. We can go so far as to say that **the practice of taqiyya is mainstream in Islam**, and that those few sects not practicing it diverge from the mainstream...Taqiyya is very prevalent in Islamic politics, especially in the modern era."

The primary **Quranic verse sanctioning deception** with respect to non-Muslims states:

*"Let believers not take for friends and allies infidels instead of believers. Whoever does this shall have no relationship left with Allah – unless you but guard yourselves against them, taking precautions."*<sup>139</sup>

Al-Tabari's (838-923 AD) Tafsir, or Quranic exegeses, is essentially a standard reference in the entire Muslim world. Regarding 3:28, he wrote: "*If you [Muslims] are under their [infidels'] authority, fearing for yourselves, behave loyally to them, with your tongue, while harbouring inner animosity for them... Allah has forbidden believers from being friendly or on intimate terms with the infidels in place of believers – except when infidels are above them [in authority]. In such a scenario, let them act friendly towards them.*"

Regarding 3:28, the Islamic scholar Ibn Kathir (1301-1373) wrote: "Whoever at any time or place fears their [infidels'] evil, may protect himself through outward show."

*The entire sequence of Quranic revelations are a testimony to taqiyya and, since Allah is believed to be the revealer of these verses, he ultimately is seen as the perpetrator of deceit. This is not surprising since Allah himself is often described in the Quran as the "best deceiver" or "schemer."* Koran 4:142: "The hypocrites wish to deceive Allah, but he will deceive them." Koran 8:30: "Remember the unbelievers who plotted against you and sought to have you taken prisoner or to have you killed or banished. They made plans, as did Allah, but Allah is the best plotter of all" (see 3:54, 8:30, 10:21). This phenomenon revolves around the fact that the Quran contains both peaceful and tolerant verses, as well as violent and intolerant ones.

---

<sup>139</sup> Koran (Medina) 3:28; see also 2:173; 2:185; 4:29; 22:78; 40:28.

There is also a philosophical – more particularly, epistemological – problem with taqiyya. *Anyone who truly believes that no less an authority than God justifies and, through his prophet's example, sometimes even encourages deception, will not experience any ethical qualms or dilemmas about lying.* This is especially true if the human mind is indeed a *tabula rasa* shaped by environment and education. ***Deception becomes second nature.***

Indeed, this sentiment sums it all up: for a zealous belief in Islam's tenets, which, as has been described above, legitimizes deception, will certainly go a long way in creating incredible self-confidence when deceiving one's enemies.”

We recommend your reading the full article to learn of the interesting *origins* of taqiyya.

***Kitman:*** "Kitman" is close to "taqiyya," but rather than outright dissimulation, it consists in ***telling only a part of the truth***, with "mental reservation" justifying the omission of the rest.<sup>140</sup>

***Muruna (Sanctioned prohibition).***<sup>141</sup> This is the Sunni equivalent of taqiyya, a Shiite doctrine. However, it is in actuality far worse than taqiyya, since it ***sanctions all prohibitions that block Muslim interests, even blasphemous ones.*** Muruna is accomplished by permitting behavior normally so eschewed by Sharia that ***Westerners logically assume a more moderate version of Islam*** when such prohibitions are suddenly permitted.

***Tawriya.***<sup>142</sup> This doctrine, which has been part of Islamic law and tradition for centuries, is unfamiliar to most non-Muslims. ***It allows lying in virtually all circumstances.*** The term “double-entendre” best describes tawriya, and applies to a situation where ***a speaker says something that means one thing to the listener, though the speaker means something else***, and his words technically support this alternate meaning. For example, Muslims, when

---

<sup>140</sup> One example of *kitman* may suffice. When a Muslim maintains that "jihad" really means "a spiritual struggle," and fails to add that this definition is a recent one in Islam (little more than a century old), he misleads by holding back, and is practicing "kitman." When he adduces, in support of this doubtful proposition, the hadith in which Muhammad, returning home from one of his many battles, is reported to have said (as known from a chain of transmitters, or isnad), that he had returned from "the Lesser Jihad to the Greater Jihad" and does not add what he also knows to be true, that this is a "weak" hadith, regarded by the most-respected muhaddithin as of doubtful authenticity, he is further practicing "kitman."

<sup>141</sup> Shoebat W and Barrack B: Muruna: Violating Sharia to Fool the West. PJ Media February 18, 2012:

<http://www.shoebat.com/2012/02/28/muruna-violating-sharia-to-fool-the-west/>

<sup>142</sup> <http://www.raymondibrahim.com/11267/tawriya-lying>

acknowledging Christmas, may tell Christians I wish you the best, but mean in their heart I wish you become a Muslim.

**“.....it is permissible to lie if attaining the goal is permissible”<sup>143</sup>**

Now that you are familiar with the Doctrines of Deception, you are less likely to be fooled into believing that the Western-style garb and smiles of your “dialogue” partners are manifestations of “moderate” Islam in action. ***Judge your Muslim fellow citizens by their actions, rather than their words!***

***Why would you choose to “dialogue” with people whose tradition condones and encourages lying? And where do you think a “dialogue” about the Ninth Commandment, “Thou Shalt Not Bear False Witness...”, would lead?***



***And, now that you know there are at least seven possible major impediments to real dialogue with Muslims, you will hopefully agree that you should think long and hard about engaging in dialogue with people who represent a belief system that***

- **Is really a supremacist, totalitarian ideology in the guise of a religion**
- **Teaches that Moses and Jesus were Muslims**
- **Can not engage in real debate and which knows no compromise**
- **Is forbidden by its laws to question any of its doctrines**
- **Knows no “moderate” version of itself**
- **Is inextricably linked to the seditious Muslim Brotherhood**
- **Unhesitatingly uses deception to further its cause**

---

<sup>143</sup> *Reliance of the Traveller* r8.2.

***If you are feeling guilty that what we have written sounds un-American, even un-patriotic, the following quotations from past US presidents should dispel this notion:***

In 1786, **John Adams and Thomas Jefferson** met with Arab diplomats from Tunisia, who were conducting terror raids and piracy against American ships (Barbary Pirates). Writing to John Jay, Thomas Jefferson described what he saw as the main issue and the reason why they were attacking Americans who had done them no harm. The following quote is from **Thomas Jefferson**:<sup>144</sup>

"We took the liberty to make some inquiries concerning the grounds of their pretensions to make war upon a nation who had done them no Injury, and observed that we considered all mankind as our friends who had done us no wrong, nor had given us any provocation. The ambassador answered us that it was founded on the laws of their prophet, that ***it was written in their Koran, that all nations who should not have acknowledged their authority were sinners, that it was their right and duty to make war upon them wherever they could be found***, and to make slaves of all they could take as prisoners, and that every Musselman (Muslim) who should be slain in battle was sure to go to paradise."

***"The precept of the Koran is, perpetual war against all who deny, that Mahomet is the prophet of God.*** The vanquished may purchase their lives, by the payment of tribute; the victorious may be appeased by a false and delusive promise of peace; and the faithful follower of the prophet, may submit to the imperious necessities of defeat: but the command to propagate the Moslem creed by the sword is always obligatory, when it can be made effective. ***The commands of the prophet may be performed alike, by fraud, or by force.***"<sup>145</sup>

John Quincy Adams, c. 1829

".....today, nobody can find in them [Asian and African countries conquered by the Muslims] any "social values" whatever, in the sense in which we use the words..... ***There are such "social values" today in Europe, America and Australia only because during those thousand years, the Christians of Europe possessed the warlike power to do what the Christians of Asia and Africa had failed to do -- that is, to beat back the Moslem invader.***"

Theodore Roosevelt, in his book, *Fear God and Take Your Own Part*, (1916)

---

<sup>144</sup> <http://michiganstate.247sports.com/Board/97/Thomas-Jefferson-quote-about-Muslim-Extremists-4859340/1#a4968645>

<sup>145</sup> <http://www.jihadwatch.org/2006/05/fitzgerald-jefferson-the-adamses-and-making-sense.html>

## UTILIZING EFFECTIVE DIALOGUE ENGAGEMENT TOOLS

We now come to the more *practical* portion of our Guide, in which we provide you ***concrete tools for approaching “dialogue.”*** If you follow the advice herein closely, you will either be able to definitively vindicate your original beliefs about opening an Interfaith Dialogue with a particular individual or group, or you will confirm your suspicions and doubts. Either way, you will have substantially strengthened your ability to engage at a higher level and reach an ***informed*** conclusion.

To begin with, we identify ***three stages or phases*** in the “dialogue” process:

In **Stage 1: The pre-engagement phase**, you will still be in the process of contemplating “dialogue” with Muslims. You will not yet have made formal contact with a particular Muslim or Muslim group, but are considering doing so. In discussing this, ***we provide tools to help you reach an informed decision*** as to whether or not to proceed.

In **Stage 2: The “discovery” phase**, you will have committed to “dialogue” with a particular individual or group, but are not yet sure what form the dialogue is going to take, or what kinds of Muslims you are engaging with. Here, we provide ***tools to help you discover the true nature and intent of your “dialogue” partner(s).***

In **Stage 3: Managing the “dialogue”**, you will already be fully engaged in the “dialogue” process, but are having doubts about the effectiveness of the exercise or are uncomfortable with the direction in which it is heading. Here, we provide ***tools to enable you to put your uncertainties to rest and to move forward with confidence.***

### **Stage 1: The pre-engagement phase**

If you are in this phase, you are fortunate as you have not yet committed, or compromised, yourself in any fashion. Our suggestion: Study this Guide – we know that you, after examining the numerous pitfalls inherent in the “dialogue”-with-Muslims process, will then be able to make an informed decision.

A suggestion: If you are really intent on interfaith dialogue, why not consider engaging with ***groups within your own faith representing viewpoints other than your own?*** Conservative Jews engaging with Orthodox Jews? Baptists engaging with Catholics? We are sure that much good could emerge from such encounters.



Who are the Muslims you are most likely going to be engaging with? – those who are **members of MOSQUES!** In light of this, ask yourself: What are the probabilities that your dialogue partners espouse jihadist views? As we have documented here, much greater than you may think!

The following important **information regarding mosques** is taken from an article written by Robert Spencer<sup>146</sup> in response to news that *a call for the monitoring of mosques has gone out from Muslims in Saudi Arabia*. This followed a report of a Riyadh mosque serving as a facade for manufacturing explosives.

"American authorities have as much reason as Saudi authorities to be concerned. Four separate studies all found that **80% of U.S. mosques were teaching jihad**, Islamic supremacism, and hatred and contempt for Jews and Christians. *There are no countervailing studies that challenge these results.* In 1998, Sheikh Muhammad Hisham Kabbani, a Sufi leader, visited 114 mosques in the United States. Then he gave testimony before a State Department Open Forum in January 1999, and asserted that 80% of American mosques taught the **“extremist ideology.”**

Then there was the Center for Religious Freedom’s 2005 study, and the Mapping Sharia Project’s 2008 study. Each independently showed that upwards of 80% of mosques in America were preaching hatred of Jews and Christians and the necessity ultimately to impose Islamic rule.

And in the summer of 2011 came another study showing that only 19% of mosques in U.S. *don’t* teach jihad violence and/or Islamic supremacism.

Specifically:

A random survey of 100 representative mosques in the U.S. was conducted to measure the correlation between Sharia adherence and dogma calling for violence against non-believers. Of the 100 mosques surveyed, 51% had texts on site rated as severely advocating violence; 30% had texts rated as moderately advocating violence; and 19% had no violent texts at all. Mosques that presented as Sharia-adherent were more likely to feature violence-positive texts on site than were their non-Sharia-adherent counterparts. In 84.5% of the mosques, the imam recommended studying violence-positive texts. The leadership at Sharia-adherent mosques was more likely to recommend that a worshiper study violence-positive texts than leadership at non-Sharia-adherent mosques. Fifty-eight percent of the mosques invited guest imams known to promote violent jihad. The leadership of mosques that featured violence-positive literature was

---

<sup>146</sup> <http://frontpagemag.com/2012/robert-spencer/muslims-in-saudi-arabia-call-for-monitoring-mosques/>

more likely to invite guest imams who were known to promote violent jihad than was the leadership of mosques that did not feature violence-positive literature on mosque premises.

That means that around 1,700 mosques in the U.S. are preaching hatred of infidels and justifying violence against them."

***What are the implications of these studies<sup>147,148</sup> for your prospects of conducting genuine interfaith dialogue with Muslims?***

**Sixty percent of US Muslims Reject Freedom of Expression [2012].<sup>149</sup>**

***Could your "dialogue" partners be among them?***

***If, after considering all the pitfalls, you do decide to dialogue with Muslims, be wary regarding your choice of a venue:***

There are specific prohibitions in Islamic scripture and law pertaining to where Muslims and non-Muslims may worship.

"It is offensive to pray:

..... (5) in a Church;"<sup>150</sup>

The *converse* also applies:

"It ill becomes the idolaters to visit the mosques of Allah, for they are self-confessed unbelievers. Vain shall be their works, and in the Fire they shall abide forever.

---

<sup>147</sup> Links to the mosque studies can be found by going to Robert Spencer's article (our reference <sup>146</sup>) or at <http://mappingsharia.com/>  
<sup>148</sup>

[http://www.americanthinker.com/2012/08/a\\_mosque\\_is\\_not\\_like\\_a\\_church\\_or\\_a\\_synagogue.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/2012/08/a_mosque_is_not_like_a_church_or_a_synagogue.html)

<sup>149</sup>

[http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2012/11/sixty\\_percent\\_of\\_us\\_muslims\\_reject\\_freedom\\_of\\_expression.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2012/11/sixty_percent_of_us_muslims_reject_freedom_of_expression.html)

<sup>150</sup> *Reliance of the Traveller* f4.14, in the Prayer (Salat) Chapter.

None should visit the mosques of Allah except those who believe in Allah and the Last Day, attend to their prayers and render the alms levy and fear none but Allah. These shall be rightly guided."<sup>151</sup>

Rev. Mark Durie, Anglican priest and author, in his article: *Stop opening churches to Muslims: Islamic prayers cursing Christians and Jews have no place in chapel*,<sup>152</sup> argues that another good reason for churches not to host Muslim worship, paradoxically, is **their veneration of Isa, the Islamic Jesus**:

“Churches should not welcome into their buildings the veneration of Isa the Islamic Jesus, who, as a true Muslim, is intended to bring about the final, violent destruction of Christianity. By all means, let Christians show kindness to their Muslim neighbors, but the sentiments embedded in Islamic daily prayers, which curse Jews as the target of Allah's wrath and Christians for going astray, can have no place in a Christian church - even if recited in the cadences of classical Arabic.”

A further word of caution comes from scholar, author and former Muslim cleric Sam Solomon, who is also advisor to British and European parliamentarians on Islamic issues. He warns that it is a common ploy for Muslims to ask to borrow churches and synagogues for worship, ostensibly because their own places of worship are overflowing. **Once a Muslim group comes into any of these houses of worship, they consecrate them as holy ground for Allah.**<sup>153</sup> Support for this statement can be found in an anecdote from Islamic history:

After a brief and bloodless siege, Muslims seized control of Jerusalem from the Byzantines in 638. **Caliph Omar Ibn al-Khattab** accepted the city's surrender from Patriarch Sophronius in person. Omar was shown the great **Church of the Holy Sepulchre** and was offered a place to pray in it, but he refused. He knew that if he prayed in the church, it would set a precedent that would lead to the building's transformation into a mosque. He instead prayed on the steps outside, allowing the church to remain a Christian holy place. His actions after his

---

<sup>151</sup> Koran (Medina) 9:17-18

<sup>152</sup> <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/feb/23/stop-opening-churches-to-muslims/>

<sup>153</sup> Sam Solomon, cited by Genl. William Boykin on the Glenn Beck Show. Boykin's remarks come about 78 minutes into the segment. [http://web.gbtv.com/media/video.jsp?content\\_id=20081607&topic\\_id=24584158&tcid=vpp\\_copy\\_20081607&v=3](http://web.gbtv.com/media/video.jsp?content_id=20081607&topic_id=24584158&tcid=vpp_copy_20081607&v=3)

takeover of Jerusalem ensured the Church of Holy Sepulchre remained open to Christian worship.<sup>154</sup>

***And no matter where you choose to meet, beware that Iftar Dinner!***

Ramadan is the Month of Jihad. Don't believe it? Check it out for yourself.<sup>155,156,157</sup>

Robert Spencer of *Jihad Watch* has written about this lesser-known aspect of Ramadan:<sup>158</sup>

“Is Ramadan a time to “cherish family, friends, and neighbors, and to help those in need,” and to “reconcile differences and seek peace,” or is it “a month of holy war and death for Allah”? [It is both].....***Murdering infidels.....doesn't contradict the spirit of Ramadan; it embodies it*** [our emphasis].....the idea of Ramadan as a time for warfare against infidels went back to Muhammad's time.”

We have only scratched the surface! Read all about Ramadan ***and the other Muslim festivals*** - and how they fly in the face of our Judeo-Christian culture - in our original work, *The Holidays of Islam. A Guide for Non-Muslims*. This can be found as a free download on the home page of [www.SneakyIslam.com](http://www.SneakyIslam.com).

***So, if you are planning to meet, scrupulously avoid doing so at each other's places of worship! And decline invitations to celebrate Ramadan, the Month of Jihad, in any shape or form!***

---

<sup>154</sup> Mosque of Umar, Jerusalem (on website *Sacred Destinations*).

<sup>155</sup> <http://creepingsharia.wordpress.com/2012/07/12/nypd-holds-annual-pre-ramadan-conference-favoring-muslims-for-month-of-jihad/>

<sup>156</sup> <http://creepingsharia.wordpress.com/2009/08/20/ramadan-is-the-month-of-jihad-video/>

<sup>157</sup> <http://www.jihadwatch.org/2012/07/jihad-group-claims-credit-for-bulgaria-mass-murder-ramadan-is-a-month-of-holy-war-and-death-for-alla.html>

<sup>158</sup> [http://atlasshrugs2000.typepad.com/atlas\\_shrugs/2012/07/atlas-exclusive-robert-spencer-ramadan-follies.html](http://atlasshrugs2000.typepad.com/atlas_shrugs/2012/07/atlas-exclusive-robert-spencer-ramadan-follies.html)

## **Stage 2: The “discovery” phase**

***Which of the three forms of “dialogue” are you facing?***

**1. Real dialogue?** A willingness to frankly and openly ***address the following questions*** might suggest that these Muslims’ intentions to engage in real, constructive dialogue are genuine:

Issues that could expose their true identity might include:

- Do you accept the validity of other religions?
- How do you understand the expression “People of the Book”?
- May Muslims convert to other religions without fear of criticism or threat from other Muslims?
- Do you accept the legitimacy of scholarly inquiry into the origins of Islam?
- Do you accept the laws of a majority non-Muslim government and unreservedly pledge allegiance to that government?
- When Islamic customs conflict with secular laws (e.g., covering the face for drivers’ license pictures), which should give way?
- Do you accept the right of Israel to exist as a Jewish state without threat from its neighbors?
- Will you publicly condemn by name as terrorist groups such organizations as Hamas, Hezbollah, Islamic Jihad, and al-Qaida?
- Should Muslim taxis be permitted to refuse service to blind people accompanied by dogs, or those carrying liquor?
- Should Muslim women have equal rights with men (for example, in inheritance shares or court testimony)?
- May Muslim women marry non-Muslim men?
- Should gays and lesbians be accorded full civil rights?
- What are your views on *Shirk*, considered by Muslims to be the greatest sin under Islam?
- Do you give zakat, and if so, do you know what your contributions are being used for?
- Would you consider joining us in a joint project, such as one calling attention to the persecution of Christians in the Muslim world?
- What are your thoughts on American Laws for American Courts (ALAC)?.

In regard to the latter issue: It has been argued that **anti-Sharia laws** such as ALAC infringe upon Muslims’ First Amendment rights to practice their religion. However, such laws do *not* aim to restrict individual Muslim religious practice, but aim to stop the political and supremacist aspects of Islam that infringe upon the rights and freedoms of *non-Muslims*.<sup>159</sup>

---

<sup>159</sup> [http://www.americanthinker.com/2012/03/the\\_necessity\\_of\\_anti-sharia\\_laws.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/2012/03/the_necessity_of_anti-sharia_laws.html)

No single reply to the above questions establishes a militant Islamic disposition (plenty of non-Muslim Europeans believe the Bush administration itself carried out the 9/11 attacks); and ***pretence is always a possibility***, but these questions offer a good start to the vexing issue of separating enemy from friend.

Ideally, these questions should be posed *publicly* - in the media or in front of an audience – and the answers acknowledged *in written form*, thereby reducing the scope for dissimulation. However, understandably, Muslims who hold views contrary to those of the Muslim mainstream will feel seriously threatened by their less-than-accepting peers, and are unlikely to agree to commit in this fashion.

Tawfik Hamid has published a “Declaration of Beliefs of Muslim Moderates” intended for signing by willing Imams of mosques, by Muslim leaders, and by Islamic organizations.<sup>160</sup>

**2. Schmoozing?** This will be obvious if your “dialogue” partners studiously avoid discussing any of these questions, and instead choose to focus on “commonalities.”

**3. Sham dialogue?** Your “dialogue” partners will be happy to discuss these issues, but the tone and content of their words will, if you come properly prepared, expose their (hidden?) agenda.

A very useful hint: ***Stay in charge of the conversation by asking questions.*** If you get called on it, simply state that you want to understand the Muslim approach to all things.

***Ask them what form of Islam they practice.*** Sunni? (Which Sunni school of law: Hanafi, Maliki, Shafi'i, or Hanbali?). Shiite? (which branch of Shiism? Fivers? Seveners? Twelvers? Ismailis? Khojas? Buharas? etc.). Salafist or Wahhabi? Sufi? Barelwi?

Watch their **body language** when you ask them tough questions. Do they, for example, divert their eyes?

“State that you will ***base your arguments on facts of the doctrine of Sharia and Islam and not on what any imam or writer says.*** Point this out when their statements are not from Islamic doctrine. Everything that Islam does is based upon its doctrine. So what you say can be proven by the doctrine and history of Political Islam. Use facts, not opinions. Use the Sharia, not Muslims. Ask if they

---

<sup>160</sup> <http://www.radicalislam.org/content/your-local-mosque-moderate-or-radical>

have any familiarity with the Koran, Mohammed or Sharia. **This question is very powerful since it establishes a hierarchy of who knows what.** If they have some familiarity with any of their doctrine, now is a good time to find out how much they know and have read.”<sup>161</sup>

Beware of politician-style answers which totally avoid answering the question posed. **Rephrase the question and try again.**

Always research your “dialogue” partner’s background by going to **their website**. Links to Muslim Brotherhood-affiliated organizations (a very frequent phenomenon) will reveal their true intent.

Perhaps your experience researching your “dialogue” partners will be like that of the two **rabbis in western New York who pulled out of a Muslim-Jewish outreach effort** in 2010 after discovering that the national sponsor was involved in Islamic fundamentalism.<sup>162</sup> The “twinning” project, which has been held each November since 2008, is a project of the Foundation for Ethnic Understanding in cooperation with the Islamic Society of North America, which was named as an unindicted co-conspirator in the 2007 Holy Land Foundation terrorist financing case.

***You will surely find the worst enemies of the Muslims to be the Jews***

Koran (Medina) 5:85

***Muslim dialogue with Jews in Italy is only possible once Israel has been eliminated.***

Conclusion of a paper presented at Al Azhar University, the center of Islamic studies, in 2008.<sup>163</sup>

***Still want to "dialogue", Rabbi?***

---

<sup>161</sup> <http://www.politicalislam.com/pdf/WebSitePDF/CanWeTalk.pdf>

<sup>162</sup> <http://www.jta.org/news/article/2010/11/15/2741742/ny-rabbis-pull-out-of-muslim-jewish-twinning-project>

<sup>163</sup> [http://www.americanthinker.com/2012/10/tackling\\_the\\_totalitarianism\\_of\\_islam.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/2012/10/tackling_the_totalitarianism_of_islam.html)



### **A note about head scarves worn by your “dialogue” partners:**

This may surprise you: ***The wearing of the hijab (head scarf) is not a religious requirement, but a political statement.*** This may be the first clue that your prospective dialogue partners have a hidden agenda. Head scarves are very much a modern tradition, coinciding with the rise of orthodox (“fundamentalist”) Islam, and are a symbol of Muslim Brotherhood influence and a rejection of the West. They are frequently donned by women who otherwise openly ignore Islamic religious dictates, such as not listening to music or traveling more than a short distance from home without a male “protector.” (The subject of the head scarf as a political symbol is discussed more fully in our companion Guide: *Workplace Accommodations for Muslims in America: An Employer’s Survival Guide*, downloadable on the home page of [www.SneakyIslam.com](http://www.SneakyIslam.com)).

To quote Nonie Darwish, .....

“.....we Egyptians know that when a woman covers herself the Islamic way it means one thing, ‘I am for Sharia.’ No ifs ands or buts.”<sup>164</sup>

.....and ***don’t be fooled by an apparent lack of religious observance*** by your “dialogue” partners. This is not necessarily an indication that you are dealing with “moderate” (secular) Muslims. The Islamic “Law of Necessity”, the doctrine of *taysir*<sup>165,166</sup> allows Muslims dispensation from Islamic law whenever needed for the greater good of the Muslim cause.

### **Stage 3: The Managing-the-“dialogue” Phase**

So – you have discovered into which of the three categories of “dialogue” you have landed. To reiterate, these are

- 1. Real dialogue – *the rarest kind***
- 2. Schmoozing – *the least useful kind***
- 3. Sham dialogue – *the most dangerous kind***

This Guide will have achieved its most desired aim if it has stopped you from entering into a fruitless and painful “dialogue” with orthodox Muslims in the first place. If, however, you have already been caught in the “spider’s web”, here are

---

<sup>164</sup>

[http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2012/07/egyptian\\_reformists\\_alarmed\\_by\\_hillary\\_and\\_obama.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2012/07/egyptian_reformists_alarmed_by_hillary_and_obama.html)

<sup>165</sup> <http://www.raymondibrahim.com/7749/top-muslim-cleric-qaradawi-urges-western-muslims>

<sup>166</sup> <http://www.meforum.org/3294/olympics-ramadan>

some suggestions as how to proceed further. Let us examine each scenario in turn:

**1. *Real dialogue?*** You are engaged in a dialogue with Muslims who are acutely aware of orthodox Islam's true agenda, and are trying to break away from it. This is real interfaith dialogue of an extremely rare kind, and your co-interfaithers (if their views are made public) will likely require police protection. They are engaging in apostasy, punishable by death under Sharia law.

***But let's be realistic: What conclusions are you likely to reach in the course of real dialogue regarding (to take an obvious example) the Koran?***

An intellectually-honest discussion on the Koran with your **genuine** Muslim dialogue partners ought to lead to the following conclusions:

1. *The Koran is best understood by referring to the Hadiths and Sira*, which provide Muhammad's example. What emerges is that Muhammad's behavior contradicts practically every norm of Western society, including those of Judaism and Christianity in particular.

2. *The Koran is a derivative work*,<sup>167,168</sup> being derived from a wide variety of sources. These include Jewish scripture and legend, the writings of Heretical Christian Sects (the Gnostic Gospels), and Samaritan, Sabaeen, Zoroastrian, Hanafi, Hindu and Pagan beliefs and customs. There are, arguably, only two new facts in the Koran. The first new fact is that Mohammed is the prophet of Allah, and the second new truth is that if you don't believe he is prophet of Allah, you can be killed.<sup>169</sup>

3. *Whereas Judaism and Christianity are both seen as religions rooted in history*, modern scholarship of Islam reveals a profound lack of neutral testimony, archeological data, datable documents, and evidence from credible external sources. Internal sources are recorded two centuries after the event, influenced by the intervening years and intended to provide a "salvation history" legitimizing the faith and scripture of Islam.

4. The peaceful Meccan surahs are *abrogated* by the violent Medinan ones.

---

<sup>167</sup> <http://www.politicalislam.com/blog/you-can-never-awaken-a-man-who-is/>

<sup>168</sup> <http://debate.org.uk/topics/books/origins-koran.html>

<sup>169</sup> <http://www.politicalislam.com/blog/you-can-never-awaken-a-man-who-is/>

You and your genuine dialogue partners, all of whom one assumes are well-read and have inquiring minds, know all of the above. So, what would be the point of such a “dialogue” exercise other than perhaps to debate the finer points of these conclusions? A more productive course of action (may we suggest) would be to embark together on a **constructive project**, such as one calling attention to the plight of women in the Muslim world, or educating the general public about Islam, unvarnished. How about cooperating in drawing the public's attention to the prohibition against the building of churches or synagogues in Saudi Arabia?

**2. Schmoozing?** You are engaged in a “dialogue” with secular Muslims, who are not interested in raising or exploring key theological issues with you. You are enjoying the hummus and are eyeing that attractive young man or woman across the table with a view to a possible romantic relationship. This is schmoozing and could be relatively harmless. By all means continue, but, for heaven’s sake, stay informed. You are engaging with people who are linked, whether they care to admit it or not, by family or other ties, with others whose intentions toward you may not be so benign. You proceed at your own risk.

Beware the **Schmooze-Sham interface**: You are engaged in “dialogue” with orthodox Muslims, but you are discussing only issues that “unite” you. Key theological differences have not been raised. This kind of intercourse may feel warm and fuzzy, but is, in actuality, fraught with danger. Should discussion of key theological differences arise, *you could find yourself at the edge of the Sham Dialogue precipice.*

But be mindful of what their scripture teaches them: The **Koran Says that Non-Muslims Should Not be Taken as Friends**. There are at least nine places in the Koran where believers are warned not to befriend non-Muslims. Here are some of them:

- Ye who believe! Take not for friends unbelievers rather than believers: Do ye wish to offer Allah an open proof against yourselves?<sup>170</sup>
- Ye who believe! Take not the Jews and the Christians for friends. They are friends one to another. He among you who taketh them for friends is (one) of them. Lo! Allah guideth not wrongdoing folk.<sup>171</sup>
- They indeed have disbelieved who say: Lo! Allah is the Messiah, son of Mary.<sup>172</sup>
- For the Unbelievers are unto you open enemies.<sup>173</sup>
- As for them, they are but plotting a scheme.<sup>174</sup>

---

<sup>170</sup> Koran (Medina) 4:144

<sup>171</sup> Koran (Medina) 5:51

<sup>172</sup> Koran (Medina) 5:17

<sup>173</sup> Koran (Medina) 4:101

<sup>174</sup> Koran (Mecca) 86:15

- Ye who believe! Fight those of the disbelievers who are near to you, and let them find harshness in you, and know that Allah is with those who keep their duty.<sup>175</sup>

In the real world: Contact with Muslims does not preclude what you may consider “friendship” as long as theological differences are never raised!

**3. Sham Dialogue?** You are engaged in “dialogue” with Orthodox Muslims who are intent on pursuing their scripturally-mandated stealth jihad agenda. Hopefully, this Guide will have convinced you of the futility and dangers of this type of intercourse – Sham Dialogue - and you will terminate the relationship in an expeditious manner.

***However, should you wish to continue this sham “dialogue” in ways that will expose your Muslim counterpart’s true agenda, we strongly recommend that you become thoroughly familiar with the following features of the Trilogy:***

1. The centrality of **Muhammad** to Islam
2. The amazing focus of the Trilogy on the **Kafir**
3. The Doctrine of **Abrogation**
4. The Doctrines of **Deception**
5. **Koran-based assertions** most frequently made by Muslims.

## **1. The centrality of Muhammad to Islam<sup>176</sup>**

Any time that someone wants **to explain Islam by the Koran alone**, you are dealing with a person who is either ignorant or is being willfully deceptive.<sup>177</sup> The Koran proclaims in 91 verses that **every Muslim is to model their life after the example (Sunna) of Mohammed, but the Sunna of Mohammed is found only in the Sira and the Hadith.** The Koran is only 14% of the Islamic sacred texts. Mohammed, not Allah, is 86% of the textual doctrine. There is one, and only one criterion for being an expert on Islam—knowledge about Allah **and Mohammed.**

---

<sup>175</sup> Koran (Medina) 9:123

<sup>176</sup> <http://www.politicalislam.com/pdf/WebSitePDF/CanWeTalk.pdf>

<sup>177</sup> <http://www.politicalislam.com/blog/jesus-akbar/>

***So, always make the Sunna – the example of the “perfect man”, Muhammad – central to your argument.***

***Mohammed is the supreme authority in Islam.*** No Muslim, no media pundit, no imam, no book, no article, not even the president of the US can be above Mohammed. ***Once you know Mohammed, you know the truth of Islam. This is the heart of the matter.*** Islam is simple. Islam is the political, religious and cultural doctrine found in the Trilogy and Sharia. The Sharia is the key to showing how Islam actually works and what its doctrine really is.

***".....'By Allah, had Muhammad ordered me to murder you, my brother, I would have cut off your head.' Wherein the brother said, 'Any religion that can bring you to this is indeed wonderful!' And he accepted Islam."***

The Sira: Tabari VII:97 and Ishaq 369

## **2. The amazing focus of the Trilogy on the *Kafir***

Be familiar with the dualistic nature of Islam and **present the *kafir* viewpoint.** This is fully discussed in Impediment #1.

## **3. The Doctrine of Abrogation**

Be familiar with ***the doctrine of abrogation*** -- Early Muslim scholars were uncertain which verses to codify into sharia's worldview. For instance, should they use the one that states there is no coercion in religion (2:256), or the ones that command believers to fight all non-Muslims until they either convert or at least submit to Islam (9:5, 9:29)? To solve this quandary, they developed the ***doctrine of abrogation*** – *al-naskh wa al-mansukh* (the abrogating and the abrogated), supported by the Quran. This essentially states that verses "revealed" later in Muhammad's career take precedence over those revealed earlier whenever there is a discrepancy:

“Whatever a Verse (revelation) do We {Allah} abrogate or cause to be forgotten, We bring a better one or similar to it. Know you not that Allah is able to do all things?”<sup>178</sup>

Why the contradiction in the first place? The standard answer has been that, because Muhammad and his community were far outnumbered by the infidels in the early years of Islam, a message of peace and co-existence was in order.

---

<sup>178</sup> Koran (Medina) 2:106.

However, **after Muhammad migrated to Medina** and his following grew in military strength and numbers, the militant or intolerant verses were revealed, urging Muslims to go on the offensive.

According to this standard view, circumstance dictates which verses are to be implemented. When Muslims are weak, they should preach and behave according to the Meccan verses; when strong, they should go on the offensive, according to the Medinan verses. Many Islamic books extensively deal with the doctrine of abrogation, or *Al-Naskh Wa Al-Mansukh*.

The Koran contains at least 193 abrogated verses,<sup>179</sup> 113 of which have been abrogated by the ***Verse of the Sword***.

#### **4. The Doctrines of Deception**

These are fully discussed in Impediment #7.

Remember that, when it comes to deception, ***Muhammad was a deceiver*** and advised Muslims to deceive Kafirs. Allah plots against Kafirs and deceives them. All Muslims who follow the doctrine are deceivers of Kafirs. That is their sacred task. So when you hear about all of those good verses in the Koran, know that you are being deceived. All of the “good” verses in the Koran are denied later in the Koran.

#### **5. Koran-based assertions most frequently made by Muslims**

We provide **rebuttal arguments** for each assertion:

##### **a): Assertion: *The Koran preaches Love.***

##### **Rebuttal:**

Apologists are correct in saying that Islam teaches love and kindness, but they fail to add that this ***applies only to the treatment of those within the Muslim community.***

While there are 300 references in the Koran to Allah and fear, there are 49 references to love. Of these references, 39 are negative, such as the 14 negative references to love of money, power, other gods, and status. Three verses command humanity to love Allah and two verses are about how Allah loves a

---

<sup>179</sup> [http://wikiislam.net/wiki/List\\_of\\_Abrogations\\_in\\_the\\_Qur'an](http://wikiislam.net/wiki/List_of_Abrogations_in_the_Qur'an)

believer. There are 25 verses about how Allah does not love Kafirs. This leaves five verses about love. Of these five, three are about loving kin or a Muslim brother. One verse commands a Muslim to give for the love of Allah. This leaves only one quasi-universal verse about love: Give what you love to charity. But even this is contaminated by dualism since Muslim charity (*zakat*) only goes to other Muslims.<sup>180</sup>

***There is not one verse about either compassion for or love of a Kafir***, but there are twelve verses that teach that a Muslim is not a friend of the Kafir. To put this in perspective, nearly one out of twelve verses in the Koran says that Allah ***hates*** non-Muslims to the extent that he will torment them for eternity in horrible ways.

There have been serious ***attempts made to get the Koran banned as hate speech***:

- In 1999, **Hindus in Calcutta** petitioned the government to ban the Koran as hate speech.<sup>181</sup>
- In April, 2012, an apostate from Islam in **Spain** named Imran Firasat petitioned the Spanish government to ban the Koran. As of the time of writing, his petition has been formally accepted by the Spanish parliament.<sup>182</sup>

### ***Peering through the Fog of Words in the discourse on Hate Speech***

*“Truth is the new hate speech”* – Pamela Geller.<sup>183</sup>

The term *du jour* with Muslims responding to criticism (or even mere honest discussion) of Islam and Muslims is ***Islamophobia***. The suffix “phobia” is extremely inappropriate, for, as the banner on the web site *Bare Naked Islam* states, *It isn’t Islamophobia when they really ARE trying to kill you*, or, as the title

---

<sup>180</sup> <http://godofreason.com/new-page-105.htm>

<sup>181</sup> Sita Ram Goel, *The Calcutta Quran Petition* (New Delhi, India: Voice of India, 1999), 276-77.

<sup>182</sup> <http://gatesofvienna.blogspot.com/2012/04/petition-to-ban-koran-in-spain.html>

<sup>183</sup> <http://www.jihadwatch.org/2011/10/banned-speech-at-the-hyatt-pamela-geller-truth-is-the-new-hate-speech.html>



of a flyer put out by the David Horowitz Freedom Center states, *Not All Fears are Phobias*.<sup>184</sup>

The origin of the term *Islamophobia* has (perhaps incorrectly)<sup>185</sup> been attributed to the Muslim Brotherhood, which supposedly coined it for the purpose of beating down critics, i.e., those engaged in what they call **hate speech**. This is certainly a prime example of “the pot calling the kettle black.” For example, as Dr. Bill Warner of *Political Islam* has stated, there is more hate speech (of the *real* kind, against Jews) in the Koran than in *Mein Kampf*.<sup>186</sup>

**Slander and Defamation of Religion:** The OIC (the 57-member state Organization of Islamic Cooperation) is pushing for the enforcement of “religious defamation” laws in the international arena. To gain traction among the international community, the OIC maintains that such laws should protect all religions from defamation, not just Islam. But one great irony is lost, especially on Muslims: if such laws would ban, e.g., movies and cartoons that defame Islam, they **would also, by logical extension, have to ban the religion of Islam itself**—the only religion whose core texts actively defame other religions!<sup>187</sup>

What does “**Defamation**” mean? Typical dictionary-definitions include “to blacken another’s reputation” and “false or unjustified injury of the good reputation of another, as by slander or libel.” In Muslim usage, defamation simply means anything that insults or offends Islamic sensibilities.

*What about the term **Bigot**?* The Merriam-Webster online dictionary defines a **bigot** as one who regards or treats the members of a group (racial or ethnic) with hatred and intolerance. Consider, dear reader, to whom this term should apply in light of what you now know about the Islamic scriptures.

**b): Assertion: Islam’s tolerance of other religions is shown by the statement in the Koran that “*There is no compulsion in Religion.*”<sup>188</sup>**

### **Rebuttal:**

---

<sup>184</sup> <http://c481901.r1.cf2.rackcdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/not-all-fears-are-phobias.jpg>

<sup>185</sup> <http://www.jihadwatch.org/2012/08/did-the-muslim-brotherhood-invent-the-term-islamophobia.html>

<sup>186</sup> <http://www.politicalislam.com/blog/its-all-in-the-interpretation/>

<sup>187</sup> <http://www.raymondibrahim.com/12330/how-religious-defamation-laws-would-ban-islam>

<sup>188</sup> Koran (Medina) 2:256

Islamic spokesmen in the West frequently quote this to disprove the contention that Islam is spread by the sword, or even to claim that Islam is a religion of peace. According to an early Muslim, Mujahid ibn Jabr, **this verse was abrogated** by the Medinan Qur'an 9:29, in which Muslims are commanded to fight against the People of the Book. Others, however, according to the Islamic historian Tabari, say that 2:256 was never abrogated, but was revealed precisely in reference to the People of the Book. They are not to be forced to accept Islam, but may practice their religions as long as they pay the jizya (poll-tax) and "feel themselves subdued" (9:29).<sup>189</sup>

**c): Assertion: Islam's respect for the sanctity of all human life is shown by the statement: "*Whoever killed a human being shall be looked upon as though he had killed all mankind.*"**<sup>190</sup>

**Rebuttal:**

After September 11, 2001, many Muslims and apologists of Islam glibly came out with this Koranic quote to show that Islam and the Koran disapprove of violence and killing. Unfortunately, these wonderful-sounding words are being quoted out of context. Here is the entire quote:

"That was why We laid it down for the Israelites that whoever killed a human being, except as a punishment for murder or other villainy in the land, shall be looked upon as though he had killed all mankind; and that whoever saved a human life shall be regarded as though he had saved all mankind. Our apostles brought them veritable proofs: yet it was not long before many of them committed great evils in the land. Those that make war against God and His apostle and spread disorder shall be put to death or crucified or have their hands and feet cut off on alternate sides, or be banished from the country."

***These supposedly noble sentiments are in fact a warning to Jews. 'Behave or else' is the message.*** Far from abjuring violence, these verses aggressively point out that anyone opposing the Prophet will be killed, crucified, mutilated and banished!

**d): Assertion: *Islam is a Religion of Peace***

---

<sup>189</sup> <http://www.jihadwatch.org/2007/07/blogging-the-quran-sura-2-the-cow-verses-222-286.html>

<sup>190</sup> Koran (Medina) 5.32

## **Rebuttal:**

***Is Islam a Religion of Peace?***<sup>191</sup> Ask the Armenians, ask the Israelis, ask the Christians of the Middle East and Africa, ask the South Sudanese, ask the Hindus of India....and the list goes on and on.

Roughly 1400 years of history bear testimony to the fact that the Jihad doctrine has been taken very seriously by Muslims through the generations. **An estimated 270,000,000 (yes, you read that correctly!) have died at the hands of Muslim aggression.**<sup>192</sup> Details of the Jihad, which has resulted in the annihilation of entire civilizations,<sup>193</sup> have been documented through the centuries by Muslims themselves.<sup>194,195</sup> There have been almost 20,000 deadly attacks attributed to Islam since 9-11.<sup>196</sup>

For more on this, see Impediment # 1.

***By their fruits ye shall know them (Matthew 7:16)***

**See Impediment # 2 for a detailed rebuttal of the following three assertions (e, f, and g):**

**e): Assertion: *We all worship the same God.***

**f): Assertion: *Judaism, Christianity and Islam are all Abrahamic religions and therefore have much in common.***

---

<sup>191</sup>

[http://www.americanthinker.com/2012/09/sixteen\\_reasons\\_why\\_islam\\_is\\_n\\_of\\_the\\_religion\\_of\\_peace.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/2012/09/sixteen_reasons_why_islam_is_n_of_the_religion_of_peace.html)

<sup>192</sup> <http://www.politicalislam.com/tears/pages/tears-of-jihad/>

<sup>193</sup> <http://www.politicalislam.com/blog/the-annihilation-of-civilizations/>

<sup>194</sup> <http://www.meforum.org/3182/history-muslim-conquests>

<sup>195</sup> [http://www.americanthinker.com/printpage/?url=http://www.americanthinker.com/archived-articles/./2005/11/the\\_truth\\_about\\_islamic\\_crusad.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/printpage/?url=http://www.americanthinker.com/archived-articles/./2005/11/the_truth_about_islamic_crusad.html)

<sup>196</sup> <http://dailycaller.com/2012/07/17/islamorealism-ad-claims-19207-deadly-islamic-attacks-since-911/?print=1>

**g): Assertion: As People of the Book, Jews and Christians enjoy a special relationship with Muslims.**

In addition to the Koranic verses previously discussed, since you now know something about the **Abrogation and Deception** doctrines of Islam, you will also be able to rebut Koranic assertions such as:

**h): Assertion: The Koran teaches the *oneness of God and acceptance of all the prophets*<sup>197</sup>**

**i): Assertion: The Koran teaches *brotherhood*<sup>198</sup>**

**j): Assertion: The Koran teaches *acceptance of diversity*<sup>199</sup>**

**k): Assertion: The Koran teaches *peaceful relations with the Jews and Christians*<sup>200</sup>**

**l): Assertion: The Koran teaches *universal justice and fair dealings with all people*.<sup>201</sup> This claim, which apologists for Islam attempt to back up by quoting from the Koran and Hadiths, has been **effectively rebutted by Robert Spencer**.<sup>202</sup>**

---

<sup>197</sup> Koran (Medina) 2:285

<sup>198</sup> Koran (Medina) 49:13

<sup>199</sup> Koran (Medina) 5:48

<sup>200</sup> Koran (Medina) 3:64; (Mecca) 29:46; (Medina) 5:5

<sup>201</sup> Koran (Medina) 4:135; 5:8

<sup>202</sup> <http://www.jihadwatch.org/2009/05/islam-and-the-golden-rule.html>

## CONCLUSIONS

***Having read this Guide, you now know that***

- 1. Not everything called “dialogue” is worthy of being called “dialogue.”**
- 2. Most “dialogue”, as conducted in the US, is mere schmoozing (social interaction where substantive religious differences are not addressed).**
- 3. If you are engaged in “dialogue” and are not “schmoozing”, you are probably being proselytized or intellectually bullied by Orthodox Muslims (“Sham Dialogue”).**
- 4. There are ways of recognizing “Sham Dialogue”, and effective ways of responding to it – all included in this Guide.**
- 5. You could (although this is unlikely) be involved in *real, constructive interfaith dialogue*. You are aware that seven major impediments to this rare form of dialogue exist.**
- 6. If you are, in fact, engaged in genuine dialogue - congratulations! – but be very, very careful – your Muslim counterparts are courting execution for apostasy! But remember: *Even the Pope says that real dialogue is impossible!***

***If your eyes have finally been opened after thoughtfully studying this Guide, what should you do now?***

Well, if you are a leader of a religious organization that has been contemplating interfaith dialogue, you know what to do. ***Stop, and change direction or, if you must, proceed with EXTREME caution*** using all the tools that we have presented here. But what if you are a congregant and the thought leader(s) of your congregation are determined to move forward?

We would suggest that you follow your conscience and the truth wherever it leads. ***Stand up for what you believe is right***, even in the face of adversity, just as Jesus and the great Biblical Prophets did. First, spread this document throughout your congregation and ask/demand that the church/synagogue elders call a meeting with those leaders intent on moving forward with interfaith dialogue with Muslims. Take them to task. Ask them to really THINK and use logic along with the great compassion that they are so focused on. Demand that they give specifics to refute what is in this document to support their position and then research their answers (*if need be*) to prove them wrong. Do not allow them to intimidate you or brush you off simply because they are the traditional leaders (*who also happen to be the ones who have made a serious error in judgment through ignorance and now need to save face*). After all, they are only human and are not infallible. Tell them that and let them know it is okay to be wrong – just not after they have been confronted with irrefutable evidence of the real truth.

It is important for you to realize that ***this document now empowers YOU*** to move into a position of thought leadership within your own congregation, if you are not already. Why? Because just as your religious leader now holds the power of truth (*as he/she reads from your sacred documents during worship services*), you too now hold the same power to persuade as you reveal the real truth about the dangers of interfaith dialogue with Muslims. Although the going may be tough in the beginning, stay strong and focused and be resolute as you rally others to your cause. Consistently demonstrate fearless confidence that you are right and do not back down and you will eventually be rewarded with victory.

On the other hand, what if, after seeing all this information, you are convinced of the futility of interfaith dialogue but still want to proceed with it *for the sake of fostering peace*? Odds are that after your dialogue partners see that you are knowledgeable and challenging, they will lose interest and move on, knowing there is nothing left to gain.

### ***A few final thoughts:***

- ***There are deep divisions within the Muslim world that date back almost to Islam's very beginnings. We are, of course, referring to the bitter and bloody Sunni-Shiite conflict.<sup>203</sup> It continues even until today, as the two blocs vie for dominance in the Muslim world. If Muslims can't get***

---

<sup>203</sup> The Shiite's central belief is that after the assassination of the fourth Caliph in 661 CE, the next successor to Muhammad should have been Ali, his brother in law. They split with the Sunnis over the issue of succession shortly thereafter.

***Intrafaith Dialogue*<sup>204</sup> right amongst themselves, how can you expect them to succeed at interfaith dialogue with you? This is the proverbial “elephant in the room.”**

- ***If you have finally decided to continue on, make sure that you understand that your Muslim dialogue partners have to be in denial of nearly all of their Holy Books to be sincere!***

---

<sup>204</sup> In her book, *Muslims, Christians, and the Challenge of Interfaith Dialogue* (Oxford University Press, 2007), Jane Idleman Smith quotes reservations regarding interfaith dialogue expressed by prominent Muslim scholars. Regarding the views of Mahmoud Ayoub of Temple University: “He feels that dialogue in the American context has become “fashionable”, sometimes with “touchy-feely” dimensions that he and most Muslims want strongly to avoid, and is thus in danger of losing its meaning. Dialogue as a concept, he says, is beginning to “wear out.” Recognizing that there are deep divisions in the Muslim community itself, including those between Sunnis and Shi’ites, he urges more consistent intrafaith dialogue, perhaps even before much creative interfaith or multifaitth conversation can take place.” (pp. 133-134).

