

# A REPLY TO A MOSLEM

By Guy V. Caskey

Recently I read a tract entitled, *Why I Believe in Islam*. Originally it was a radio broadcast of a speech on a station in Ghana, West Africa. The tract was sent to me by a Christian who lives in that country with the request that I examine it in the light of God's word and reply to it.

Inasmuch as I lived in South, Central and East Africa for many years, had close association with Muslim people and studied the Koran (Qur'an), memorizing many of their sacred scriptures, I feel some competency in fulfilling the request. This examination is not necessarily exhaustive, in the sense that it touches every doctrinal, historical, ethical and moral difference between that system and Christianity, but it will be thorough enough to point up important and major differences in these two bodies of belief and these two ways of life.

A brief definition of terms might be helpful to those who are not well acquainted with the religion of Islam. The term *Mohammedanism* is used in the sense of the teachings of the prophet Mohammed-of his revelation recorded in the Koran. The word *Mohammed* in Arabic literally means praised, or the praised one. *Islam*, in Arabic, means submission to God's will. It is a monotheistic religion whose supreme deity is called *Allah* and whose chief prophet and founder is *Mohammed*. The words *Muslim*, *Muslem* and *Moslem* are different spellings of the noun and adjective forms that apply to the believers or followers of Mohammed. Let it be understood at the outset that there can be no reconciliation between these disparate religions and absolutely no compromise in these philosophies which are so at variance and discord with one another.

It shall be the burden of this treatise to show the contrariety and contradiction of Islam to Christianity, and that the two systems are discordant in principle, antagonistic in purpose and that Islam is repugnant to the spirit and character of Christianity. Let it also be understood that the strength of Christianity's case does not lie in any support from either Protestant or Catholic denominationalism. These systems are just as offensive and incongruous to the genius of the religion of Christ as Muslimism. The entire basis of proof or disproof is derived from the teachings of Jesus and His inspired apostles. So the principles enunciated in this tract and the refutation of the fallacious doctrines of Islam are not received from men, but from the word of God. The source of this knowledge and instruction is the New Testament.

## AN EXAMINATION OF THE TRACT

The gentleman in Ghana who made the radio speech and authored the tract, *Why I Believe in Islam*, said in his opening remarks, "... the only religion, which gives practical guidance to individuals as well as the society as a whole, is Islam." Not knowing this man personally, I cannot say how much he knows about his religion, Muslimism. From this statement, and many others he makes in the course of his speech, one would conclude that his acquaintance with it and his understanding of the facts, rules and principles of the order are somewhat lacking.

This statement he makes at the beginning of the tract is a contradiction of his own religion. I say that because Mohammed himself enjoined his followers to believe the Bible and he distinctly charged them to believe the New Testament. In confirmation of this assertion, notice these quotations from the Koran: "He has sent down to thee the Book in truth, confirming what was before it, and has revealed the law, and the gospel before for the guidance of men" (Sura 3:1). Again: "We believe in God, and what has been revealed to thee, and what was revealed to Abraham, and Ishmael, and Isaac, and Jacob, and the tribes, and what was given to Moses, and Jesus, and the prophets from their Lord, —we will make no distinction between any of them, —and we are unto Him resigned" (Sura 3:78-79). Still another passage where Mohammed issues an injunction to his followers to accept the inspired teachings of Jesus: "Verily, we have inspired thee as we inspired Noah and the prophets after him ... and Jesus ... those who misbelieve and are unjust, God will not pardon them, nor will He guide them on the road— save the road to hell, to dwell therein for aye" (Sura 4:161-166). In the same Sura, and speaking on the same subject, hear Mohammed again: "The Messiah, Jesus the son of Mary, is but the apostle of God and His Word" (Sura 4:169).

As plain as Mohammed's directive to his followers is that they should believe and follow the inspired teachings of Jesus, how can this gentleman make such boisterous and contradictory statements as "the only religion which gives practical guidance to the individual as well as the society as a whole is Islam"?

## **MOHAMMED'S IGNORANCE**

Mohammed's knowledge of Christianity was both meager and confused. Nor did he know much of the enlightening history of Israel. He had learned some childish tales from the Talmud and some garbled legends of the Hebrew patriarchs. While he placed his stamp of approval upon both the Old Testament and the New Testament, he took no pains to ascertain what they revealed.

Although he summoned his followers to believe the Scriptures, with the threat of eternal punishment if they did not, by his ignorance he involved himself and his followers in a fatal inconsistency. He attributes inspiration and a divine origin to the Bible, as well as to the Koran, but it is impossible to believe both with any semblance of consistency or good sense.

Mohammed said in Sura 10:38, "This Koran could not have been composed by any beside God. But it is a confirmation of that which was revealed before." And he further said: "And if thou art in doubt ... ask those who read the Book before thee; verily, the truth is come to thee from thy Lord, be not then of those who are in doubt. And be not of those who say the signs of God are lies, or thou wilt be of those who lose" (Sura 10:94)!

Muslims evade the awkwardness of this false position by propounding that the later revelation (Koran) supersedes the earlier (New Testament), and that they receive the words of Jesus only insofar as these are confirmed by the words of Mohammed. But if the facts recorded in the New Testament are true, then there is no room for Mohammedanism as a true religion in the world.

Let me further proclaim this charge: Near the end of Jesus' brief sojourn on the earth, He said to his twelve apostles: "But the Helper, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, He will teach you **all things** and bring to your remembrance **all things** that I said to you" (John 14:26). Briefly let us analyze and sum up this passage: Jesus was about to leave the earth and return to the father; but the Father, he said, would send them the Holy Spirit, to stand by the side of the apostles, and enable them to teach **all things** and remember **all** that Jesus taught them during the three and one-half crowded years he had been with them. Look at another passage in John. Still talking with the twelve about His return to the Father, and the help they would receive, Jesus said, "However, when He, the Spirit of truth, has come, He will guide you into **all truth**" (John 16:13). Give attention to this plain but important fact. Jesus said that the Holy Spirit would guide the apostles into **all of the truth**. If he kept His promise to them (and He did) that they would be guided in **all the truth**, how could there be any more truth or any new truth after these inspired, God-prepared men? How could there be additional truth revealed to Mohammed six hundred years afterwards, when Jesus said the Apostles had revealed to them **all the truth** and that they were guided therein?

Listen now to Peter, one of those inspired apostles of Jesus: "His divine power has given to us **all things** that pertain to life and godliness, through the knowledge of Him who called us by glory and virtue" (II Peter 1:3).

Language cannot be more unambiguous. In clarion tones he tells us that through our knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ, we have learned that His divine power has provided **everything (all)** we need for both life and godliness. Mohammed is six hundred years too late for us to seriously consider, and we will discover other things wrong with his teachings as we proceed.

## ONLY ONE GOSPEL

Give serious thought and consideration to the words of Paul, another inspired apostle chosen by Jesus: "But even if we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel to you than what we have preached to you, let him be accursed. As we have said before, so now I say again, if anyone preaches any other gospel to you than what you have received, let him be accursed" (Galatians 1:8-9). Any other gospel preached than that which was given through the apostles of Jesus is false, and the one who preaches that different gospel, or receives it, will be accursed.

Jude, an inspired writer of the New Testament, declares "to contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints" (Jude 3). This is an affirmation, a pronouncement, of the complete and perfect will of God, given one time for all time.

Kittel, the German scholar of the New Testament language, says that this word *once (hapax)* "emphasizes the once-for-allness of the death of Christ" (Hebrews 7:27& 9:12). Again he says, in further defining the word, "that which is laid down once and for all." In considering the meaning of Jude 3, he says that men may "know everything necessary to salvation." Thayer, in his Greek lexicon (the New Testament was originally written in Greek), says: "used of what is so done as to be of perpetual validity and never needs repetition."

Hundreds of so-called prophets and revelations have followed that time (Mohammed is just one of them), but the revelation given by Jesus through His apostles was final, complete, supreme and finished communication of God's will to man.

I have shown that Mohammed called upon and adjured his followers to believe Jesus and His teachings, but how, upon reason, common sense or consistency, can one believe Jesus and Mohammed at the same time. It is impossible to reconcile the two. Thus the claim for the inspiration of Mohammed and his writings in the Koran is indefensible.

The apostle John, in the last book he wrote (about A.D. 96), warned, "If anyone adds to these things, God will add to him the plagues that are written in this book" (Revelation 22:18).

Mohammed's writings, which came 600 years later, are, without question, an addition to the word of God. The plagues that John promised will ultimately fall on the guilty parties.

James, the brother of the Lord Jesus Christ, and one of the God inspired writers of the New Testament, calls this New Covenant "the perfect law of liberty." The Greek word for *perfect* (τελειος) means *complete, finished, full-grown, and mature*. How could James have said that, if 550 years later, another revelation was added by one called Mohammed? How could he designate it as perfect and specify that it was complete when it was not, and would not be, according to Muslim doctrine, for more than five centuries thereafter?

Despite these irreconcilable and self-contradictory positions Mohammed occupied in the Koran, he said: "Verily, the true religion in God's sight is Islam" (Sura 3:17).

## **INEXCUSABLE IGNORANCE**

Mohammed was ignorant of the best known characters of the Bible. This is not a denunciation of his intelligence, or an indictment of simple-mindedness. Although he was unschooled, he was not dumb or empty-headed. But this is a charge that he was uninformed and unenlightened as to either true Christianity or Judaism, revealed in the Old Testament. The chronology of events discussed in the Bible meant nothing to him. Let me give you a classic example of his unfamiliarity and shallowness in respect to the most widely known happening the world has ever known. Mohammed, in his smattering of knowledge, confused Miriam, the sister of Moses, with Mary, the mother of Jesus. John Alden Williams, in his translation of the Koran (it is reputed to be the most accurate translation of the Koran in the English language), renders Sura 19:26 thus: "Then she brought it [the child] to her people, carrying it; said they, 'O Mary! thou hast done an extraordinary thing! O sister of Aaron! thy father was not a bad man, nor was thy mother a harlot!' And she pointed to him...."

According to Mohammedans, Amram (Imran) was the father of the virgin Mary (see the chapter of Imran's family-Sura 3:30-31). "When Imran's [Amram's] wife said, 'Lord! I have vowed to Thee what is within my womb, to be dedicated unto Thee ... I have called her Mary.' " In matter of time, there are fifteen hundred years between Miriam's birth and the birth of Mary, the mother of Jesus. The smallest child in a Bible class knows perfectly well that Miriam, the sister of Moses and Aaron, was not the mother of the Lord Jesus Christ!

## **WHAT OF MOHAMMED'S MORALS?**

Mohammed claimed to be God's inspired apostle and representative (Sura 3:29, 4:161& 61:6). He was not only ignorant of God's word; he was a fabricator, a deceiver, and a falsifier. I do not wish to be unkind or rude; but I must tell you that Mohammed was an impostor and a liar. The last reference above, Sura 61.6 reads: "And when Jesus the son of Mary said 'O children of Israel! verily, I am the apostle of God to you, verifying the law that was before me and giving you glad tidings of an apostle who shall come after me, whose name shall be A'hmed! [the equivalent to Mohammed and meaning praised, laudable]' " (Sura 61:6). This was not only a blatant, blustering falsehood; (Jesus never said any such thing) it was also deliberate. For one to consciously, voluntarily and purposefully say that Jesus made a statement which he never made is a case of willful dishonesty, and dishonesty is a sin of immorality.

## **MORE OF MOHAMMED'S IMMORALITY**

But Mohammed's immorality extended far beyond lying. Let us briefly review from the Koran his teachings about polygamy, marriage and divorce-interspersed with a few of his own escapades with women! Instead of feeling it incumbent on him as a prophet of God to set his followers an example of temperance and high-toned living, he rather used his office as a title to license from which ordinary men were restrained. Restricting his disciples to four wives (at one time), he retained to himself the liberty of taking as many as he pleased. He actually married eleven women, nine of whom survived him, and this sanctions the publishing of a new paragraph of the Koran, as allowing him this "special privilege ... above the other believers" (Sura 33:48).

## **A FASHIONABLE AND POLITICAL PRACTICE**

Among oriental chiefs and princes, the extension of the harem has always been of the first modes of exhibiting the grandeur of a ruler. Mohammed was no exception. Many are the accounts of his scandalous amours. Not only was he polygamous and licentious, but he defended his conduct, when it created a scandal, by professed revelations, which are now embodied as parts of the Koran.

When his wives murmured, and with justice, at his irregularities, he silenced them by a revelation, giving him conjugal allowances that he had himself proscribed (forbidden) as unlawful. When he designed to contract an alliance with a woman forbidden to him by his own law, an inspired permission was forthcoming, encouraging him to the transgression.

## **EXAMPLES OF MISCONDUCT IN THE KORAN**

Let us look at some of the examples of his moral conduct in the Koran itself: "And when thou didst say to him God had shown favour to and thou hadst shown favour to, 'Keep thy wife to thyself and fear God'; and thou didst conceal in thy soul what God was about to display; and didst fear men, though God is more deserving that thou shouldst fear Him; and when Zaid had fulfilled his desire of her we did wed thee to her that there should be no hindrance to the believers in the matter of the wives of their adopted sons when they have fulfilled their desire of them: and so God's bidding to be done" (Sura 33:37).

Zaid was Mohammed's freedman and adopted son. Mohammed had seen and admired Zaid's wife Zainab, and her husband at once offered to divorce her: this Mohammed dissuaded him from until the transaction was sanctioned by the verse. The relations of the Arabs to their adopted children were, as has been remarked before, very strict; and Mohammed's marriage to Zainab occasioned much scandal among his contemporaries. This, and other passages, abrogated for him all the inconvenient restrictions!

Mohammed wanted free reign in selecting as many women as he might desire, and he wanted no restraints placed upon him by his wives or his followers. So he would conveniently receive a revelation from Allah which would justify his promiscuous larks, his frolicking debauchery and his countless dizzy rounds of pleasure.

Listen to one of his such revelations from Allah! "O thou prophet! verily, we make lawful for thee thy wives to whom thou hast given their hire, and what thy right hand possesses out of the booty that God has granted thee, and the daughters of thy paternal uncle and the daughters of thy paternal aunts, and the daughters of thy maternal uncle and the daughters of thy maternal aunts, provided they have fled with thee, and any believing woman if she give herself to the prophet, if the prophet desire to marry her;—a special privilege this for thee, above the other believers. We knew what we ordained for them concerning their wives and what their right hands possess, that there should be no hindrance to thee; and God is forgiving, merciful" (Sura 33:48).

## **A SYSTEM OF INEQUALITY**

Besides being a system of inequality and partiality, it is a system that permits, promotes and encourages profligacy and debauchery. I hear a strong objection and protest against this statement from Muslims. In their attempt to defend their practices, they become loud in their disapproval. But how do you respond to and refute such unquestionable evidence and such undeniable conclusions? When a Moslem may take as many as four wives at one time, divorce all of these and take four more, and keep as many female slaves as concubines as his right hand can afford, the proof is indisputable that this social and religious structure is but legalized prostitution and whoredom. It has more than just a religious connotation; the directive for such conduct is supposedly authorized by the God of heaven. And that's blasphemy! Such a social arrangement is no higher or better morally than the vestal virgins of the Roman pagan temples of Paul's day who were used in a religious setting by those who qualified to satiate their lust.

Is it possible for you to picture Jesus, by the wildest stretch of the imagination, being as wanton, lewd, vulgar and shamelessly unvirtuous as this man Mohammed, who claimed to be God's final prophet? Such a thought is nauseous to any decent, modest person who has any respect for purity. To compare Mohammed with Christ and to claim that Muslimism is on par with Christianity is impious irreverence of the most sordid kind!

## **HIS DEBAUCHERY CONTINUED**

In the Koran, the promises of physical pleasures are greatly in excess of promises of a higher kind. By contrast, in the New Testament, physical descriptions that are used to describe spiritual and eternal matters are never of the grosser kind.

Indulgence and sexual dissipation marked Mohammed's life. However, he was only practicing what he preached. In fact, in all of his wantonness, he justified himself by receiving direct revelations from Allah. According to the high and noble standard of Christianity, he would be a loose-moral, rakish adulterer.

Mohammed may not have forcibly raped women, but he seduced them—as in the case of his adopted son's wife. Another example of his profligacy is his liaison with the Coptic girl, Mary. He lay with her on the day due to Ayesha or Hafsa. Hafsa was greatly enraged, and Mohammed, to pacify her, swore never to touch the girl again. He then enjoined Hafsa to keep the matter secret from the rest of his wives. She, however, revealed it in confidence. Mohammed, annoyed at finding his confidence betrayed, not only divorced her, but separated himself from his other wives for the space of a month, which time he passed in Mary's apartment. He then proceeded to receive additional revelation from Allah, which was intended to free him from his oath, and to reprove his wives for their criticism and conduct.

Listen to his revelation: "And when the prophet told as a secret to one of his wives a recent event, and when she gave information thereof and exposed it, he acquainted her with some of it and avoided part of it. But when he informed her of it, she said, 'Who told thee this?' he said, 'The wise one, the well aware informed me.' If ye both turn repentant unto God, —for your hearts have swerved! —but if ye back each other up against him, —verily, God, He is the sovereign, and Gabriel and the righteous of the believers, and the angels after that, will back him up" (Sura 62:3-4).

What kind of religion is it (and what character the ethic of human conduct) that would promise the support of God, Gabriel, righteous believers and the angels of heaven to a man guilty, as a whoremaster, of openly and flagrantly living in an apartment of a Coptic girl to whom he was not even married?

But Mohammed went even further in his supposed revelations to absolve himself from the guilt and to free himself from any future blame in his sexual intemperance. His revelations left him bold, brazen and shameless. Here is an example: "It may be that his Lord if he divorce you will give him in exchange wives better than you, Muslims, believers, devout, repentant, worshipping, given to fasting—such as have known men and virgins too" (Sura 66:5).

## **THE LOW ESTATE OF WOMEN IN MUSLIMISM**

These passages from the Koran not only show the very low estimate in which women in the Moslem religion are held by the prophet, but that they were to be used as playthings to satiate man's physical lust. He treated her as a piece of property, chattel, to be used and disposed of upon any whim or caprice. Notice another passage from the Koran that indicates the impulse of the man and his extravagant notion to gratify his sexual urges and pleasures: "Put off whomsoever [of your wives—defer her turn of conjugal rights] thou wilt, or whomsoever thou cravest of those whom thou hast deposed [divorced] and it shall be no crime against thee" (Sura 33:51).

I know of no system of ethics in history up to this present time more obscene, unchaste, lewd and scurrilous than the permissiveness of the Koran and the practice of Moslem men in regard to their relationship with women.

## **POLYGAMY ADVOCATED**

The vulgar and abusive system of multiple wives is an integral and vital part of the very fabric of Mohammedanism. It deprives women of their rights, robs them of the God-assigned sphere in which He intended the woman to serve and subjects her to drudgery and toil of a slave.

The husband alone unilaterally (without her consent) can terminate the marriage by repudiation (*talag*) of his wife. A husband may, in this extrajudicial process, repudiate his wife at will and his motive in doing so is not subject to scrutiny by the court or any other official body. A repudiation repeated three times constitutes a final and irrevocable dissolution of marriage; but a single pronouncement may be revoked at will by the husband during the period known as the wife's "*iddah*", which lasts for three months following the repudiation [or any other type of divorce] or, where the wife is pregnant, until the birth of the child" (*Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1982 Edition).

Let us review briefly what the Koran, the sacred scriptures of Islam, has to say on the subject: "But if ye fear that ye cannot do justice between orphans, then marry what seems good to you of women, by twos, or threes, or fours; and if ye fear that ye cannot be equitable, then only one, or what your right hands possess [female slaves or concubines]" (Sura 4:2).

The Koran permitted Mohammed to have as many women as he desired, but his followers (believers) could have only four wives at one time. Of course, they could divorce those, as we have just seen, and get four more if they pleased. To compensate a man for being able to have only four wives at a time, the Koran provides for him as many concubines (female slave girls, secondary wives of inferior social and legal status) as he could afford!

Can you believe there are people in the world who have the audacity, the presumption and insolence to compare Muslimism with Christianity, and the impudence to make an effort to draw a parallel between Mohammed and Christ? In my long years of study of the two systems, I see no point of analogy, not even an approximate one. One of the systems connotes bloodshed, lust, and inequality; the other possesses the attributes of love, sharing, and concern for the welfare of the other person.

Direct your thoughts to another passage from the Koran in this same context: "Men stand superior to women in that God hath preferred some of them over others ... But those [wives] whose perverseness ye fear, admonish them and remove them into bed chambers and beat them" (Sura 4:38). This is physical abuse and mistreatment of women. Such teaching is of an entirely different character from that which is found in Christianity.

Look carefully at the instruction the inspired apostle Peter gave in the New Testament: "Likewise you husbands, dwell with them with understanding, giving honor to the wife, as to the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life, that your prayers may not be hindered" (I Peter 3:7).



Give attention to these strong terms: husband and wife dwell together. That is equality. They are coheirs. They are heirs together of God's grace. And that expresses equality. The husband is to honor his wife, and the term honor means "treat her as a precious possession." To "remove her into a bed chamber and there beat her," does not measure up to God's standard of the attitude toward and the treatment of his wife that is required by the God of heaven. The husband, in fact, is to love her above himself. "Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ also loved the church and gave Himself for it" (Ephesians 5:25).

How does this Muslim doctrine and practice of polygamy comport with God's will and standard set up in the Bible? Just a few passages will suffice to make the difference very plain. When God brought and bound man and woman together in marriage and the home, it was said: "Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and they shall become one flesh" (Genesis 2:24). It is important for you to weigh and analyze this statement. A man (singular) leaves his father and mother and is joined to his wife (singular) and the two (not three or four or five) become one flesh. Later, it was written by Moses: "He created them male and female, and blessed them and called them Mankind in the day they were created" (Genesis 5:2).

Centuries later Jesus said, "they are no longer two but one flesh. Therefore what God has joined together, let not man separate" (Matthew 19:6). These passages we have just read do not in any way resemble the Koran in its permission for multiple wives and its provision for easy divorce.

## QUOTATIONS FROM AUTHORITIES

Let me quote from Lane's *Modern Egypt and Tagore Law Lectures*, as well as the Koran. "There are certainly not many persons in Cairo who have not divorced one wife if they have been long married, and there are many who in the course of ten years have married as many as thirty or more wives" (Vol. I, pp. 227,231).

"A husband may divorce his wife without any misbehavior on her part, or without assigning any cause. The husband only has to say, 'I divorce thee,' and without legal procedure or appearance in a court of law, the wife is no longer a wife: whereas the woman can only divorce her husband before a court of law, and by proving ill-treatment or other reasonable grounds" (*Tagore Law Lectures*, p. 389).

An objection is raised and an argument is made in an effort to counter the force of the Scriptural disparity by saying: "Under Moses' law, men had two or more wives. Even Abraham and Jacob, under an earlier covenant, had two wives." Jesus said "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, permitted you to divorce your wives, but from the beginning it was not so" (Matthew 19:8). He had just reminded them "He that made them at the beginning made them male and female." And Paul spoke plainly and strongly: "Truly, these times of ignorance God overlooked, but now commands all men everywhere to repent" (Acts 17:30).

In contrast listen to the words of the Koran: "O thou Prophet! When ye divorce women, then divorce them at their term" (Sura 65:1). The commentators of the Koran explain that "at their term" is when they have had three periods of menstruation, or if they prove with child, then don't divorce them until after their delivery. Rather, "Let them [the divorced women] dwell

where ye dwell, according to your means, and do not harm them, to reduce them to straits; and if they be heavy with child, then pay for them until they lay down their burdens; and if they suckle (the child) for you, then give them their hire..." (Sure 65:6).

Put this teaching along side what Jesus taught on the subject: "And I say to you, whoever divorces his wife, except for sexual immorality and marries another, commits adultery; and whoever marries her who is divorced commits adultery" (Matthew 19:9).

The Arabs were in the habit of divorcing their wives with the words, "Thy back is to me as my mother's back," after which they considered it as unnatural to approach them as it would be their real mothers. So Mohammed in his revelation said: "God has not made for any man two hearts in his inside; nor has He made your wives, —whom you back away from, —your real mothers" (Sura 33:3). The first restriction was to the effect that divorce was revocable (that it could be repealed or canceled, or annulled) until it had been pronounced three times. "Three successive declarations at a month's interval were necessary in order to make it irrevocable [so that it could not be made void]" (Syed Ali).

"But it is notorious that all the benefit of this restriction is canceled by Mohammedan law, which considers that the treble divorce utterance in one breath is as irrevocable as when it is uttered at three distinct times" (Hidayah-teaching or duties). This law has degraded Moslem women to a deplorable extent. To counter this argument, and strike back at the opponent and attack his position, it is said that "divorce is allowed in America for almost any cause, and there are few if any countries where divorce is more rampant, widespread and uncontrollable than in the United States."

This is likely a true statement and a fair appraisal of the matter in my country. But such accusation misses the point entirely. Not for a moment have I tried to justify what people (even so-called Christian people) in the United States believe and practice. I wish we were a "nation whose God is Jehovah." I am afraid we are not. My whole presentation of this matter has been based upon what the New Testament teaches. It poses the question: "What did Jesus and the apostles preach and practice?" This is the supreme, as well as the sole, standard of authority. It is the criterion by which our lives must be governed and guided.

## **THE AUTHOR OF THE TRACT ON ISLAM**

The author of the tract, *Why I Believe In Islam*, says that he believes in Islam because it is the truth. Then he further says: "This claim can be tested in two ways. God may either manifest his signs direct for a seeker after Him, or we may come to believe in God by studying the life of a person to whom God has revealed Himself. As by the grace of God I happen to be one of those people to whom God has on many occasions and in a supernatural way revealed Himself. I stand in need of no further reason for believing in the truth of Islam than that I have experienced the truth of Islam in my own person" (*Why I Believe in Islam*, p. 5).

## **DO PERSONAL FEELINGS PROVE ANYTHING?**

The whole of this man's argument is false. It is dead wrong on every count! His premise is unsound because it is built on his own personal feelings and experiences. This is called

*emotive reasoning*, because one tries to prove something based on his emotions. That never has been accurate. It is also called *subjective reasoning*. The only proof one has is internal.

This theory gives importance to conscious experience. It says that one's feelings are the criterion for the establishment of truth. Such an assumed position is neither logical nor true. *Philosophical induction* is inferring or drawing a conclusion based upon one's own opinion, internal feelings and personal experiences. Any such thesis is completely erroneous and cannot be defended.

If this kind of assertion, made by this gentlemen in his tract, *Why I Believe In Islam*, is permissible, if what he here postulates is true, then any kind of fatuous, foolish, stupid doctrine in the world could be tested and demonstrated to be true.

Jacob, in his decision to deceive his father and secure for himself the blessing promised to the older brother, said: "Perhaps my father will feel me, and I shall seem to be a deceiver to him" (Genesis 27:12). But, in fact, his father Isaac did rely upon his feelings solely, and this is where he erred. "Then Isaac said to Jacob, 'Please come near, that I may feel you, my son, whether you are really my son Esau or not.' So Jacob went near to Isaac his father, and he felt him and said, 'The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau.' And he did not recognize him..." (Genesis 27:21-23).

When one depends on his feelings like Isaac did, and as this Moslem who authored the tract, you may be certain he will not recognize truth. Paul refers to this same pragmatic, opinionated philosophy when he said to Herod Agrippa II, before whom he stood in court, "Indeed, I myself thought [**felt**] I must do many things contrary to the name of Jesus..." (Acts 26:9).

Paul had been an inveterate foe of Christians and the cause of Christ. He **felt** that Jesus was an impostor, that Christianity was a false religion and that it should be obliterated from the earth. And he earnestly endeavored to do just that by destroying those who followed Jesus. In his actions against Christ's cause and people, he depended entirely upon his **feelings**. His, too, was a discursive philosophy, going from the premise that Jesus was a deceptive and misleading Messiah to the conclusion that this religion should be expunged from the hearts and actions of men.

## SUBJECTIVE REASONING FALSE

If subjective reasoning (based upon human emotions and personal experience) can prove this man's claim that Islam is true, what about the Hindu woman who casts her first-born child to the crocodiles in the sacred Ganges River to appease the wrath of her god. Does the fact that she feels good about her actions, returns home rejoicing and believes that she now occupies the right relationship with her gods make this kind of reasoning right? Let me reaffirm that such logic (if it can be called logic) is completely worthless. And so is this man's so called proof that "I stand in need of no further reason for believing in the truth of Islam than I have experienced the truth of Islam in my own person."

In the second place, I not only **doubt**, but also I categorically deny that he "happens to be one of those people to whom God on many occasions and in a supernatural way revealed

Himself." I have already given ample reason for such a denial, but let us briefly recapitulate the argument.

Jesus promised the apostles that the Holy Spirit would:

1. Teach them all things necessary to establish Christianity.
2. Bring to their remembrance all he had previously taught them.
3. Guide them into all the truth.
4. Provide all things necessary to life and godliness.
5. The faith was once for all delivered to the saints.

There are two other passages on this point of Bible principle to which I call your attention: "God, who at various times and in different ways spoke in time past to the fathers by the prophets, has in these last days spoken to us by His Son, whom He has appointed heir of all things, through whom also He made the worlds" (Hebrews 1:1-2).

In certain, definite and clear terms, the apostle is saying that in this last age, or dispensation, God's communication of his will to us (all mankind) has been effected through his Son, Jesus Christ. No truth in the New Testament (which Book Mohammed enjoined his followers to believe) is more strongly emphasized than that the teachings of Jesus and his apostles comprise the final, complete and perfect will of God to man.

Many men since their day (the time of the apostles) have claimed additional or progressional revelation from God. You may be sure that all such claims are false. They may not all be deliberate deceptions-though many of such doctrine has been purposefully misleading-I do maintain that any such claimed revelation since the close of the New Testament (about A.D. 96) is a counterfeit. And by that I mean it is in error, inaccurate, incorrect, and usually dishonest. As far as I know, when you examine and analyze each one of them in the light of God's word found in the New Testament, one of these assertions, or theories, for additional revelation is not better than the other. I unconditionally and positively deny the whole gamut of such claimed revelations.

## **A SYSTEM ADVANCED BY WAR**

Carnal war and conquest have been the instruments by which Muslimism has been advanced. The central principle of the religion is expressed in Sura 3:135: "... and that God may assay those who believe, and blot out the misbelievers. Do ye think that ye can enter Paradise and God not know those of you who have fought well? ..."

Give strict attention to some verses from the Koran on the subject and concentrate on an examination of each one to discover the true nature and character of the system. "When thou didst set forth early [commentators say this refers to the Battle of Ohod, when Mohammed experienced a severe check, and lost two teeth by a shot from an arrow] from thy people to settle for the believers a camp to fight ... Why! God gave you victory at Bedr

when ye were in a poor way..." (Sura 3:117). "Verily, those of you who turned your backs on that day when the two armies met, it was but Satan who made them slip" (Sura 3:149).

"O ye who believe! be not like those who misbelieve, and say unto their brethren when they knock about in the earth, or are upon a raid, 'Had they but been at home, they had not died and had not been killed' ... And if, indeed, ye be killed in God's way or die, surely forgiveness from God and mercy is better than what ye gather; and if ye die or be killed it is to God ye shall be assembled" (Sura 3:150-151).

"Those who fled, and were turned out of their houses, and were harmed in my way, and who fought and were killed, I will cover their offences, and I will make them enter into gardens beneath which rivers flow" (Sura 3:194). "Let those then fight in God's way who sell this life of the world for the next; and whoso fights in God's way, then, be he killed or be he victorious, we will give him a mighty hire" (Sura 4:75).

"Those who believe fight in the way of God" (Sura 4:77) "... take ye not patrons from among them until they too flee in God's way; but if they turn their backs, then seize them and kill them wheresoever ye find them" (Sura 4:90).

"O ye who believe! when ye meet those who misbelieve in swarms, turn not to them your hinder parts; for he who turns to them that day his hinder parts, save turning to fight or rallying to a troop, brings down upon himself wrath from God, and his resort is hell, and an ill journey shall it be! Ye did not slay them, but it was God who slew them; nor didst thou shoot when thou didst shoot, but God did shoot" (Sura 8:15-16). (This alludes to the alleged miracle of the gravel thrown into the eyes of the Qurais at the Battle of Bedr, to which the Muslim victory was due.)

"... but shouldst thou ever catch them [unbelievers] in war, then make those who come after them run by their example [that is make example to all future opponents by the severity of your dealing with them]" (Sura 8:59). "O thou Prophet! ... urge on the believers to fight" (Sura 8:65).

## **THE MANDATE TO FIGHT CARRIED OUT**

"The Jews of Medina met Mohammed's claim to be a prophet of the God of Abraham with opposition and ridicule, and they intrigued with his enemies both in Mecca and Medina. In time therefore, the main group of the Jews were driven out, and one clan, the Qurayzah, was destroyed by putting the men to death and enslaving the women and children" (*Encyclopedia Britannica*).

Notice some of the dissimilarities in this area of thought between Christianity and Muslimism. Islam has been advanced by the sword; Christianity has been advanced by love. Mohammedanism gives emphasis to the physical; Christianity gives emphasis to the spiritual. The religion of which Mohammed is the author stresses the outward; the religion of which Christ is the author stresses the inward.

You will observe that, in II Corinthians 10:5, Paul says "bring every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ."

In Mohammedanism, there is bloodshed, plunder, and reciprocation of evil for evil. The spirit of Christ's teaching is the antithesis, the exact opposite of this. The Lord is the one to take vengeance: "Vengeance is Mine, I will repay" (Romans 12:19& Hebrews 10:30). The unlikeness of the two orders is well expressed by Paul in these words: "Bless those who persecute you; bless and do not curse ... Repay no one evil for evil. Have regard for good things in the sight of all men ... Beloved, do not avenge yourselves ... Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good" (Romans 12:14-21). You see, Paul learned this from Jesus (Matthew 5). There is hardly a single note of harmony between these two arrangements.

Jesus said, "I say to you, love your enemies, bless those who curse you, do good to those who hate you, and pray for those who spitefully use you and persecute you" (Matthew 5:44).

At the other extreme, the direct opposite of what Jesus taught, Mohammed said, "... seize them and kill them wheresoever ye find them" (Sura 4:90). "We destroyed them..." (Sura 7:3); "Ye did not slay them, but it was God who slew them..." (Sura 8: 16).

The nature of Christ's kingdom is seen in the prophecies of the Old Testament: "... they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; ... neither shall they learn war anymore" (Isaiah 2:4).

In reply to this, someone asks, "What about the military expeditions that Christians undertook from the end of the eleventh century to the end of the thirteenth century to recover the Holy Land from the Moslems?" These were called the "Christian Crusades," and those who participated were called "Christian Crusaders."

The vigorous and concerted action of these people in the Medieval Crusades was not Christian in any sense of the word, and they were certainly not crusades for Christ, because our Lord never taught or intended that Christianity be advanced in any such fashion. Ostensibly it was for Christianity's progress to recapture what they falsely conjectured and imagined was holy ground. But the professed reason for doing a thing is not always the true reason. Simply because a man claims to be a Christian does not make him a Christian. One may believe something to be true, and believe it sincerely, when in fact, it is false. And to believe something because one has had a personal experience (or "encounter" as some call it), or because they *feel* that it is right, does not establish it as truth. Such *subjective evidence* is no evidence at all! It must undergo the test of a divine standard to carry any weight of authenticity.

## **ISLAM'S RELATION TO OTHER RELIGIONS**

From early experience, the orthodox Muslims concluded:

- (1) that rebels within the Muslim state must be brought back to submission through Jihad, a conclusion that appears to be corroborated by the Qur'an, and
- (2) that a nonrepentant apostate must be put to death.

Mohammed's political experience with the Jews, whom he repeatedly found betraying the pacts for joint defense of Medina against his Meccan foes, however, led to the gradual adoption of a severe policy of expulsion and execution of Jewish males at Medina (*Encyclopedia Britannica*, Islam, pp. 925-926). In those early days of Muslimism, they believed that open war against unjust imams and all Muslims who commit grave sins was a religious obligation-and that Muslims who commit grave sins are infidels condemned to eternal hellfire in the world to come and ought to be killed in this life.

On and on, this spirit of war, bloodshed, carnage, plunder and devastation goes, as a thread through the whole of the Koran. It is the genius by which the religion of Islam is propagated. How different from the spirit of Christianity! The hate and bloodshed of Muslimism is the very antithesis of the character of love that permeates the religion of Christ. The two dispositions are antipodes.

Jesus said to Peter: "Put your sword in its place, for all who take the sword will perish by the sword" (Matthew 26:52). "My kingdom is not of this world. If My kingdom were of this world, My servants would fight, so that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now My kingdom is not from here" (John 18:36).

Often Jesus in teaching a lesson would say, "The kingdom of heaven is like..." that is, the kingdom which is both heavenly (spiritual) and from heaven. The source of it is heaven (not the earth) and the nature of it is heavenly-those spiritual qualities with which God imbued it for man's good in his brief stay on the earth.

Paul helped the Corinthian church to understand the character of God's kingdom when he said to them: "For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ" (II Corinthians 10:4-5).

### **IT IS A SYSTEM OF MATERIALISM**

You would expect that a religion that was born in a climate of physical opposition and has lived by a kind of military aggression would stagnate into an organism of materialism. While it is a form of idolatry to believe that some peculiar sanctity attaches to the Kaabah, the knowledge that there are great material and economic advantages which accrue to the city of Mecca from the annual influx of pilgrims induced Mohammed to resolve to make pilgrimage obligatory on all his followers.

So that you may see to what extent Mohammed is responsible for directing the hopes of his people to a material paradise, let me read a fair specimen of the descriptions given in the Koran: "These are they who are brought nigh, in gardens of pleasure! A crowd of those of yore, and a few of those of the latter day! And gold-weft couches, reclining on them face to face. Around them shall go eternal youths, with goblets and ewers and a cup of flowing wine; no headache shall they feel therefrom, nor shall their wits be dimmed! And fruits such as they deem the best; and flesh of fowl as they desire; and bright and large-eyed maids like hidden pearls; a reward for that which they have done!

"They shall hear no folly there and no sin; only the speech, 'Peace, Peace!' ... And made them virgins, darlings of equal age (with their spouses) for the fellows of the right! ..." (Sura 56: 10-35).

Everywhere you turn in the Koran, it must be admitted that the promises of physical pleasure are greatly in excess of promises of a higher kind. Listen to this passage from the Koran: "For those who fear are gardens with their Lord, beneath which rivers flow; they shall dwell therein for aye, and pure wives and grace from God" (Sura 3: 11).

Again: "But those who believe and do aright, we will make them enter gardens beneath which rivers flow, and they shall dwell therein for ever and aye, for them therein pure wives, and we will make them enter into a shady shade" (Sura 4:60).

Jesus taught that "in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage" (Matthew 22:30).

Paul, addressing the subject of the afterlife, said: "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" (I Corinthians 15:50).

Later, Paul wrote to the Corinthian church again: "... though we have known Christ according to the flesh, yet now we know Him thus no longer" (II Corinthians 5:16). It is not a fleshly relationship in the hereafter. It is clear and convincing to one that reads the New Testament that for the next world the Christian will be changed. He puts off a perishable body and puts on one that is imperishable. He tells us that "the body is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption. It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power. It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body" (I Corinthians 15:42-44).

Muslimism pictures a man in the next world with a fleshly, natural, physical body, enjoying the physical pleasures of that world-such as possessing many wives whom will be virgins with beautiful, large, dark eyes.

While living in East Africa some years ago, we hired a young Muslim as a supervisor of a number of workers employed to produce food for the students who were attending our Bible school. His father had married his mother many years before and by her had seventeen children. During the time we lived there, the father, in keeping with the teachings of the Koran, put away that wife and took two young women to be his wives (Sura 4:3, 33:50). (The above information came to us from his son; and we, of course, saw him.)

You may find this passage from the Koran enlightening on the topic: "And do not marry women your fathers married, except bygone ... but lawful for you is all besides this, for you to seek them with your wealth, marrying them and not fornicating; but such of them as ye have enjoyed" (Sura 4:26-28).

The highest joy the Muslim man can entertain for the next life is to dwell in gardens beneath which rivers of water flow and possess many dark-eyed wives who are virgins. Such a worldly, unspiritual concept of life after death is so carnal and earthly that it could not bear any possible resemblance to Christianity, or in the remotest way favorably compare to it.

But, again, someone objects to the argument and charges Christians of being just as materialistic in their concepts of heaven as are the Muslims. They cite, as proof, a description



of heaven [?] in the book of Revelation in the New Testament (chapters 21 & 22). But there are these three things to consider about the Revelation account before we draw such conclusions and are convinced of their veracity.

First, this is non-literal, highly figurative language. John set that fact early in the book: "He sent and signified it by His angel to His servant John" (Revelation 1:1).

The word John used was, signified [*semaino* (σημαίνω)], which means to indicate by a sign or signal, to set forth in sign language. So, Revelation chapters 21 and 22 are not literal. The streets were not literally gold and the walls were not literally jasper.

Secondly, John has been discussing the persecuted and beleaguered church under Roman rule in the last half of the first century. He promised the Christians if they would faithfully endure these persecutions until death, they would receive a crown of life (Revelation 2:10).

He also promised the suffering Christians that He would bring about an end of this pagan power, this old dragon, through internal decay, natural calamities and outside forces against Rome. Having passed through that persecution, the church would be like a bride adorned for her husband. And the announcement would be made that the dwelling of God is with men (Revelation 21:3). There follows the beautiful, figurative language of God's tabernacle (dwelling with men), which seems to be a description of the church (which is God's temple or tabernacle), following those days of hardships and devastation at the hands of Roman paganism.

Thirdly, if it is a description of heaven instead of the church, it is far from the material, physical, carnal, sexual terms the Koran uses to describe the after life. You must be able to see the vast difference!

## IT IS A SYSTEM OF RITUALISM

Muslimism reminds students of world religions of the ritualism of perverted Christianity-such as is found in Roman Catholicism and in many of the Protestant denominations. Let us read just a few passages from the Koran.

"O ye that believe! approach not prayer while ye are drunk, until ye well know what ye say; nor yet while polluted,—unless ye be passing by the way,—until ye have washed yourselves. But if ye are sick, or on a journey, or one of you come from the privy, or if ye have touched a woman, and if ye cannot find water, then use good surface sand and wipe your faces and hands therewith; verily, God pardons and forgives" (Sura 4:46). This brings to mind the ritual of Roman Catholics who make the sign of the cross three times, count their beads and kiss the feet of the statue of one of their saints. Through courtesy, we may call it ritualism. Actually, it borders on idolatry.

During the earliest decades after the death of the Prophet, certain basic features of the religio-social organization of Islam were singled out to serve as anchoring points of the community's life and formulated as **Pillars of Islam**. They are:

**The Profession of Faith.** "There is no god but Allah and Mohammed is his Prophet." This profession must be recited at least once in one's lifetime, aloud, correctly, and purposefully, with an understanding of its meaning with an assent from the heart.

**Prayer.** The second pillar consists of five congregational prayers in a day, although they may be offered individually if one cannot go to the mosque for some reason. They must face toward Mecca. Each unit of prayer consists of a standing posture, during which verses from the Koran are recited, as well as two prostrations. At every change in posture, God is great, is recited. Tradition has fixed the materials to be recited in each posture.

On this point of ritualism, Moslems practice pilgrimage. Every Moslem, male or female, and in whatever country they reside, must visit the Holy City and the Temple at Mecca at least once in his life. This duty is enjoined in the Koran; it is enforced by the example of Mohammed himself, and by a traditional saying of his, to the effect that he who dies without performing it may as well die a Jew or a Christian. The Koran seems to admit to some latitude: "It is a duty toward God incumbent on those who are able to go thither, to visit the house of God" (Sura 3). The orthodox sects say: "Everyone who is able to walk and to earn his bread on the way..." Consequently, many poor creatures leave their homes in Northern India or inner Africa, resolved to beg their way to Mecca, and face all the terrors and unknown dangers of the desert, wilderness, sea and foreign lands.

We are not here arguing whether the Koran made it imperative that every Muslim, in his lifetime, goes to Mecca. We are arguing that such a ritual is closely akin to idolatry.

Mecca is the Holy City of Islam, not because it is the birthplace of Mohammed, but because it contains the most ancient temple in Arabia, the world-renowned Kaabah, or Bait Allah. Of this temple, the Koran boldly says: "Verily the first house appointed unto man to worship in was that which is in Becca, blessed, and the Keblah for all creatures. Therein are manifest signs: the place where Abraham stood; and whosoever entereth therein shall be safe." Their legend is that the temple had a supernatural origin and a date anterior to the creation. Such teaching, such ritualism is rank idolatry. Just here, I ask you to consider one passage of scripture from the New Testament: "God, who made the world and everything in it, since He is Lord of heaven and earth, does not dwell in temples made with hands. Nor is He worshiped with men's hands, as though He needed anything, since He gives to all life, breath, and all things" (Acts 17:24-25). What Paul is saying is that no building is sacred, for it is not in the building God dwells, but in the hearts and lives of his people.

The Kaabah stands in a wide court, skirted by colonnades of marble and stone pillars, and ornamented by a number of domes, and is itself, as the name denotes, in the form of a cube of about thirty-five feet. Built into the northeast corner, about four or five feet from the ground, is the famous **Black Stone** (about eight inches long and six inches high), which sober Moslems believe to have been brought from a neighboring mountain to mark the point from which the circumambulation of the Kaabah was to commence, but which enthusiasts believe to have fallen from heaven, and to be destined to witness at the last day in favor of all those who have kissed it. Originally white, it is supposed to have become black by the kisses of sinful men. This, too, is utter idolatry.

In Cairo, I have seen the rock out of which water (supposedly) miraculously gushed to save Ishmael from dying of thirst. It has been touched, kissed and licked by the hundreds of thousands of Muslims until a deep groove or a narrow depression had been formed in it.

In Saudi Arabia, I have seen Muslims spread out their prayer rugs and worship toward Mecca as if this were a talisman (a kind of good-luck charm) to keep away evil and bring good fortune. Further, I have seen them forced by threat from their places of business to the mosques at the hour of prayer.

Listen to Jesus on this subject: "Woman, believe Me, the hour is coming when you will neither on this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, worship the Father ... But the hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth" (John 4:21-23). Let me reiterate Paul's language inspired of God in Galatians 1:11-12 and learned from Jesus: "God, who made the world and everything in it, since He is Lord of heaven and earth, does not dwell in temples made with hands" (Acts 17:24).

Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem are no more sacred to God and Christians than any other place. It is not the place, the building, nor the geography that is important. It is the spirit of the man within, the object of his worship and the truth by which he is guided. "God is Spirit, and those who worship Him must worship in spirit and truth" (John 4:24).

To believe that certain postures and directions of worship are what are important, to contend that particular garments worn in pilgrimage are necessary for purity and acceptance, and that by circumambulation of a so-called sacred shrine will bring the rewards of forgiveness and peace, characterize the system as little better (if any) than primitive forms of paganism of uncivilized idolaters. Frankly, the only difference I see is not in principle but in outward forms and appearance. What makes modern idolatry more attractive is that it seems to be dressed up in evening clothes!

### **READ THIS ACCOUNT OF PILGRIMAGE**

"When the pilgrim arrives at the last stage on his way to Mecca, about five miles from the town, he enters the sacred territory. Here, accordingly, he bathes, lays aside his clothes, and assumes the proper pilgrimage garb [Ihram], which consists of two unstitched white cloths, one of which is wrapped around the waist, while the other is thrown over the shoulders. This, with the sandals, is the only covering of the pilgrim. On arriving at the sacred building itself, the pilgrim prays, drinks a cup of the distasteful water of Zem-Zem, and begins his circumambulation, or Tawaf. Seven times he makes the circuit of the Kaabah, keeping his left side next to it, uttering prayers and acts of adoration as he goes. The first three circuits are made with impetuous movements, as of one making his way against difficulties, asserting his belief in the face of an opposing world; the remaining circuits are made with the usual ease of movement. The Black Stone is then kissed, the whole body pressed against the sacred edifice, and the pilgrim gives way to the thronging crowd that follows him. The other essentials of the pilgrimage are the seven runs between Mounts Safa and Marrwah, the visit to Mount Arafat, the stoning of the devil and the concluding sacrifice. Worn out with exposure, the violent exertions, and the watching entailed by such ceremonies, the wearied pilgrim rests a few days and then proceeds homeward. On his arrival, he is hailed as a distinguished person, his intercession is besought, and he is ever after dignified by the title of Haji added to his name" (*Mohammed*, Marcus Dods, pp. 41-42).

There is no doubt that this excessive devotion to and reverence for a thing (things) is correctly and accurately designated as idolatry.

## **WHAT OF IDOLATRY IN THE CHRISTIAN WORLD?**

In the so-called Christian world, those who bow before images and objects in churches and cathedrals do not feel that the commandments that forbid the worship of idols are applicable to them. They say they do not worship the images, only what they represent. They just bow before them and worship God. But the Lord taught that bowing before an image or an object is the worship of that image.

"I have reserved for Myself seven thousand men who have not bowed the knee to Baal" (Romans 11:4).

People do not wish to be called idolaters, so they call their actions by some other name; but that does not change the fact that they travel thousands of miles, spend untold sums of money in the process, circumambulate the Kaabah and kiss the Black Stone, believing that protection from harm and innumerable blessings of the highest character accrue to them as a result. Call it what you will; it has every mark of idolatry.

## **IT IS A SYSTEM OF INFIDELITY**

Not only was Mohammed contradictory in his revelation of the Koran with reference to Jesus, he was also an infidel. In one breath he acknowledges Jesus and calls upon his followers to believe in him, with the threat of damnation if they do not and in the next breath he expresses the rankest and most contemptuous infidelity.

Read his words from the Koran: "... God has stamped on them their misbelief, so that they cannot believe except a few ... and for their saying, 'Verily, we have killed the Messiah, Jesus the son of Mary, the apostle of God,' ... but they did not kill him, and they did not crucify him, but a similitude was made for them" (Sura 4:154-155).

From this tract before me, I read these words: "The promised Messiah Alaihissalam, proved conclusively that Jesus had not gone to the skies; he had been taken down from the cross in a state of swoon and having come out of the sepulchre, he traveled to Kashmir [India], where he lived to the ripe age of 120 years" (p. 2).

The very heart of Christianity is that Christ was crucified, buried, raised again the third day and ascended to the right hand of God, thus engendering hope in the hearts of men for a resurrection. Jesus himself said that "they would kill Him, and the third day He will rise again" (Mark 10:34). Another passage from the New Testament on the subject: "The Son of Man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again" (Luke 24:7). In verse 46 of that same chapter are these words, "... to rise from the dead the third day."

Paul stated emphatically to the Corinthian Christians: "For I delivered to you first of all that which I also received: that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures" (I Corinthians

15:3-4). Earlier in the letter, Paul testified: "For I determined not to know anything among you except Jesus Christ and Him crucified" (I Corinthians 2:2).

Mohammed said, in substance, to believe in Jesus and the gospel or be damned. And, in essence, he also said not to believe that Jesus was crucified, or that he was raised from the dead or that he ascended into the heavens. This is an irreconcilable contradiction, and it constitutes utter infidelity.

Explain how they can even believe in God and deny Jesus and what he said. They set aside the central doctrines of Christianity. The idea that Jesus is the Son of God is sternly rejected, the doctrine of the Trinity (God the father, Jesus Christ the savior, the Holy Spirit the revealer of the truth) is held to contradict God's oneness, and since Jesus did not die on the cross there was no collective guilt of man for which he could atone, there was no atonement and no resurrection. The Koran says, "They did not kill him, for sure" (Sura 4:156)!

Jesus said, "He who receives you receives Me, and he who receives Me receives Him who sent Me" (Matthew 10:40 & Mark 9:37). "He who hears My word and believes in Him who sent Me has everlasting life..." (John 5:24). You cannot receive God without receiving Jesus; and you cannot receive Jesus without receiving His word.

But Jesus said: "I will be crucified and raised the third day." Mohammed said: "Believe in Jesus and the gospel, but do not believe that he was crucified and raised from the dead." This is an inextricable dilemma. I mean that this is not only an awkward position, but also an impossible situation from which one cannot disentangle himself. It is for him insolvable.

Mohammed further stated concerning Jesus: "The Messiah the son of Mary is only a prophet: prophets before him have passed away" (Sura 5:79). The author of this tract stated that his messiah had proved conclusively that Jesus had not gone into the skies. Listen to the angel of the Lord addressing the disciples: "Men of Galilee, why do you stand gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, who was taken up from you into heaven, will so come in like manner as you saw Him go into heaven" (Acts 1:11). Tell me, how do you believe Jesus and his gospel and deny this plain language?

I repudiate these assertions and refuse to accept that Jesus was only a prophet. Jesus declared, "The Son of Man has come to seek and to save that which was lost" (Luke 19:10). "I have come that they may have life, and that they may have it more abundantly" (John 10:10).

"These [signs] are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in His name" (John 20:31). "Repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem" (Luke 24:47). "If you abide in My word, you are My disciples indeed. And you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:31-32). "Come to Me, all you who labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest" (Matthew 11:28).

Read still more upon this central theme of Christianity: "For we do not have a High Priest who cannot sympathize with our weaknesses, but was in all points tempted as we are, yet without sin" (Hebrews 4:15). Compare this with Mohammed's life revealed in the Koran, and in history about him!

"He will manifest in His own time, He who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords" (I Timothy 6: 15).

A resume of these passages says; Jesus is our Savior, Lawgiver, High priest and King. He gives us life, freedom, help in all our temptations and eternal salvation. Mohammed said he was only a prophet and like other prophets, passed away. But, then, this is infidelity. You must know that Jesus said: "I am going away, and you will seek Me, and will die in your sin. Where I go you cannot come. So the Jews said, 'Will He kill Himself, because He says, "Where I go you cannot come?" And He said to them, 'you are from beneath; I am from above' ... Therefore I said to you that you will die in your sins, for if you do not believe that I am He, you will die in yours sins" (John 8:21-24).

## CONCLUSION

Although we have not dealt with Muslimism exhaustively, the divine resources upon which we have called to show that it is a fallacious system, point up these erroneous features:

1. It is a system that teaches that men are superior to women.
2. It is a system that allows the mistreatment and abuse of women.
3. It is a system that makes of women sexual playthings— and slaves.
4. It is a system of unholy polygamy.
5. It is a system of inequality.
6. It is a system of bloodshed and warfare. Let me here add a quotation from history: "Soon after the Hegira, emboldened Moslems began raiding Meccan trade caravans to retaliate for the city's opposition to the Prophet's mission. In March 624, Mohammed himself led some 300 of the faithful against a larger force sent by Mecca to punish the raiders. He won, and believers took this triumph as divine espousal of their cause. By 628 Mohammed could lead 1,400 to Mecca and secure a treaty that called for a ten-year truce, with permission for Moslems to make a pilgrimage to the Kaabah. But new converts soon tilted the balance of power further in his favor. In January 630, he seized upon an incident as a breach of the treaty and marched on Mecca with a force of 10,000. Warned of the odds, the Meccans offered only token resistance. Mohammed rode triumphantly into his native city" (*Great Religions of the World*, National Geographic Society, pp. 235-236).
7. It is a system of materialism, physicalism, worldliness and sensualism.
8. It is a system of unbelief and infidelity.
9. It is a system of idolatry and paganism.

Those who have carefully studied both religions, Christianity and Islam, know, if they have looked at the two objectively, that there are no major points of analogy. They do not resemble in teaching, in spirit there is no correspondence, in nobility of morals there is no

compatibility and in the magnificence and eloquence of the Christian standard, there is absolutely no approximation on the part of the religion of Mohammed. Probably what makes for the greatest dissimilarity between the two bodies is the fact that Muslimism makes no real provision for forgiveness. No man is good enough to deserve salvation. There is no system of law that can provide redemption of the human soul. If there were, no man is able to keep that law perfectly. "For all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God" (Romans 3:23). One would have to keep the law perfectly to earn for himself justification. He would have to be able to say: "At no time in my life have I violated law; I have lived without sin, never having an evil thought, never speaking an unkind word and never doing anything that would infract God's high standard." Inasmuch as no man, except the Lord Jesus Christ, has ever done this, man is under judgment and condemnation. The only solution is forgiveness. And that has been provided by God through the offering of His Son, Jesus Christ, upon the cross. It is impossible for the blood of animals to atone for sin (Hebrews 10:4). It took the sacrifice of the sinless Son of God to provide that propitiation. "We have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (Hebrews 10:10).

Muslimism teaches that one is saved by his right conduct. That salvation is a debt that God owes him because he has done right. Christianity teaches that one is saved by the grace, mercy and goodness of God in our response to this love, our acceptance of his offer and our total submission to His will. This is the crowning feature of Christianity, and this is the ultimate difference between the religion of Christ and the religion of Mohammed.

There is nothing in the scheme of Islam that can serve as a basis for forgiveness. How could the mere human act of pilgrimage provide remission of sins and conciliate God? No animal sacrifice can accomplish man's forgiveness. "For the law, having a shadow of the good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with these same sacrifices, which they offer continually year by year, make those who approach perfect.... For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats could take away sins" (Hebrews 10:1-4). Man is not good enough to be saved. He cannot be counted just before God on account of his own good works of righteousness. So, he is hopelessly, helplessly and haplessly lost, except for the one bright ray of light. What is that? The sacrifice of Jesus Christ, the spotless, sinless Son of God. The contrast in these two systems is eloquently depicted by Paul in Hebrews 10:11-12: "And every priest stands ministering daily and offering repeatedly the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. But this Man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down at the right hand of God." "...once at the end of the ages, He has appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself" (Hebrews 9:26). John declares, "We have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous. And He Himself is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the whole world" (I John 2:1-2). No such provision is found in any religion of the world, except true Christianity, Islam has nothing that remotely resembles this.

We read in Acts 4:12: "Nor is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved."

*This Document Produced by*  
***Mission Printing, Inc.***  
WORLD EVANGELISM BY THE PRINTED PAGE  
*Arlington, Texas*

**www.missionprinting.org**  
d\_r001e.pdf

**A Non-Profit Work  
of the  
Churches of Christ**

**THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT TO BE SOLD**