

Self-Study Course on Islam

(Level 1)

Bill Warner

www.politicalislam.com

CONTENTS:

- (00) Introduction**
- (01) Mohammed**
- (02) The Basics**
- (03) Jihad**
- (04) The Jews**
- (05) The Christians**
- (06) The Dhimmi**
- (07) Women**
- (08) Slavery**
- (09) Ethics**
- (10) The Koran**
- (11) Submission and Duality**
- (12) Tears of Jihad**
- (13) Conclusion**

Introduction

Welcome to the first 'self-study course' on Islam.

We need to ask the question: **Why is this 'the first self-study course on Islam'?** There are many books on Islam, but the fact that there has never been a course presumes that you know nothing about Islam and then leads you step by step to provide a thorough knowledge of Islam. This course is in three levels. These talks are the first level, and at each level, you will see the whole picture of Islam.

Until now studying Islam has always been by scholars - university scholars and Islamic scholars. The university scholars are from the history, Arabic language, religion, and Middle East studies departments. Each of these areas has its own narrow view of Islam. In the past, they've told us that Islam is very complicated and difficult to understand. Why? A university professor wants to be viewed as learned and intelligent. He wants you to think that he is the master of a very difficult and obscure topic. The same thing is true of an imam (a religious leader of Islam).

After September 11, 2001, the attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, Islam started receiving attention of a new kind of scholarship, scholarship that is not based on Arabic, history or religion. This new scholarship uses modern analytic techniques that are based on science, math and engineering.

The scientific method is a new way to study Islam. Analysis shows that Islam is both a religion and a political system and that the political system is the greatest part of Islamic doctrine.

What is the difference between religious Islam and political Islam? Do you remember when some Danish artists drew some cartoons of Mohammed? There were weeks of rioting, threats, lawsuits, killings, assassinations and destruction by Muslims. If Muslims want to respect Mohammed by never criticizing, joking about him and taking every word he said as a sacred example -- that is *religious*. But when they threaten, pressure and hurt non-Muslims for not respecting Mohammed, that is *political*. When Muslims say that Mohammed is the prophet of the only god, that is religious, but when they insist that non-Muslims never disrespect Mohamed, that is political. When the newspapers and TV agreed not to publish the cartoons, that was a political response, not a religious response.

Let's consider the Koran:

Detailed statistical analysis shows that over sixty percent of the Koran is political in nature. That is, it tells how to relate to non-believers, not how a Muslim leads a good life. Less than forty percent of the Koran is actually devoted to the religion of Islam. This is a major insight, because when you study Mohamed's life, you also learn that the bulk of it was political, not religious.

The power of this course is that you will be able to sort out the religion of Islam and the politics of Islam. As a political system, Islam can be criticized as easily as you can criticize Communism, Nazism, Democrats or Republicans. They are all just political systems. It is still socially allowable to reject a political system. These lessons will free you from the religion of Islam.

This course is based upon *Five Principles of Political Islam*. When you understand these principles, you will be able to use them to educate and persuade others.

The first principle is that everything Islam does to the non-Muslim is based upon three texts-Koran, Sira and Hadith. The Koran is what Mohammed said Allah revealed to him. The Sira is Mohammed's biography and the Hadith is the traditions of Mohammed and are small stories and sayings of Mohammed. Notice that what is common to Koran, Sira and Hadith is Mohammed. So really, everything that Islam does to non-Muslims is based upon Mohammed. What Mohammed does and says is so important that Islam has a word for it - Sunna.

This is not the way that Islam is discussed in the media or by politicians. Usually someone gives their opinion of Islam. In most cases they describe how Islam reacts to what we do. The media's view is that we act and Islam reacts. This course will teach you that what Islam does and says is based first of all on Mohammed, not us. The deep motivation is the Sunna of Mohammed.

The second principle is that most of the Trilogy is about the non-Muslim, not about the religion of Islam. Islam is primarily a political system.

The third principle is that all non-Muslims are kafirs. About 60% of the Koran is about the kafirs. Kafirs are all those who don't believe that Mohammed is the prophet of Allah. The Koran says that kafirs are hated by Allah and that Allah plots against kafirs. Kafirs are lower than animals and can be killed, robbed, tortured, crucified, enslaved and more. There is a good argument for kafir being the worst word in the human language. Christians,

Jews, atheists, Buddhists, Hindus, animists, pagans and Zoroastrians are all kafirs.

The concept of the kafir is important because so much of Islam is focused on them. For Mohammed, and therefore, Muslims, there is a vast divide between themselves and kafirs. It is so deep that Islamic ethics has one set of rules for Muslims and another set of rules for dealing with kafirs. There will be an entire lesson on Islamic ethics.

Which brings to the fourth principle of political Islam: Islam has two ways to deal with kafirs. For the most part, Muslims make the same choice Mohammed did when he started Islam and was a preacher. But there is another choice. When Mohammed became a politician and warrior and spread Islam, he gave Muslims a second way to act towards kafirs. He rose to power by using deceit, war, and violence. All of this is detailed in the Sira and you will learn about it in this course. At the end of the course, you will see what moral choices Muslims have when they are with kafirs.

The fifth principle is that kafirs must submit to Islam's will in the public sphere. The word Islam means submission and a Muslim is one who has submitted to Islam. The Koran, Sira and Hadith make it clear that kafirs must submit to Islam in all politics. So all interaction between Islam and kafirs includes a pressure to speak and act in the way of Islam.

So the five principles of political Islam are:

- *Islam is based upon the Koran and what Mohammed did.*
- *Most of Islam is political and is about what to do about non-Muslims.*
- *All non-Muslims are kafirs, the worst form of life.*
- *A kafir can be treated in two different ways.*
- *A kafir is supposed to give way to Islam in all public matters.*

In the last lesson, you will learn how these five principles can be used for easy analysis and understanding.

The first level of this three level course is the audio programming. You're going to learn the why of Islam. If you'll look closely at what is said about Islam on the TV and written in the newspapers and magazines, notice that they don't explain "why" Islam does anything, except as a reaction to what we do. A typical explanation of Islamic terror is that it is because of something we did. But this is totally wrong. Islam has a highly detailed political view. Islam doesn't look to us to decide what to do. The majority of Islam is determined by its own political doctrine. Its political purpose is to

annihilate all civilizations that are not Islamic. That sounds harsh, but once you understand the doctrine and history of Islam, you will see something. Islam annihilates native cultures.

We were told in the media after September 11th that Islam had been hijacked, that the act of 9/11 was not Islamic. You're going to learn about the political theory of Jihad and once you understand the political theory, which is all based upon Mohamed, you'll understand that September 11th was by the book. It was exactly like Mohamed would have ordered it to be done.

Islam is not just a religion. Islam is a complete civilization. It has an ethical system; a doctrine of law, a political doctrine, and it has a highly detailed theory of Jihad. All of this is based upon Mohamed. Mohamed is one of the most fascinating men who ever lived. You're going to learn and be stunned that Mohamed was not a success as the prophet of Allah.

The religion of Islam failed. Mohamed taught the religion of Islam for 13 years and only got 150 people to believe him. Then he turned to politics and war. He called it *Jihad*, and in 10 years' time he became the first ruler of all of Arabia. When Mohamed died, he did not have a single enemy left in Arabia. Mohamed is the perfect Muslim; everything in Islam is based upon him. Actually, far more of Islamic doctrine is based upon Mohamed than Allah and the Koran.

In this course you're going to learn about the Koran and how it is only about 20% of the doctrine of Islam. The bulk of the doctrine of Islam is established by Mohamed's perfect example, not his God, Allah. Every Muslim is a Mohammedan because they pattern their life after Mohammed.

You are going to understand Mohamed as a political figure, as a man who changed the world. He became enormously successful at politics and that's where the success of Islam lies -in its politics.

Mohamed's biography is a sacred text. 75% of it is devoted to his life as a Jihadist and a politician. This reflects Mohamed's success.

You will also learn about the Koran and understand its basics.

We will have a lesson on women. Islam has an entire doctrine on how to treat women.

One of the most shocking lessons is on the roots of slavery. Everything you have been taught about slavery is only half right. Islam is the key to world slavery.

Islam has the most unique ethical system in the world. Islamic ethics have nothing in common with ours. There is no Golden Rule in Islam.

You will learn about submission and duality - the key concepts of Islam. Knowledge about submission and duality gives clarity of thinking.

You will learn about the most shameful word, dhimmi. That one word contains an entire hidden and forbidden history.

There is one issue that people have when they hear about Islam. At work or school they have to meet Muslims and they are nice people. So when you hear something grim about Islam, you may think, 'Well, Ahmed is not like that'. If Ahmed is so nice, how can these dreadful things be true?

First, this entire course is about Islam, not Muslims. Muslims are people; Islam is a doctrine and an ideology. Before you can understand how Ahmed can be so nice, you must first understand the entirety of Islam. Islam is a dualistic ideology; it always has two answers. This is because there are two Korans and two Mohammeds. When you understand the dual nature of Islam, you will understand how some people, who call themselves Muslims, can be very nice. But you will also understand how they have some moral choices they can make that are not available to you. You also will never have to ask a Muslim anything about Islam. You will become your own expert. Islam is a most fascinating subject, particularly political Islam.

Mohammed

If you know Mohammed, then you know Islam. If you do not know Mohammed, you do not know Islam. Every Muslim's life goal is to imitate Mohammed in every detail. Mohammed led a fascinating life - he was a business man, prophet, politician and warrior. His greatest invention was a political system that can make all others submit.

We're going to study Mohammed before we study the basics of Islam. This is because Mohammed is the origin of Islam and he comes before everything. There was no Islam before Mohammed and he called himself the last of the prophets. In a sense, Islam both begins with Mohammed and ends with Mohammed. The importance of studying Mohammed is found in the Koran itself. Over 30 times the Koran says that every human being is supposed to do everything in their life patterned after Mohammed. Then it turns around and says over 40 times that if you don't do everything like Mohammed did it, you will go to hell. Everything has to be done the way Mohammed did. Mohamed is the perfect pattern of life for all peoples for all time.

We know an enormous amount about the man Mohammed. His biography the *Sira*; it is over 800 pages long and it is in fine print. Then, as if that were not enough, we have what are called the traditions of Mohammed, also called the *hadith*; we have thousands upon thousands of these traditions. We know a lot about this man. As a matter of fact, we can probably know more about the personal details of Mohammed's life than we do, for instance, George Washington.

The importance of Mohammed can be found in the religion of Islam. Most kafirs (kafir is what the Koran calls a non-Muslim) think that you become a Muslim by worshiping the God Allah, but this is not true. You can worship the God Allah and still not be a Muslim. What it takes to be a Muslim is to worship Allah exactly like Mohammed did and we know exactly how he worshiped his God. The further importance of Mohammed can be found in this: there is not enough in the Koran to enable you to practice the religion of Islam.

There are Five Pillars of Islam which we will study in the next lesson, but there is not enough information in the Koran to practice even one of the Five Pillars. You cannot worship in an Islamic way without imitating Mohammed. Mohammed's way of doing things is so important that it has a very special name: The Sunna. Sunna means The Way.

It is in Mohammed that we find right and wrong, except right and wrong as we think of it in a moral sense is not used within Islam. Instead, the concept is: "What is permitted" and "What is forbidden." What is permitted is what Mohammed did. What is forbidden is what he said not to do, or he himself didn't do, so the Sunna of Mohammed is what dictates Islam. Again, this is the reason we have to study Mohammed.

One of the ways that you can tell how much someone knows about Islam is if they mention Mohammed or not. Sometimes you run into people who want to explain Islam on the basis of the Koran. When this happens, you can be sure you have run into a person who does not really understand Islam. Again, the Koran is not remotely enough to explain Islam. Mohammed defines all the ethics and customs of Islam.

Let's take a very small item. Have you ever been watching a news-broadcast and there's some Islamic leader from the Middle East and he's talking and he's angry, perhaps he's shouting. Why do they do this? One simple reason: Mohammed was easily angered. This is recorded in both the

Sira and the Hadith, so when you see a Muslim who is quick to anger, he is simply imitating Mohammed.

Mohammed was the perfect father, the perfect husband, religious leader, military leader, and political leader. There is no aspect of life, including business, where a Muslim does not turn to the example of Mohammed. He is the perfect Muslim. There is not a Muslim alive who does not know the life of Mohammed. What is odd is that there are so few kafirs who know anything about the life of Mohammed. When you study Mohammed, it is rather confusing, because he seems to be two very different people.

Let's quickly review his life. He was an orphan as a child, and later became a businessman. He went on caravan trading trips to Syria. He was prosperous and well thought of in his community. He was seen as a person who could settle arguments and heal disputes. He was a very religious man, and then, in his 40s, he began to go on religious retreats, leaving the city of Mecca and praying by himself. Then he started to hear a voice, and he saw a vision. Now, this was a voice that no one else ever heard, and a vision that no one else ever saw, but it was very important to Mohammed and it completely changed his life and, indeed, his entire character.

After seeing this vision and hearing the voice, he went back to Mecca and began to tell people -first his friends and family- that he had been chosen as the messenger of the only God of the Universe. Later this God was named and was called *Allah*. Mohammed began to introduce two principles that were to change him and to change the entire world forever.

The first of these principles was *submission*. Mohammed said that the God of the universe told him to tell everyone else that they were to do exactly what he said when he said it. That their lives were to be patterned after him, that he was the perfect man, the perfect pattern. This created dissension within Mecca because amongst the other things he told the Meccans was that their ancestors were burning in hell. He then created, at the same time, a second principle called *duality*. He created a great division between those who believed what he said and those who did not. This was the great division of the Koran -humanity was divided into the *believer* and *nonbeliever*, the *Muslim* and the *kafir*.

Mohammed was very aggressive in pushing his message. So much so that he irritated the Meccans. He was not very successful as a consequence, and over the next 13 years, in spite of his daily preaching, he failed to gain many followers. He was argumentative and caused trouble, but the Meccans

couldn't do anything about him because he was protected by his uncle who had some power within Mecca. Then, his protector died, and the Meccans told Mohammed, "You'll have to leave. We're sick and tired of living with you. You've created dissension and distress and suffering within our community." So Mohammed went north 100 miles to a town called *Medina*.

Everything changed, because Mohammed became a politician and a warrior. He did not succeed by numbers when he was a preacher, but now he became overwhelmingly successful because he created a new concept, the concept of *jihad*. Jihad totally changed Mohammed and totally changed Islam. Now, through jihad, Islam had a way to get money and lots of it. It had a way to bring about political power.

Here we have the second element of duality that Mohammed introduced. There are two Mohammeds. There is the religious preacher Mohammed, and there is the warrior politician Mohammed. Duality is one of the things that is confusing about Islam. It always has two messages to preach and the reason it has two messages to preach is that there are two Mohammeds. More than that, when you read the Koran, it's clear there are two Korans - one Koran which is religious, the other Koran which is political. Mohammed the religious man was not much of a success at all, but Mohammed the political man, and the warrior, was overwhelmingly successful. In the last nine years of his life, he averaged an event of violence every six weeks for nine straight years. By this process of constant warfare, he became the first ruler of all of Arabia.

Let's look a little more at Mohammed because he explains everything we see inside of Islam. If there is ever anything that puzzles you about Islam, all you need to do is to look to Mohammed, because if Muslims do it, Mohammed did it.

One of the things we see is that Mohammed did not get along well with his neighbors. Even in his religious phase, he was pushy and aggressive. Remember the Meccans didn't like him, they said, "You've created more suffering in this community than we've ever had before." Before he became a Muslim, Mohammed was a good neighbor. After he became the messenger of Allah, he became an aggressive neighbor. When he went to Medina, his behavior became even worse.

As an example--when he moved to Medina, half the town was Jewish. Within three years after he arrived, all the Jews had been either driven out of Medina after their money was taken or they'd been killed and sold into

slavery. But after Mohammed had conquered all of Medina, being a hostile neighbor had a new meaning. If you lived even 100 miles away, Mohammed would show up with his arms and troops and demand that you submit to Allah. Once he ruled all of Arabia, he was still a hostile neighbor. Before Mohammed died, he had struck out to the north to Syria to fight the Christians. His dying words were: *"Let there be neither Jew nor Christian left in Arabia."*

Mohammed was the most successful military man who ever lived. Let's take a look at this. As political leader, he became all-powerful. We have other examples in history of men who became all-powerful and we can measure to some degree how powerful they were by how many people they caused to die. The person who in our known history killed the most people was Mao Tse Tung. As far as we can tell, figures show that through starvation and persecution and outright executions, Mao Tse Tung was responsible for the deaths of 77 million people.

Now we come to Mohammed. Mohammed has influenced the deaths, through his principle of jihad and aggressive politics, of 270 million people. Now this has taken over 1400 years. Mao killed 77 million within his lifetime. But still, the total of those that Mao killed is fewer than those who were killed in imitation of Mohammed. When you think of a political leader, you may think of Napoleon, you may think of Alexander the Great or Caesar, and they were great generals, but they don't hold a candle to Mohammed, because no one today kills for Napoleon, no one today kills for Caesar, but today as you're listening to this talk, it is undoubtedly true that somewhere in the world people are being destroyed because of the perfect example of Mohammed.

Mohammed had a very dualistic personality. He had a sense of humor, he loved children. He wept when his favorite warrior was killed. But at the same time he was a soft-spoken man who laughed heartily when the head of one of his enemies was thrown at his feet. He was the perfect slave-holder and slave trader. Mohammed was deeply involved in slavery. Indeed, one of the ways he financed jihad was through the sale of slaves. He got his slaves in the time-honored way of killing their protectors. He attacked a tribe, killed the male members until the rest surrendered and then they were given a choice to convert. If they didn't, they were sold into slavery -women, children, men. This was profitable and, indeed, jihad was profitable. He used jihad to finance more jihad. Mohammed came up with a way to make religion and politics pay and pay well.

Mohammed was a very intolerant man. This is interesting. Before Mohammed, Arabs were noted for their religious tolerance. Indeed, Mecca, the town where Mohammed first rose to power, had over 360 religions. No man was ever injured because of his religion until Mohammed. Mohammed converted the Arab from being a tolerant person to the most intolerant person and the reason that the Arab became intolerant was that they followed the Sunna of Mohammed.

One of the conventions regarding Mohammed today is that no one can tell a joke about him. You hear jokes about Jesus, Noah, Adam, St. Peter, God, but you never hear a Mohammed joke. You may remember when a Danish cartoonist said "Let's have a contest and see who can draw the best Mohammed cartoon." People died because of those cartoons because Islam was offended. You can't make a joke about Mohammed, not even one. In fact, in Pakistan and other Muslim countries, to tell a joke about Mohammed is literally a death sentence.

There's one more thing about Mohammed which explains Muslims and Islam. He never forgot a slight or an insult. When he reentered Mecca -this time triumphant after the jihad in Medina, the first thing he did, and here we have the essence of the man Mohammed, the first thing he did was to pray, the second thing he did was to have all religious art destroyed. So the religious objects of 360 religions in Mecca were destroyed. Mohammed helped to build the fire and break the objects. The next thing he did was to issue death warrants for five different people who had criticized him. These were intellectuals, not warriors. For instance, two of the people who were killed were dancing girls. What had they done? They had been in a skit, with a song and a poem that ridiculed Mohammed. Mohammed never forgot an insult.

Mohammed is the most common name in the world even after 1400 years. He continues to be the most influential politician and warrior who ever lived. His life as the Messenger of Allah shapes ethics, morals, politics and culture of over a billion Muslims. His politics have annihilated half of ancient Christianity, Hinduism and Buddhism. You must know the life of Mohammed.

The Basics

The most important fact about Islam is that it is a political ideology. The religion is of secondary importance. The religion is based upon the Five Pillars. The politics are based upon jihad, the sixth pillar. Islam divides the

world into believers and kafirs [unbelievers]. When you understand kafir, you will understand all of political Islam.

Almost everyone thinks of Islam as a religion but as you're going to discover, religion is the least of Islam. Islam is an entire civilization. It's a culture, a legal system, a thought system, and an ethical system. Islam is all encompassing.

First, let's explain some of the basics.

Everything in Islam depends upon Mohammed. Mohammed begins Islam and Mohammed ends Islam. Islamic doctrine is found in three texts - The Koran, the Sira (the life of Mohammed) and the Hadith (the traditions of Mohammed). All of these can be held in one hand.

Scientific analysis has made these documents very readable, so we can easily understand Islamic civilization.

The religion of Islam is simple. It's based upon the *five pillars*. The first of these pillars is “there is no God but Allah and Mohammed is his prophet”. If you say that in Arabic in front of other Muslims, you have become a Muslim. It is the most central aspect of Islam, acknowledging the Koran and the Sunna (Mohammed's perfect example).

The next pillar is “charity”. The *zakat* is a charity tax but charity inside of Islam is quite different from what most of us think as charity. First of all, Muslim charity goes to Muslims; it does not go to kafirs, unbelievers.

There's another difference in Islamic charity. Money given to an Islamic charity can support Jihad. It can support the creation of Jihad and it is also specifically for helping those whose family members have died in Jihad. So, Islamic charity is a little different from ours.

Another of the five pillars is “prayer”. Of course, Muslims are famous for their attitude towards prayer which is done five times a day and even in public places. After prayer we have the “Haj”. And that is the pilgrimage trip to Mecca. This is supposed to be done once in every Muslim's life if he can afford it.

Another religious obligation is “to fast” every year in the month of Ramadan. Now fasting for a Muslim means that you don't eat or drink when the sun is up and you do not eat until the sun goes down. At night you can eat and drink as much as you wish.

Those are the religious five pillars. Then there is a sixth pillar. The sixth pillar is Jihad. The reason Jihad is called a pillar of Islam is that just like the

other five it is incumbent upon all Muslims without exception. All Muslims are supposed to participate in Jihad. We will have an entire lesson on Jihad later, but just because a Muslim is supposed to participate in Jihad does not mean that he's actually involved in the Jihad of the sword. Jihad can be done with the sword, with the mouth, with a pen and with money, but more about that later.

Jihad is both religious and political. Islam is primarily a political doctrine, not a religious doctrine. For instance, the Koran is more concerned with the unbeliever, the kafir, than it is the believer. It spends 61% of its time discussing the kafir, only 39% of the Koran is about Islam and the Muslim. The Koran spends so much time talking about the kafir that we must address that issue now.

The word *kafir* is usually translated as *unbeliever* but that is not correct since the word unbeliever is a purely neutral word. For instance, you might be an unbeliever in the Big Bang Theory of the creation of the universe. That makes you an unbeliever about the Big Bang. That is simply a logical statement; it just says you don't believe. If you don't believe the theory of the Big Bang, it does not mean that I can discriminate against you or hurt you. It's just an idea you don't agree with.

But, not so in the Koran with a kafir. The Koran goes into enormous detail about the unbeliever, the kafir. Allah despises the kafir. Allah plots against the kafir. The Koran says that the kafir can be crucified, tortured, kidnapped, abused, raped, stolen from, and punished. There are many, many references to the kafir in the Koran. Remember 61% of it is devoted to the kafir.

Now let's deal with another fundamental of Islam. A Muslim is forbidden to enter into any religious aspect of life with a kafir. So, all of this talk about the kafir is not religious. It is political. That is, Islam treats the kafir as being outside of Islam and has an extensive doctrine with how to deal with kafirs.

As an example of the political nature of being a kafir, there are many, many references in the Koran to Hell and the kafir is in Hell, but the reason a kafir is in Hell is not because he did anything that was morally wrong such as theft or murder, but simply because the kafir did not believe that Mohammed was the prophet of Allah. So Islamic Hell is a political prison for intellectual dissenters.

The other basic thing about Islam is that it does not have the Golden Rule. Indeed Islam denies the truth of the Golden Rule. In Islam there is no

such thing as humanity. Instead the world is always seen as being divided into the kafir and the believer. Humanity is not seen as one body.

Once you have that fundamental division you no longer have the Golden Rule because the Golden Rule is to treat others as you would be treated and that means all others. Islam does not work like that. Islam instead is based upon a different principle than the Golden Rule and this is the essence of Islam. Islam is based upon submission and duality. Submission because the word Islam means submission and that all others must submit to Islam. Now all others having to submit to Islam is a political statement. The political aspect of submission is that the kafir must submit to the Muslim and Islam. If Islam demands the political submission of kafirs, then it cannot have the Golden Rule.

The other principle that Islam is based upon is duality. We will see this in great detail when we study the Koran, but we've already seen duality. There was the Mohammed of Mecca and the Mohammed of Medina and those two men are not the same. Duality and submission is what Islamic civilization is based upon.

Islam is the most successful political system on the face of the earth. For 1400 years Islam has slowly expanded. In only two cases in the whole history of Islam has it ever been driven back. Both of those occurred in Europe. One in Spain and the other in Eastern Europe. Other than those two times Islam keeps expanding. It expands on a daily basis. Indeed as we will discover later, the power of political Islam increases every day in Europe and the United States.

We like to think that liberal democracy is the most powerful force on the face of the earth, but liberal democracy is only 200 years old, and is very difficult to implement whereas political Islam is 1400 years old and is quite easy to implement. And once it is in place, it always stays in place. Once a nation becomes Islamic the only thing that can change it is force from the outside as occurred in Spain, where the Moors were driven out of Spain. Otherwise there has never been a case of a revolution inside of an Islamic country. By revolution here we mean one that eliminated Islam as the driving political force, not a change of rulers.

Political Islam is very effective. There have been over 270 million people killed by Jihad over the last 1400 years. Islam has also been very successful in the business of slavery. For 1400 years it has enslaved the kafir and we will

have an entire lesson on how Islam has enslaved the European, the African and the Asian. Political Islam is a phenomenally successful political ideology.

Now these lessons are going to be about Islam, not Muslims. That is, we're not going to be describing Muslims, but the doctrine of Islam, and what we're going to be describing is the doctrine of political Islam. The religion of Islam is of a concern only to one type of person. The religion of Islam is for those who wish to go to Islamic paradise and those who wish to avoid Islamic Hell. Since this series is not directed towards Islamic Heaven or Hell, we will not discuss the religion, nor will we be discussing Muslims as a people. This is important because it will keep this entire series on an intellectual basis.

We need to talk a little bit about kafir culture or kafir civilization. Twenty percent of the world is Islamic. The other 80% is made up of kafirs. We need to understand that kafir culture includes the Christian, the Jew, the Hindu, atheists and the Buddhist. It includes Chinese. It includes Australians. It includes Africans. It includes the animist, that is those who believe that the world is a spirit affair. So kafirs are everybody, but Muslims. Now here's what's important about that. Kafirs need to understand that so far as Islam is concerned, there is not the slightest bit of difference how a kafir is treated whether he's an atheist, a Christian, a Jew, a Hindu. It doesn't make any difference. For instance, Christians make a great deal of distinctions amongst themselves and for that matter so do Buddhists, but from the outside, that is from the viewpoint of Islam, all kafirs are the same. They deny Mohammed. They deny the Sunna of Mohammed, that is the way of Mohammed, and all kafirs deny the truth of the Koran. Kafirs are all those who don't believe that Mohammed is the Prophet of Allah.

An infidel can only be a Jew or a Christian; therefore the term infidel is a religious term. Another term used by Islam is polytheist, many gods. This, too, is a religious term. Atheist is a religious term. And one last term that Islam uses for the kafir is Peoples of the Book and this refers again to Christians and Jews. Those terms, pagan, infidel, polytheist, atheist and People of the Book are religious words. And remember this lesson series is not at all about the religion. That's the reason kafir is the word to use because an infidel is a kafir. A polytheist is a kafir, a pagan is a kafir, an atheist is a kafir and the People of the Book are kafirs as well. So we will use the term kafir.

We will be studying the deaths of 270 million kafirs over 1400 years in Jihad. That's 60 million Christians, 80 million Hindus, 10 million Buddhists and 120 million Africans of varying religions. But now we have to recognize

one more thing about the kafir, and that is this: almost all kafirs do not want to know about Islam. We will study in this series why kafirs never refer to the injury of Islam, why kafir Christians don't know how Turkey and Egypt went from being Christian to Islamic. Why do Buddhists never talk about the fact that Islam has killed 10 million Buddhists? You can find some Hindus who are willing to discuss the destruction of 80 million Hindus but they're rare. So one of the things that we will study in this series is why kafirs fear and dread Islam so much that kafirs refuse to study their own history. We will study why European kafirs never refer to the fact that a million Europeans were taken into slavery. Kafir and Islam is what this entire series is about. It's all about the politics of Islam.

We will use the term ignorance or to be ignorant in these talks. For some people the term ignorance is a putdown or a slur, but the term ignorance means not knowing, to be empty of knowledge. It's like the glass is empty. Empty is not negative, it just means that you need knowledge.

Since Islam is a complete civilization, that is to say, since Islam contains everything that it needs within itself it has no need of the kafir civilization. It annihilates the kafir's civilization. In every case, once Islam rises to political power in a country, the original civilization is annihilated. When you go to Egypt today you do not see any sign of the original Coptic or Christian civilization that was in Egypt. It is gone. Everything about it has disappeared. Even the names that people use, the names for cities all change. Islam is a complete civilization and therefore when a country becomes fully Islamicized there is no trace whatsoever of the original civilization and that is one of the marks of Islamic politics.

If we are to save kafir civilization, kafirs must learn about their losses to Islam and why they happened.

The basics of Islam are the Five Pillars, jihad, submission, duality and kafir. Once you understand those words, you can understand how political Islam has annihilated civilizations for 1400 years.

Jihad

Jihad was Mohammed's greatest invention. It made him successful. Jihad is a misunderstood word. Most of jihad is done with money and persuasion, not violence. It is jihad that fills Washington DC with money to buy influence. It is jihad that causes our textbooks in our schools to never mention anything negative about Islam.

Jihad is surely one of the more famous Arabic words. Jihad does not mean holy war, although it includes holy war. Jihad actually means struggle, which is a much better way to see it because jihad includes much more than war with violence. Jihad can be done with the sword, the mouth, the pen and with money. The Koran calls jihad-- fighting in Allah's cause.

The Koran lays out the vision of jihad. The Sira (Mohammed's biography) lays out the grand strategy of jihad. The hadith (the Traditions) give us the tactics--all the small details about what needs to be done. And of course all of these things are modeled upon Mohammed, because Mohammed is not only the perfect Muslim, but also the perfect jihadist. You can see how important jihad is when you read Mohammed's biography the Sira. Jihad takes up about three quarters of the Sira. There was only a nine-year period in which he pursued intense jihad but the number of pages that are devoted to it gives you an idea of how important it was. The importance is this: Mohammed, the man, the preacher, the religious man, did not succeed until he turned to jihad. It's only natural that Muslims would look to jihad as their most successful strategy and therefore record the most about it.

Now let's take care of one issue. Muslims frequently say, ' Well, the real jihad is inner struggle, the spiritual struggle.' That is the Greater Jihad. The jihad of the sword and war is the Lesser Jihad. But the hadith tell us about the greater jihad --the inner spiritual struggle. But only 3% of the hadith are devoted to this kind of struggle. The other 97% are about killing the kafir. Is jihad the inner struggle? Yes. Is jihad killing the kafir? Yes. Notice again we have a duality.

There are two ways to view jihad. A Muslim may choose whichever he need for the moment. Let's look at an example that everyone remembers. On September 11, 2001 the World Trade Center and the Pentagon were attacked by Muslims in an act of jihad. It was said by Muslims that that the jihadists had hijacked their religion. But let's look and see, because when you understand jihad as it comes from the Koran, the Sira, and the hadith you will discover that everything about 9/11 was by the book.

This was not the first time the World Trade Center had been attacked by jihadists. In 1993, an attempt was made to bring down the Twin Towers with a massive bomb placed in the basement. That didn't work, but it didn't matter because the second time it did. The second time was practiced over and over. When it all came down on September 11 they had been through it many times. This is modeled on the example of Mohammed.

When Mohammed turned to jihad, the first time he sent his men out to kill and rob, they failed. They didn't find anyone to rob. The second try was also a failure, as was the third and several subsequent attempts. But when they went out for the eighth time, they were successful. 9/11 is just like Mohammed's jihad.

Another way it was like jihad was that Muslims after 9/11 said "Oh, We're the real victims. Muslims were the ones who were really hurt." Again, this is precisely like Mohammed did it. When his eighth attack was successful he was accused by the Arabs of violating all the rules of war because he attacked during the holy month of Ramadan. The Koran replied to this and said that what the Meccans-the kafirs-had done to Mohammed was far more serious than being killed. It was true that the Meccan Arabs had run Mohammed out of the city, but they didn't harm anyone. When the Muslims killed the kafirs they said, "We're the real victims here, not the dead kafirs."

Another way in which 9/11 was modeled after Mohammed is this: Muslims claimed "Oh, we are the religion of peace." The veil of the religion of Islam was used to hide the political act of jihad. This has been done before as well. Mohammed always covered his political actions with a religious necessity.

The World Trade Center was chosen as a target for two reasons. The first reason is it was a trade center, a business center. It was the hope of Al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden that destroying the World Trade Center would paralyze the American economy. Because you see, jihad wherever possible is an economic attack. Mohammed's attacks on the caravans were to gain wealth for himself and to remove wealth from the kafirs.

When he attacked towns he destroyed the farms outside the town. Like 9/11 this was a form of economic warfare and 9/11 was an economic attack. Now the second reason that the World Trade Center were attacked was that Zawahiri, seemingly the key planner, was told that there were a lot of Jews there. This again was just like Mohammed because Mohammed persecuted Jews of Medina and Khaybar and Ladak.

Another way that 9/11 was modeled after Mohammed's actions is this. The men who did it were immigrants to this country. Mohammed did not take up jihad until he was an emigrant. When he moved to Medina he called that his "immigration." How important is this immigration? Well, "Islamic Time" starts when he entered Medina and became a politician and warrior.

That's the reason why all Islamic calendars start with that time and not with the time of Mohammed's first revelation, which might seem to be the Time Zero for Islam. Time Zero was chosen because of immigration, the beginning of Mohammed's political success.

As a sneak attack, 9/11 also followed Mohammed's method. He used sneak attacks whenever possible. So on 9/11 when we woke up to terror and fire, it was just as though Mohammed had ordered it. Now this may seem trivial. but those who were attacked were kafirs and jihad is always against the kafir, according to Mohammed.

The attack on the World Trade Center violated the rules of war, another of Mohammed's tactics. One of the reasons that Mohammed always beat the Arabs was because they kept expecting him to play by the rules. After all, before Mohammed there were established rules of war. But when Mohammed developed jihad he threw out all the rules. Brother would kill brother, father would kill son, tribe member would go to war against another tribe member. This violated all the rules of Arabian war, but Mohammed knew how to win, and that was to violate the rules.

Another way that September 11 was very Mohammedan was there was no shame or remorse inside of the Islamic community. The most popular book in the Arab world after 9/11 was written by a man who had shared a jail cell with Zawahiri. And his criticism of Zawahiri was not that what they had done was immoral. No. What was wrong was it woke the sleeping tiger, America. Many Muslims expressed no remorse over 3000 dead kafirs because at no time in Mohammed's life did he ever express the slightest remorse over the death of a kafir. Indeed we have records in which he laughed and cheered, when kafirs died.

Here's an interesting thing about the attack on the World Trade Center. Two days after it happened, the telephones begin to ring in churches all across America and when the church member picked up the phone, the other person said "I'm a Muslim and we would like to come to your church and give a seminar on Islam, the peaceful religion.

Now, this was a great deception, but it was also done with amazing speed and power. Think about it. Do you know of any other group, Democrat, Republican, military- anything in the world- that could with, only 48 hours notice, launch a uniform public relations attack across an entire nation?

Islam's political nature, not its religious nature, is all that is important to us. September 11 was a political attack with religious motivation, yes, but its essence was political.

Another clue that September 11 was modeled after Mohammed is that we were called to Islam before the attack. That was Mohammed's way also. Osama bin Laden issued a videotape in which he condemned America and then called America to Islam. If America had come to Islam -I guess in this case, if George Bush had decided to become a Muslim-there would not have been an attack. But the call to Islam was issued first. This was patterned after Mohammed's perfect jihad.

September 11 was a defensive attack. All jihad is defensive because the kafir creates the first offense by denying Mohammed. So the kafir has already offended Allah. Therefore, what follows the offense is a defensive attack. If it were not for the kafir there would be no jihad.

And this brings us to something else that we need to know. According to Islamic doctrine jihad is eternal and is incumbent upon all Muslims. Jihad is not to cease until the last kafir has submitted. As long as there are kafirs there will be jihad.

Soon after 9/11 Islam started attacking the kafirs by calling them Crusaders. Now the Crusades are portrayed as evil by Islam. But why did the Crusaders go to an Arabian, Muslim Middle East? They went to help the Christians who cried out for help. That's how it all started. It wasn't a band of Europeans who saddled up their horses and went over just to kill Muslims. They went there in response to a plea for help, because the suffering of the Christians in the Middle East was too great to bear. We must remember how Islam spread to the Middle East. Islam came to the Middle East and conquered with a sword. A sword wielded by Umar the Second Caliph. There was great destruction. So indeed, the Crusades is one of the few times that kafirs turned to help other kafirs who were being attacked by jihad.

Now, let's deal with something else. We have said that jihad is incumbent upon all Muslims. Yet when you go to work, if there's a Muslim who works there he doesn't come in with dynamite strapped to his chest and blow everybody up, but he can still participate in Jihad. After 9/11 the FBI started following the money. And it was discovered that many Muslims across the United States were giving quite generously to what are called charities and when the money was given it was understood that it was to support jihad. So when a Moslem writes a check to support jihad he is a jihadist. When a

Muslim says "Oh no, no, no, jihad, holy war, that is not our way. Our way is the religion of peace." That denial is an act of jihad.

The biggest jihad happening in America today is practiced by Saudi Arabia and other Middle East countries. And they're not using the sword, they're using the dollar. The Saudis-Saudi Arabia- spend ten times as much money each year as the Soviet Union did to spread communism. What the Saudis are spreading its Islam and Sharia. They pump enormous amounts of money into this country. Most mosques are built with Saudi money, and then staffed by an Imam chosen by the Saudis.

But what is more problematic is the money being spent to affect our politics. Washington, DC is awash in money from the Middle East and this money is used to buy votes, influence people and launch political campaigns. If you're a Moslem and want to run for political office in this country you will not have trouble with financing your campaign. Any Muslim who wants to do anything to advance Islam in this country has a blank check. Jihad can be waged with money and the Saudis are using money extensively, just like Mohammed. Mohammed's dying words were these: "Neither Jew or Christian shall be left in Arabia. Keep giving the money to influence the kafir ambassadors." And that's what the Saudis are doing. They are influencing the kafir ambassadors and doing it very well.

Another place that Muslims use money to advance jihad is in our educational system. No textbook that teaches about Islam in our schools can be used unless it is approved by a Muslim committee. As a consequence, the only Islam that is studied in our schools is the glorious religion, a glorious political system. No mention is ever made of the killing of 270 million kafirs over 1400 years. There is no mention in these textbooks of the Dhimmi, a semi-slave. We will spend more time studying the dhimmi later. According to our textbooks, Islam conquered without any suffering at all. No mention is ever made of how Islam has played the key role in slavery for 1400 years. This propaganda that glorifies Islam in our textbooks is jihad. But the educational jihad doesn't stop with textbooks. The Saudis have pumped a large amount of money into our universities' Middle East history departments, Arabic departments, and religion courses. These large amounts of money are to influence how history and religion and politics are taught. Large sums of money are also pumped into professorships supported by the Saudis. Studying Islam in our universities is done with a curriculum that is approved by the Saudis.

So, jihad by the dollar in our education system is far more dangerous than the jihad by sword. Another example of jihad is the fact that anyone in the media who makes a comment will be pressured and threatened with lawsuits. Muslims are using our own civil rights laws with great effect to intimidate and make sure that no one ever says anything about Islam that Muslims don't like. Because you see, freedom of speech is not Sunna, the way of Mohammed.

In the end, it is not the jihad of violence that is so important in our culture. What is important is we do not have any understanding of what is happening. We don't understand that when money is used to influence our politicians, the media and schools, that is jihad. So it is not that Islam is so strong, but that we know so little and that makes us so very, very weak.

Jihad is Islam's strongest political concept. It can be done with the sword, the pen, by the mouth and with money. Mohammed's life furnishes Islam with a perfect example of both tactics and strategy for jihad. The attack on the World Trade Center is a text book case of jihad, but the most powerful jihad is the Islamification of our civilization.

The Jews

Mohammed used the Jews as the basis for being a prophet. The Jews then became an example of what happens to anyone who resists political Islam. They were assassinated, robbed, executed, raped, enslaved, kidnapped, became the first dhimmis (semi-slaves) and exiled. All of modern Jew hatred by Muslims was formed by Mohammed.

The Jews are very important in the formation of Islam. It could be said that if there were no Jews there would be no Islam. The reason for this can be found in the Koran. When Mohammed had his first vision, which no one else saw, and when he heard the voices that no one else heard he said that the voice was of the Angel Gabriele. This is important because Gabriele is in the Jewish tradition. From the beginning Mohammed said that his authenticity rested on the fact that he had the same basis as the prophets in the Old Testament. There were no Jews in Mecca when he started telling his story of Noah and Adam and Moses. The characters were the same but the stories were different. For instance in the Jewish scripture, the story of Moses and the Pharaoh is about the release of the Jewish slaves. In the Koran, the story of Moses and the Pharaoh is not about freeing the Jews; instead it is about the fact that the Pharaoh would not admit that Moses was a prophet. So the Egyptians were destroyed.

In the story of Noah, the same was true. The reason that Allah destroyed the Earth with water was because men would not believe that he was a prophet of Allah. On and on the stories go. All of them changed to advance the Koran's central argument everyone had to listen and do exactly as a prophet of Allah said. The message of the Koran is the entire world is divided into those who believe Mohammed and those who do not.

If there had been Jews in Mecca they would have said: "wait a minute that's not the way this story really happened." The Koran by saying that the stories in the Old Testament have been corrupted. You see every one of those people Adam, Noah, Moses, David, and Solomon, all prophesied that one day would come the final messenger of Allah-- Mohammed. But the Jews had destroyed all of those prophecies. The real Jewish scriptures are found in the Koran according to the Koran.

At first the Jews are seen favorably in the Koran of Mecca. But, listen to what Islam has to say today about the Jews in the modern world. Jew hatred by Muslims is reported frequently in Europe today.

Here are some words from modern Muslim political leaders. A former Turkish Prime Minister in front of crowds has publicly proclaimed that "the Jews are bacteria and like a disease".

In Saudi Arabia on a TV show an interviewer asked the man on the street questions about the Jews. One of them was would you be willing to shake hands with a Jew? One person said "of course not. I would have to cut off my hand." Another question: if a child asked you who were the Jews what would you say? One respondent: "Allah's anger is upon them they strayed from the path of righteousness; they are the filthiest people on the face of the earth because they only care about themselves."

Another quote from a modern Muslim who is a professor in a university in Egypt that is roughly equivalent to Harvard. This imam is on a fatwa committee. A fatwa is simply just a legal judgment. So the legal counsel issued a fatwa saying that Jews were apes and pigs. They went further to say that Jews fabricate lies, they listen to lies, and they hide the truth and support deception. They are hypocrites. They want other people to feel pain. They are happy when others suffer. They are rude and vulgar. They break their promises and they're cowards.

This is a decided contrast to Mohammed in Mecca. In Mecca Mohammed practically claims to be a brother to the Jews. He said that he was the last of the line of the Jewish prophets. What explains this? One explanation for this

is that Muslims picked up their Jew hatred from modern Europeans. That it's a remnant of Nazism. Let's examine this further. Let's go back 600 years ago; long before any of the modern European existed.

In Tunisia when the call to prayer came a Jew said that Mohammed was no prophet in the line of the Jews. He was beheaded for insulting the prophet. In Morocco a ruler said that the Jews pay the tax and they are very humble. We will learn later what this means. In North Africa Jews that sold wine to Muslims were beheaded and their families sold into slavery. In Tunisia a Jew who dressed like a Muslim was to be stripped and beaten and jailed. If he was caught riding a horse he was to be pulled off of the horse stripped and beaten. In medieval Iran, a Jew was forbidden to go out into the rain since the water might fall off of him onto the ground and a Muslim might step in it and become contaminated. So as a consequence when it rained, Jews were not allowed in the marketplace for fear of contaminating Muslims. All of these stories were before there were any of the modern European states, so we have to look elsewhere for the attitudes of Jew hatred by Muslims.

Let's go back to the Koran because there are two Koran's. The second Koran written in Medina draws a totally different picture of the Jews. There were a lot of Jews in Medina. There were three tribes and they comprise about half the population. When Mohammed entered Medina it did not take long for the Jews to inform him that he was not a prophet in their lineage. No one could contradict Mohammed, so it didn't take long until he took care of the problem. After about a year he had become politically powerful enough to attack one of the Jewish tribes. He beat them and took all of their money and exiled them from Medina. Not long after that, he found an excuse to attack the second Jewish tribe. After he captured them he took all of their wealth and was going to do worse. But the Jews had allies amongst the Arabs. One of their old allies stepped forth and said "do not harm them; they are former allies of mine." So Mohammed exiled them and took all of their money.

His third attack was against the strongest tribe of Jews. After the Jews surrendered the men were separated from the women and children. The men were taken into the marketplace and one by one their heads were cut off, all 800. Mohammed set there throughout the day starting alongside 12-year-old wife Aisha. The executions went on into the night by 10 o'clock at night the last Jew lost his head by torchlight. The Jewish women and children the children were adopted in the Muslim families and raised as Muslims. He sold

them in wholesale lots into slavery. Now this is a story that every Muslim knows. There was a different attitude in Medina than in Mecca. But, after the Jews of Medina had been destroyed Mohammed did not stop there.

He went north to Khaybar where the Jews were prosperous. He put them under siege and after they surrendered he took all of their wealth. But this time he did not kill them. A dead Jew does not make you any money. He created a new form of human being called the dhimmi. A Dhimmi existed in an Islamic world. A Jew could only be Jewish in his home or in the synagogue. All of the culture, laws and politics was Islam. A dhimmi had to pay a tax, the JHIZIYA. 50% of everything they earned was paid to Islam and Mohammed. The Koran says in addition to paying the tax that the Dhimmi has to be humiliated. Remember the medieval reporting in which the Jews paid the tax and were very humble-- that's because they were dhimmis.

But Mohammed did not stop with making enemies out of the Jews of Khaybar. As he lay on his deathbed his last words were that neither Jew nor Christian shall be allowed in Arabia. Three years after that when Umar was caliph, that is supreme ruler of all of Islam, he drove the Jews out of Arabia. From that day forward there have been no Jews in Arabia. Saudi Arabia exists in religious apartheid.

The Koran goes further in talking about the Jews; it calls them APES. Remember, earlier back when the fatwa ruled that the Jews are apes and pigs? The modern scholar wasn't making that up. Mohammed added further that the Jews were rats. So we have here two totally different views of the Jews. This is dualism. One view of the Jews is that the Jews and Muslims worship the same God. Why, they are brothers. The other view of the Jews is they are APES and rats. These are two opposite ideas, but due to dualism inside of Islam they are both true. A Muslim can say to the Jew, " oh, we worship the same God. We are brothers in religion." Or he can say they're apes and rats.

Let's move forward from Medina to modern times. There is a problem between Jews and Muslims today. It's known as the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. It is important to know that it is the official position of the Israeli government that Islam plays no part in the problem of Israel. Let's listen to what the leaders of the Palestinians say. Here is one leader. "I support the Palestinian cause. I support jihad" Israelis proclaim that the problem is simply a modern political problem. It is a struggle between nation states, but Jihad is not a modern concept. It is a 1400-year-old concept. A leader of Hamas said: "the Koran used terms that are closer to animals than human beings. The

Jews were likened to a donkey carrying books and were compared apes and pigs. The Israelis today are the descendents of apes and pigs". Another leader said: "the Prophet Mohammed foretold that Judgment Day would come only when the Muslims fight the Jews and the Muslims would kill the Jews and the stones and trees would say "servant of Allah there is a Jew behind me. Come and kill him."

Another Islamic leader says: Allah willing we will enter Israel as conquerors and liberators, not the negotiations, but through jihad.

We have here two very different views of the problem in Israel. Jews today deny that Islam has anything to do with Israel's problem. While Muslims say that Islam demands that jihad will annihilate Israel. We've covered the history of Jews in Islam and saw that Mohammed enslaved, killed and created the dhimmi. In that one word, dhimmi, we find the reason that Jews and Christians do not recognize the source of their problems in Islam. They have been annihilated, humiliated and shamed. Jews and Christians were Dhimmi. Whether it was North Africa, Spain, turkey or Egypt; the Dhimmi were treated badly. No one wants to remember such dreadful history; so they deny its existence.

Instead of telling this 1400-year history of shame, Jewish scholars create a beautiful lie, the lie of the golden age of Islam. It is said that the high point of civilization was found in Islamic Spain. That it was a culture of tolerance in great intellectual striving. There is a wee bit of truth to this, in that there were a few Jews and a few Christians who prospered and were in high places of government as advisers and in other capacities. But to call this a golden age is an elitist view, because there were very few who prospered. Can a golden age exist that is based upon the dhimmitude of kafirs? Can it be a golden age when the Europeans fought for seven hundred years to drive out Islam from Spain? Can a Jewish scholar call the history a golden age when 5000 Jews were killed in one day in Cordoba? There may have been some gold flecks in Spain but it was no golden age.

So it is the history of the Dhimmi that explained the amnesia about the history of Islam and the Jews. For that matter, no kafir wants to look back and see how a total of 270 million kafirs were killed over 1400 years. The history is too bad. No kafir wants to look back and say that his ancestors were enslaved. No Jew wants to look back and say that for 1400 years they were dirt on the street in Islam.

It is sad that this history is not remembered. Until Israel sees its true place in history, that the Jews of Israel are descendents of the dhimmis of Islam; until Jews accept that the real struggle is Jihad, they will be doomed to repeat the history of Khaybar. The only way to save Israel is to see the true history of Islam. Living a lie of the denial of the history of Islam is not a way to preserve Israel.

The Christians

Islam has two views of Christians (duality again). The first view is that Christianity and Islam are brother religions. The second view is that Christians must change their religion to meet the demands of Islam. Modern Christians want to believe that there is a bridge between Islam and Christianity. But the history of Islam shows that Islam first deceives and then annihilates Christianity. For 1400 years Islam has destroyed Christian lands.

The Christians do not play a pivotal role like the Jews did in the formation of Islam. That is, the Koran does not have a lot to say about Christians. Nor does the Sira, the life of Mohammed, have much to say about Christians. But Islam's attitude towards the Christians can be seen in some of the final days of Mohammed's life when he sent out troops against the Christians in the North of Syria. So it was Mohammed's intent to attack the Christians. Soon after he died that's what happened. The Christians played a very important role in historical Islam and that reason is this. All the Middle East, North Africa, and what we now call Turkey was Christian.

Since these areas are Islamic today, there is a history there but let's take a look at Islam through a much more modern eye. Two days after 9/11, the phone calls started going out to all of the churches. Let us send a Muslim to your church and he will tell you about Islam, the peaceful religion. Well one church decided to go that one better. They invited a group of imams (the imams are Muslim religious leaders) and they also invited several Christian ministers. The Christians arrived that night in ones and twos. Then about the time the meeting was to start, in came all the Muslims. The imams came in as a group onto the stage and the Muslim men filed in next. They surrounded the Christians in their seats. And then the Muslim women came in all dressed in black from head to toe, and they sat in the back of the room. As Muslim women, they knew what their place was in public gatherings.

The first thing that happened was an imam walked up to the lectern and placed a very large Koran on top and opened it up about half way. This was a symbolic act that was indicative of the entire night. The Christians didn't

think anything about it one way or the other, but for the Muslims, it was a mark of who they were.

You see, Islam is a word that means submission. This word submission has several meanings. For the Muslim it means to submit to the Koran, the will of Allah and the sunnah of Mohammed. And, all Muslims are to make all others who are not Muslims submit to them. They were there to dominate. What the Muslims did was to place the Koran as the focal point of dominance because this is where normally the Bible would have been. This act of dominance was symbolic of the night.

One of the imams got up and started to give his talk. He first said that Christians and Muslims worship the same God. Well that seemed like a good foot to get started on. Of course this is not true but since the Christians did not know anything about the god Allah that seemed fine to them. The imam went ahead and said they too honor Jesus because Jesus was a prophet of Allah and that Jesus was a Muslim. He also explained that Jesus was not the son of God. He was merely a Muslim Prophet. And for that matter, the apostles were also Muslims. This came perhaps as surprise to the ministers but they didn't say anything. The imam then went ahead to say that Jesus was not crucified, therefore was not resurrected.

The next thing he told the Christians was that the concept of the Trinity was a great affront to Allah. There was no such thing as the Trinity and that it made the Christians polytheist. The fact that the Christians are viewed as polytheist explains something that happened at the beginning when the minister first said let us pray together. There was almost a panicked response from the imams at this. "No," they said, "no! We do not pray with others." This was quite puzzling to the Christian minister but since the Christians were there as hosts and they were there to be kind and polite, he didn't say anything. But not knowing anything about Islam, you can tell from the puzzled look on the minister's face, why would they object to praying together? The reason is that the Christians are viewed as polytheists. To pray with them is a terrible sin, so terrible that it has a special name, shirk. The Koran says that if they had prayed with the Christians, they would definitely go to hell. Praying with the Christians would have been a sin worse than mass murder.

Again the Christians did not understand anything about Islam or they would have never made the invitation to prayer. Or they would have simply prayed with Muslims setting there. The Muslims dominated on this point.

Inside of the Christian Church, there would be no prayers with the Christians.

Another thing that the imam said in his talk was that the New Testament was a corrupt document and was in error. Not only was the New Testament in error so was the Old Testament. But in particular, the reason that the New Testament was wrong was that the prophet of Allah, Jesus' chief prophecy was that after him would come the final prophet and his name would be Ahmed. (Ahmed and Mohammed is like Bill and William) The imam said Christians had removed these prophecies from the New Testament. This was one of the many reasons that the New Testament was a document which was simply wrong. If Christians wanted to learn the real story of Jesus what they would have to do is to read the Koran because the Koran contains the exact truth about Isa, the Arabic word for Jesus.

Imagine if the Christian minister had stood up and made these assertions - that Mohammed was not a prophet of any sort, that the Koran was a derivative work, that is it was just a book in which things were copied from the Jews and Christians, Zorastrians and the old Arabic religions, that Allah was simply the tribal moon god of the Korash tribe. That is equivalent to what the Muslim minister said but Christians didn't do that for two reasons. One, they were the host and they were going to be polite. The other reason was they had no idea that the Koran was a derivative work. In response to questions from the audience, none of the Christians had read the Koran nor had they read the traditions of Mohammed, the hadith. Nor did they know anything about Mohammed's life. But, the imams had read the New Testament and the Old Testament. So they knew the Christians and Christians knew nothing of them. This was the way the entire night went. The Christians were asked questions by the Muslims and the questions that they asked were 1400 years old. These were stock questions but the ministers were caught flat-footed. They had never thought about these kinds of questions before. Again the Moslems came prepared and the Christians were not prepared.

The lack of preparations by the Christians could be shown when one minister started talking badly about the Crusades and apologized for them. This meant he knew nothing about the Crusades. Yes, mistakes were made in the Crusades, but overall, they were a great good. And why were they a great good? It was one of the few times the Christians in Europe recognized the intense suffering of the Christians in the Middle East. The reasons the Crusades were started were simple. They came as a response to a cry for help.

And why did these Christians cry for help? Because they were being murdered, robbed and taxed to death by their Muslim overlords.

Now how did these Muslims become their overlords? Because originally that part of the world had been mostly Christian. It did not become Islamic because some imams showed up and started preaching in the marketplace. No. It was Islamic because the sword had been used to kill all those who would defend Christianity and to take over the government. The Crusaders arrived in response to a desperate cry for help.

Basically the minister with his comments said he didn't know anything about the history of Christianity and Islam. This is tragic, dreadfully tragic. For over 60 million Christians have been killed in the process of jihad. How did Turkey which is 99.7 percent Islamic go from a Greek culture, a country called Anatolia, how did that country go from being Christian to Islamic? The Christians on the stage didn't know how this process happened or know that 60 million Christians have died in jihad. They also didn't know that in the 20th century alone a million Armenians were killed in Turkey. Why didn't the ministers know these dreadful facts? Very simply, it's because they went to divinity school and no one ever mentioned these facts. They had never been taught the doctrine of Islam. They didn't know, for instance, that Islam is primarily a political ideology, not a religion.

Why don't they teach this at the universities and divinity schools? Nothing happens by accident. And in this case, the reason that Christians don't teach the history of Christianity and Islam is this. The history is so dreadful, it's so painful, it could even be called disgusting, the process where by the middle east and Turkey and North Africa all became Moslem was so tragic.

Islam has a political status for the Christians called being a Dhimmi. The Jews were the first Dhimmis but the Christians were the biggest Dhimmis of all for simple reason. There were far more of them. When the Muslims came in and took over the government and implemented Islamic law Sharia law, part of this was how Christians and Jews would be treated in public and how they would be treated in the courts of law. It was dreadful. A dhimmi has no civil rights. So this history of dhimmitude and special taxes that Christians had to pay was dreadfully humiliating.

It's a shameful history that includes the death of 60 million Christians. None of the Christians up on the stage knew what happened to the seven churches of Asia. In the book of Revelation in the New Testament, the 7

churches are addressed. The 7 churches were in Asia minor which was Anatolia or what we call Turkey today. They don't know what happened to those churches which is a real tragedy. Because in the destruction of those churches is the history of Islam that you can hold in the palm of your hand.

And Christians also had not studied enough about Islam to know that not only had 60 million Christians been killed in jihad but 80 million Hindus, 10 million Buddhists and 120 million Africans.

The Christians up on the stage that day didn't know enough to ask about slavery. Because you see, every slave that was sold to the white man on a wooden ship that brought them to America was bought from a Moslem wholesaler. The Christians didn't know enough to ask why is it that when you say the Arabic word African, abed, it's the same word that's used for a black slave. This night was a demonstration of two things, the knowledge and power of Islam and how the Christians have not done their homework.

Christian and all kafirs should know how to use the golden rule to attack the Koran. Christians and all kafirs should know the story of Mohammed?

All kafirs should know enough about the Koran that when a Muslim says Christians, Jews and Muslims worship the same God, that you offer arguments to show how that simply is not true? The knowledge is there. All kafirs should know how to argue with Islam on the issues raised in the church because everything that the Muslims said from the podium of the church is the same thing they say in real life.

All kafirs, not just Christians, should be need to be able to debate on the issue of political Islam, if not with a Muslim, then with someone at work or wherever else. What actual argument can anybody make for being ignorant about the history of political Islam? You really can't. You must face your fears because everybody has a fear about studying political Islam and that fear comes from a sense of unease about the history of political Islam. So there's a reason that you feels uneasy but these fears must be faced.

One of the reasons that the fears must be faced is that the dreadful history of Islam is moving through our world today. As an example, Iraq which used to be a majority Christian is now only 3% Christian, and yet of the refugees leaving Iraq, 30% of those leaving are Christian. Why is it that they're being persecuted? A 1400 history is happening today in Iraq. All kafirs should know about this? In Africa, Christian Africans are being killed and destroyed almost on a daily basis. How can these people be helped?

What is done to Christians is done to Hindus, Buddhists and atheists. Islam does not discriminate. All kafirs must submit.

If you're aware of the history of Islam, if you're aware of its political doctrine, then you can be more useful. And knowledge about Islam is not merely an ability to hold forth in public debate. Knowledge about Islam will sensitize you so that your politics change, so that you can see that not only has Islam killed 270 million kafirs in the past, but it's doing so today.

Kafir civilization is being destroyed on a daily basis by Islam. When a Christian is persecuted, a kafir is persecuted. The way to prevent this destruction is very simple. It is knowledge about Islam, knowledge about the Koran, and knowledge about Mohammed.

The Dhimmi

A Dhimmi lives in fear of Islam but agrees that they will not resist political Islam and they will even support it. In return dhimmis can live safely. Dhimmitude is the mind of the dhimmi. Today we see our politicians, journalists and intellectuals play the role of dhimmis.

The Dhimmi was a unique invention by Mohammed. He created a new type of creature and that creature is a semi-slave. Dhimmis started with what Mohammed did to the Jews. He took their land and then let them work the land and the dhimmis paid a tax, the jhizya, that was half of their income. A Dhimmi was a kafir who lived in an Islamic country. The first dhimmis were the Jews, but Christians and others were added later.

Jews and Christians could still practice their religion but that must be done in a private way. The laws were Islamic; the dress was dictated by Islamic law. A Dhimmi was not really free. For instance a church couldn't ring its bells because bells are a sign of Satan, according to Mohammed. A Dhimmi couldn't hold any job that made him a supervisor over Muslims. This limited rank in the military. If Christians wanted to repair the church, or Jews the synagogue, they had to get permission from the government. All of these laws are dreadful because they established a second-class citizenship; the dhimmi did not have civil rights. A dhimmi couldn't sue a Muslim or prosecute a crime against a Muslim. This type of citizen had no power and had to pay a special tax--the Jizya. The Koran says that the dhimmi had to pay the Jizya. Classically when the Christian or the Jewish dhimmi came to pay their yearly Jizya tax, they were humiliated-- grabbed by the beard, slapped in the face, or made to kneel and give the money. They were humiliated because that was the Koran said to humiliate the dhimmi.

In some Islamic countries, particularly when the country felt powerful, it was more tolerant towards the Dhimmi. A Dhimmi could even rise to a decent level of power within government, but that could all vanish overnight. The treatment of the dhimmi was shown in Coptic Egypt. (the Copts were the original Egyptians.) A Dhimmi could have his tongue removed if he spoke Coptic in front of an Islamic government official. The Dhimmi was always persecuted and was never really an equal.

When the Egyptian military tried to conquer the Byzantine Christians, but lost a battle, back in Egypt the Muslim rioted against the Christians. Christians would be killed because riots were one of the favorite ways to punish the Dhimmi. When Smyrna--the last of the seven churches of Asia--was destroyed in 1922, it was not done with the military and bulldozers. No, rioting Muslims did it. Riots are a form of jihad. The Dhimmi could always be persecuted, not only in the courts of law, but a riot could destroy an entire section of a city. Dhimmi were killed if they criticized Mohammed, and actually Dhimmi were not even supposed to study Mohammed at all.

There was a formal treaty called the Treaty of Omar, which laid out everything that was to be done to the Dhimmi. A Dhimmi could not ride a horse, but he could ride an ass or a donkey. If they were caught on a horse, they could be pulled off and beaten. When a Dhimmi met a Muslim on the sidewalk, he had to step out into the street and let the Muslim pass. The Dhimmi also had to wear special clothing or, if not special clothing, a belt or a patch on the clothing to immediately identify a person as a Dhimmi. The only protection that a Christian or a Jew had would be to make Muslim friends because many times the Muslim friend could keep the weight of Dhimmi laws off of his Christian or Jewish friend.

The persecution of the Dhimmi was unrelenting. It went on for generation after generation. Finally the Dhimmi would give up and become a Muslim. All of a sudden he had more money because he didn't have to pay the Jizya tax. Converted Dhimmi could be promoted in their jobs. They would not be spit at or have stones thrown at them on the street. They could go to court and be treated as full, equal citizens.

As the centuries passed, more and more Dhimmi converted to Islam. Dhimmitude, which is the mind of the Dhimmi, destroys the civilization into which Islam moves because the only way out is to become more Islamic by giving up all of your old culture. When Islam moved into Coptic Egypt, the culture was a blend of the old pharonic culture and mixed with the culture of the Greeks. In the end all of the Coptic culture disappeared just as the

pyramids were stripped of their beautiful marble veneer. Why? because Islam tries to destroy all kafir civilization.

Islam seeks to annihilate all other cultures by dhimmitude. The lack of civil rights, the abuse, humiliation and tax burden wears away the spirit to resist becoming Islamic. They get new names and names of cities change and then the cultural history vanishes. Once a nation has been fully Islamicized, all of its history disappears. When Napoleon invaded Egypt, none of the Muslims there could explain anything about the old temples, the statues, or the pyramids. The people were ignorant of their history. They didn't remember anything because the culture of the pharaohs had been annihilated. The culture of the Greeks in Anatolia was destroyed. In Pakistan, a Muslim country, the native culture was Hindu. Afghanistan was a Buddhist culture that has been completely annihilated.

Part of the Islamic takeover and eradication of a nation and its culture is the destruction of sacred sites. Churches or temples that are beautiful or valuable were converted to a mosque. At one time an estimate put the number of churches destroyed by the Islamic conquest of Turkey near 20,000. India had magnificent temples of worship which the Muslims destroyed.

Islam invented defacing. When Islam invaded a country, all of the religious objects were destroyed just as Mohammed destroyed all religious art. If there was a mural on a wall, the face was destroyed. Once the face was gone, the rest of the object was left. The Sphinx does not have a nose because it was defaced by Muslims.

The purpose of Dhimmitude was twofold: (1) to bring in money by the Dhimmi tax and (2) to slowly grind out the Dhimmi's culture. This process worked really well. As a matter of fact, it was so successful that there is a black hole in history about Dhimmitude. No one studies this part of world history. As a result today in our universities the history of the Dhimmi is not taught and is never mentioned. In some divinity schools, which consider themselves sophisticated, the Dhimmi is discussed. However, what is said is, "Oh, the Dhimmi was protected." It makes life as a Dhimmi sound warm and fuzzy like living in the arms of your father. And the question arises: protected from what and whom? What is not taught is how the Dhimmi was humiliated. When it is said that the Dhimmi was protected, it is the truth. To be protected as a Dhimmi means that as long as one kept paying the tax he would not be killed nor would his goods be stolen, unless there was a riot. In a riot no Dhimmi was protected.

Today there is no Islamic country is strong enough to have a full legal Dhimmi or slavery as a formal policy. However, both the Dhimmi and slavery are part of Islam, and the doctrine of Islam cannot be changed. The Koran is complete, perfect and absolute. The condition and rule of the Dhimmi is laid out in the Koran, so the Dhimmi cannot be eliminated. The reason that there is no longer a formal Dhimmi status is that Islam is not powerful enough to enforce it. Instead of having a formal status for the Dhimmi, bigotry and prejudice limit the civil rights. This leads to extralegal persecution of kafirs.

Today the Dhimmis are not just inside Islamic countries but most kafirs are Dhimmis, meaning that they defer to Islam on all sorts of issues. Kafirs have replaced the Dhimmi legal status with the mind of the Dhimmi--Dhimmitude. Let's look at some examples of Dhimmitude. Soon after 9/11 this scene was repeated in many cities: a public gathering would be held and there would be a Minister, a Rabbi, and an Imam and someone to operate as Master of Ceremonies. At this gathering the Jew and Christian said that they all worshipped the same god as the Muslims. At one of these gatherings the three religious representatives were questioned. The Christian minister was asked, "Have you read the Koran? Do you know the traditions? and Do you know the Sira (the life of Mohammed)?" The Minister answered, "Well, no." Then the rabbi was asked, "Have you read the Koran?" "No." "Do you know the life of Mohammed?" "No." "Have you read the traditions?" "No." Then the Imam was asked, "Have you read the New Testament?" "Oh, yes!" "Have you read the Old Testament?" "Sure!"

There is something wrong with this picture, because the Rabbi and the Minister said, "Oh, we worship the same God." Then in response to the questions they said, "Well we really don't know anything about Allah." Then why did they say they worshipped the same god as Allah? This is Dhimmitude. It is a desperate attempt to please the Muslim even by telling a lie! Think about it--religious leaders standing up in public and telling a deliberate lie! Why? Because it sounds good and they are deferring to Islam because inside nearly every Christian, every Jew, and for that matter nearly every kafir has a fear of Islam. Added to that today we have the dreadful political correctness, which is that minority groups can never be talked about in a negative way. For some reason one and a half billion Muslims are categorized as a minority!

Dhimmitude is the attitude of one who always tries to placate the bully. Islam is always pressuring for this attitude of submission. For example, the

Sharia, Muslim Law, permits a Muslim to have up to four wives. In the West we have monogamous laws. However, England allows a Muslim to bring in more than one wife, and they all can qualify for welfare. This is Dhimmitude. Dhimmitude is submitting to Islam for the simple purpose of submitting.

Another example of Dhimmitude is the phrase "the war on terror." The war on terror is the mark of a Dhimmi because it does not name the enemy. After Pearl Harbor the United States did not declare war against the kamikazes. It named the enemy and declared war against Japan. Dhimmis don't want to have a ideological war against political Islam. Thus, we create an artificial phrase that has no meaning. "Terror" is a technique. We cannot go to war against a technique; we only can go to war against an enemy.

We see dhimmitude in government in hiring and promotion. Government agencies give preference to Muslim Arabs over Christian Arabs in translation work. Forums are opened for Muslims to come in and talk about Islam. As a contrary example, Buddhists do not get a forum to explain Buddhism.

In another form of Dhimmitude, our universities do not teach the history of the Dhimmi nor do they teach the history of Islamic conquest. The universities teach a history of Islam, which is glorious and in which no suffering occurs.

The United States prides itself on freedom of the press and political speech. Citizens are supposed to have the right to stand up and say anything about politics. People might laugh at you, and they may not vote for you, but it's not a crime to speak. Remember the Mohammed cartoons? No newspaper in the United States published the Mohammed cartoons. Mohammed was a political figure and yet our newspapers, by law having freedom of the press, did not publish those cartoons. Newspapers defended themselves, saying that they did not want to offend anyone. Politics frequently involves offending someone. Newspapers are in the business of offending people at times. The newspapers were not offending Islam to be nice, but because Dhimmis are always afraid of Islam. Dhimmis are always looking for a way to placate and appease. When the cartoons were not shown on TV and when they were not published in the newspapers, those refusals to exercise freedom of speech or freedom of the press were acts of Dhimmis. No one was being nice; they were being Dhimmis.

To slowly accept Sharia Law is another form of Dhimmitude. Airports in the United States are changing the plumbing so that Muslims will have a

place to wash their feet before prayer. Universities have "meditation rooms;" however, the Muslims monopolize them. If a university is questioned about this seemingly unfair use, it will not defend the practice. That is Dhimmitude. When a workplace that runs an assembly line says, "If you're Muslim we will provide for you a place to pray, and you can leave the production line when it is prayer time." That's Dhimmitude. Why? because the employer does not provide that opportunity for any other employee. It is the Dhimmi who operates out of fear to placate Islam.

In the United States and in Europe there is no formal Dhimmi status, but there is Dhimmitude. As a result of this attitude, Europe is rapidly becoming islamicized. The day will come when the churches in Europe live in fear, as they do now in Turkey. A church will have to get permission from the Muslim masters to get the roof fixed. The reason the people will be subject to Islam rule is that they never studied the history of the Dhimmi and never studied the history of political Islam.

The people who do not study the history of political Islam and study the history of the Dhimmi and learn from it are doomed to repeat the subjection of the Dhimmis and lose their civilization.

Women

The dualism of Islam allows for two ways to treat women. They can be honored and protected or they can be beaten. Today Western nations allow Islamic women to be treated as Islam wants to treat them. In short, they are not subject to our laws and customs of equality. Why? Our politicians and intellectuals do not want to offend Islam by discussing the second class status of women in Islam.

Our next lesson is on women. If you're going to study Islam you have to study women as a separate category. And the reason for this is simple-Islamic doctrine denies that men and women are equal. The dualism of Islam separates women into a separate category. The Koran has whole sections devoted to how women are treated differently from men. Many hadiths show women as a special category. Islam is very proud of how it treats its women and says that in the West our treatment of women is terrible, that they are not protected and honored. In Islam, women are protected and honored.

Let's examine the doctrine that underlies each separate case of how women are treated. Islam is a rational system of politics and culture. It always has a doctrinal reason for everything it does and this is one of the things that make studying Islam easy. If Muslims do it, there is a reason. There is very

little creativity inside of Islam. It doesn't need to create, because Islam has a perfect universal and final doctrine. Its doctrine about women is perfect; therefore it doesn't need to innovate in any way. Islam even claims that it is the world's first feminist movement--that after Islam women had more rights than before.

Let's examine the subject of beatings. The Koran is clear. It says that if a woman does not obey her husband--that is, does not submit-- she can be beaten. Let's see how this plays out. A Palestinian woman sued in a sharia court; what she wanted was this: a judgment that her husband would only beat her once a week. She said that currently he beat her every day and that that was excessive. So she sued in sharia court to have them direct her husband to only beat her once a week.

At the border between Pakistan and Afghanistan, it was decided that everyone who crossed the border had to be photographed. The US military was doing this and since many of the people coming across the border were Afghani women in their full head-to-toe burqa- including the face veil--they were taken to a separate tent where a female soldier helped them get their burqa off and photographed their face.

Now this is merely anecdotal information that was passed to me by a soldier, and doesn't have any scientific evidence, but the women who did this work said that it seemed to them like nine out of ten women that they saw had been bruised in the face.

This goes along with what the Pakistan Institute of Medical Science reported. In a scientific survey of Pakistani women, about 90% of them said that they had been beaten by their husbands. In the country of Chad, in Africa, they tried to outlaw beatings, but Islam is quite strong in Chad. The imams and other Islamic leaders protested, saying that anti-wife beating laws were against Sharia law. The bill was defeated.

Some argue cynically, but practically, that since Islamic women are beaten from early on, by the time they are married they are used to this treatment and it does not seem to bother them. This business of beating wives is thoroughly established in Islam. This is not some sort of aberration. We've already mentioned that the Koran says that the beating of a wife is permitted. It also goes further to say, though, that if the woman submits she should be given food clothing and shelter, so those are also part of a woman's rights.

Mohammed left behind a great deal of information about the beating of women. There is one tradition which summarizes Islam and women. He said never ask a man why he beats his wife. We know that from one tradition (hadith) that he himself hit his favorite wife, Aisha, and we know that he stood by without comment when her father struck Aisha in his presence. But then again, Mohammed also stood by without saying a word when Ali beat Aisha's black female slave. Ali was Mohammed's cousin, son-in-law and the fourth caliph (supreme leader).

There's a famous hadith where a woman comes to Mohammed with a complaint about her husband. The hadith says that there was a bruise on her face which was green in color. Mohammed addressed the issue that she brought up, but he made no remark about the bruise on her face. Actually, at another time he left a hadith which said that when you hit women, do not strike them in the face. He also left behind one other piece of information on the beating of women. He said that they should be beaten lightly. This invites questions. What does it mean to beat lightly? Does it mean to use a small stick? And to use a stick, can you raise the stick above the head as you strike down at the woman? The Sunna doesn't describe this, it merely says that they are to be beaten lightly.

Now Islam is a dualistic system. Dualism means that Islam always has two contradictory positions. So if there is a statement that says that it proper to beat a woman, then somewhere else there will be a contradictory statement. So, in another hadith, Mohammed said: "do not strike Allah's handmaidens." That is, don't hit women. However, there are only one or two of these statements and there are many which describe how women should be subjugated. Of course, in Islam hitting a woman is not abuse because hitting a woman is allowed and not forbidden. If she's been trained properly she does not object to these beatings. Since Mohammed established very firmly that striking women was within the bounds of Islam, Sharia incorporates the Sunna of Mohammed into the formal structure of Islamic law. There are rules laid out as to the gradation of how the man makes the woman submit and the final stage is a beating.

Now let's look at another way that women are treated inside of Islam. In 2002, researchers in refugee camps in Afghanistan and Pakistan found that half the girls were married by age 13. In an Afghan refugee camp more than two out of three second grade girls were either married or engaged! Virtually all the girls who were beyond second grade were already married. One ten-year-old was engaged to a man of 60. Fifty-seven percent of Afghan girls

under the age of 16 and many as young as nine, are in arranged marriages. This is pure Sunna, the way of Mohammed. How do we know this? When Mohammed was in his mid-fifties, he was engaged to Aisha, a child of six. Then, when she was nine years old, he consummated the marriage. So, when the 60-year-old Pakistani Muslim is engaged to the 10-year-old it is Sunna, it is the way of Mohammed.

Now we come to a treatment of Islamic women which is not strictly Islamic doctrine, and that is "honor killings." An honor killing is when a man kills a woman because she has violated his honor. A Muslim male must control the sexuality of the females in his household or he is dishonored. It is one of his chief concerns. In Dallas, Texas two Muslim sisters were found shot to death in the back of their father's taxicab. The father is being sought by the police in conjunction with the murder. A friend who knew them said the father was very strict about the girl's relationships with boys, their talking with boys, as well as the type of clothing the daughter's wore. The sisters dressed in Western clothes and listen to popular music. The father was quite angry that his daughters were not acting like proper Muslim women.

Islam does not say kill the woman who does not obey instead, it brings the level of punishment up to beatings. However, once a woman is to be subjugated and that she can be beaten, it's not too far from taking the final step. Killing a family member over the issue of Islam is Sunna. We know at the Battle of Bader there is a story in which a son is remorseful about having killed his father, who was a kafir, but in the end he realizes that since his father was a kafir, even though he was a cultured man, it was better that he was dead. So it is Sunna for one family member to kill another to advance Islam.

The Koran speaks at great length about women's rights. Among them are these: that they are to receive half the amount of inheritance of a male, and that in a court of law it takes the testimony of two women to equal the testimony of one man. So, if a woman testifies against a man and he denies the accusation, then the testimony has no weight at all. In Islamic court this makes cases of rape almost impossible to prove.

Muslims will say: "Oh no, no, no! Islam teaches the equality of women!" and indeed, there are many verses which say that women are equal on Judgment Day. That's when they're equal. Then every person will be called upon to account for what they did and said in life, and in this matter men and women are to be treated equally.

Let's examine the fine print. It is true that the Koran says that women are to be treated equally on Judgment Day. They are to be judged on what they did in this life, and what they're supposed to do in this life is to obey the men, to submit to them, therefore, their "equality" on Judgment Day means that they will be judged on how well they submitted to men.

Mohammed commented that he had seen Hell and the great majority of its inhabitants were women. Why were they there? They had not fully appreciated their husbands. In the same hadith, he made the remark that women were spiritually inferior to men and that women were not as intelligent as men. Part of a woman's "rights" inside of Islam is that she's not as intelligent and she has a much better chance of going to hell.

But even if she goes to Paradise, she is still in for a second-class treatment. Paradise for men is a sexual playground, but none of that seems to extend to women, so that even in Paradise, women are not rewarded like men.

There's another interesting comment about women and worship in Islam. A man is to pray facing Mecca; the women are to be behind him in prayer. This is the reason why women always sit in the back in the mosque. Now it's interesting in the religion of Islam there are many things which can negate the power of prayer. One of those is if while you're praying a dog, a donkey or a woman should walk in front of you. So for the purposes of this tradition a woman is equal to a dog or a donkey.

Now let's take up the matter of the infamous burqa -the covering from head-to-toe which can even include the face. Some Islamic women say "Well, that is not really required." Others say that it is. So on this issue the Koran does display a dualism. We do know this: Mohammed made all of his wives wear a veil, and that everyone in the entourage around him did so. So although there is not a universal commandment that says women should wear a burqa, we do know that from the Sunna of Mohammed, his wives did that and all the women around him did. This is a powerful influence with regards to the burqa.

In the Muslim holy city of Mecca, a girls' school caught on fire. Naturally, the girls tried to escape, but they were driven back into the burning building because they were not wearing their face covering and full-body veil. They died because it was the decision of the religious police that better they should die than have their faces exposed in the public.

Another aspect of Islam is polygamy. The Koran is quite clear on polygamy. A man have one, two, three or four wives. It does not say that a woman can have one, two three, or four husbands.

There is also the matter of stoning. Now it can be argued that stoning is not Islamic, or it can be argued that it is Islamic. Here's a situation in Terhan, Iran which calls itself an Islamic republic. In 2008, two sisters, Zohre and Azar Kabiri, were convicted of adultery. They were sentenced to be stoned to death. The adultery is a crime punishable by death. The way this worked was, at first they were convicted of having illegal relations and they were given 99 lashings each. They were brought back into court and the same evidence was used to try them for adultery, whereupon they were sentenced to be stoned to death. The evidence? It was a videotape where the two sisters were caught talking to some men without adult family members with them.

There's an interesting thing about stoning, by the way. Sharia law is very technical about this, and what it says is that the stones should be chosen so they do not kill immediately. They have to be big enough so that when enough of them are thrown, they will kill the victim. Death by stoning is meant to be a torturous death that the entire community participates in.

Now we come to an important thing. We have just described Islam. We must now talk about our response to this, and our response to this is shameful. In this country, starting in the 1960s, we had a political movement called feminism which said women should be fully equal to men before the law, and a great deal of progress has been made in that. But on the issue of Islam, kafir women are shamefully silent. What we see here is indication of how our universities, for instance, have responded to Islam. They are silent. Universities should be a place where issues are discussed and described but no Women's Studies teach any of the Sharia law about women in Islam. Social workers do not report beatings inside Islamic families in Europe. The whole system has turned a blind eye to this.

What's happening in Europe-and it's starting to happen in America- is this: Muslim civil rights organizations maintain that Muslims should not fall under any aspect of family law in the West because our family law is based on ignorance of Allah's law. Therefore, there should be two sets of laws-one for kafirs and one for Muslims. So if a beaten Muslim woman shows up at the emergency room, the police would not be called. Or if she wishes to press charges, it would be in an Islamic court.

What is the response of Western women to this? Well, they don't want to be culturally insensitive. They don't want to be racist. So if this culture of Islam wants to beat its women, why should they say anything about it? They do not want to be culturally insensitive. Our universal human rights stop at Mohammed's door.

Islam has a precise doctrine of how to treat women. Other than after death, the Islamic treatment of women is that they are less than a man. That is dreadful, but what is worse is that we will not help Islamic women for fear we will offend Islam.

Slavery

You do not know the history of slavery if you do not know about Islam and slavery. Slavery is a very important and is part of a highly developed doctrine in Islam. It has a 1400 year old history which is still alive today in Africa. Mohammed was a slaver, who dealt in every aspect of slavery.

It is impossible to study the history of Mohammed and the beginnings of Islam and not become involved in the role of slavery. The politically correct version of slavery is that it only happened when white men showed up in wooden ships off the coast of Africa, went into the bush, captured slaves and brought them back to sell in America. That is the generally accepted history of slavery in America.

That does contain an element of truth but it's not remotely the story of world slavery, or even how slave trading worked in the Americas.

To study slavery from the standpoint of the world, you must study Islam because Islam has enslaved all others - the African, the European, the Asian - they have enslaved everybody.

Francis Bok, a Christian, appeared at a university to give a talk. It was very interesting because he was an actual freed African slave. He and his sister had gone to the market to sell beans and while they were in the market place, Muslim Jihadis showed up. They captured his sister and him along with others and set out on a forced march. Every night his sister was raped by the members of the troop. When they finally got to the jihadis' camp, they were put on the block and sold as slaves. Once Francis was sold, he was taken to the new master's home. He was placed in the center of the family and every member of the family took a small stick and began to beat him with it. Then they informed him that he no longer had any name. From this day forward there was no more Francis Bok. There was only *Abd* - A-B-D - black slave.

Now this is interesting. Abd is an Arabic word but it's only one of about forty different words that Islam has for a slave. That's very interesting because in the English language we simply have one word - slave. Now ask yourself a question. Why would the Arabic language have so many words for slave? Abd means black slave and an African. Think about that for a moment. Abd means both black slave and African. There is an entire history in those two meanings.

There's a word for white slave --*mamluk*. There's a word for a Hindu slave. Perhaps you're beginning to gain some idea that over a long period of time Arabs have had a lot to do with the slave trade because you don't change a language over night. It takes a long time to accumulate 40 words for a slave.

Francis Bok was given a room with the animals in the barn. They gave him some straw to lay on. This is interesting because when slavery is brought up to Muslims they will admit that it happened in the past but that it's long since passed and besides that they treated their slaves really well. Perhaps that message was not given to Francis Bok's masters because he slept in the barn with animals. He tried to escape but, was captured and beaten.

By the way, as soon as he escaped the Arabic language had a new word for him. The Arabic language has a word for an escaped male slave. It has a word for an escaped female slave. And it has a word for an escaped child slave. The Arabic language has put a fine point on slavery.

Francis kept working and plotting and growing a little older and a little stronger. Finally he found an opportune time and he escaped and he set out on his own forced march. This time not a forced march to slavery but a forced march to freedom. He got to Egypt and managed to get to America where he works with an organization called Iabolish.com and they were the group that sponsored him to come to this university.

Francis was asked from the audience "who captured you?" And he said "Muslims". Then later someone said, "Muslims can react very violently, indeed they can kill you if they don't like what you say about them, are you afraid for your own life in saying that Muslims captured and enslaved me?" His remark was memorable. He said, "I am now a free man. Now I can die because I will die as a free man." Think about that. I will die as a free man. You can learn more about Francis Bok by searching the Web under his name.

Now let's stop and take a closer look at the white man's involvement with slavery. Did he show up on the coast of Africa in a wooden ship to get slaves? Yes he did. But he didn't go into the bush to get them. He went to the slave

market where he bought them at a wholesale price in wholesale lots. Bills of sale, money and invoices were exchanged. He left with his boatload of slaves that he got from the Muslim slave trader. The Muslims had been trading slaves and capturing slaves in Africa for 1400 years and the white man just represented a new market. That's all. Muslims had been enslaving before the white man and when white people put together the code that eliminated slavery and the slave trade, Muslims just kept on with their old business. They are not inhibited by the laws of the kafir.

We know that Mohammed had Black slaves. It says so in the Hadith. It says so in the Sira. So slavery is nothing new to Islam because slavery is the ideal in Islam. The ideal Muslim is the slave of Allah and indeed Mohammed called himself the slave of Allah because inside of Islam there is no freedom. Everything has been prescribed. Everything you need to do has been recorded, laid out and your job as a Muslim is to be a slave to Allah and follow all the rules which includes the Sunna of Mohammed. A slave is the ideal Muslim. This is reflected in one of the Muslim names, Abdullah. Abd - slave; Allah - slave of Allah.

Islam has enslaved many peoples, including Europeans. It's estimated that a total of 25 million Africans have been sold as slaves and we know that about a million Europeans have been sold into slavery. Indeed, the one word that we have for slave comes from the Slavic people, the Slavs. The Muslims took many slaves out of Eastern Europe and the primary ethnic groups they preyed upon were the Slavs. So we adopted the term "slave" from the poor Slavs.

There are different uses for different of races of people as slaves. The Blacks were usually put into rough, hard work and frequently died at it. It was a death sentence to be a Black slave in the Saharan salt mines.

Whites were usually put to work in what we would call white collar jobs. They could even become leaders in the Army. The highest priced slave in the Meccan slave market for 1400 years never changed. It was always a white woman who brought the highest price. Writings from Medieval Islamic documents show that they were very free and open in discussing which race you used for which job. For instance the white woman was preferred as a slave of pleasure but if you could not afford her since she was the most expensive, then an Ethiopian woman, or as they called them then, Abyssinian woman, was the second best choice.

It is very unfortunate but this sale of white women was put in place by Mohammed. You see, Mohammed had all manner of slaves and his favorite sexual partner was a white woman. Her name was Miriam. She was a Coptic Christian. Well, since Mohammed's Sunnah determines what everything shall be, this means that the preference of all Muslims who wish a slave of pleasure is the same that Mohammed had, a white slave. So the Sunnah of Mohammed was very bad for white women.

There is an interesting special kind of slave that was used in Islam, that of the Eunuch. Generally these were Black slaves and the castration process removed everything about the sex. Eunuchs are even referred to in the Koran because they can see the woman of the house unveiled. The Koran is very clear about slavery. It's quite desirable and it has only one limitation, you cannot enslave Muslims. Only kafirs can be enslaved and poor Francis Bok, being a Christian, was a kafir.

Now Francis ran away to get his freedom but he might have escaped being a slave if he had chosen to become a slave of Allah, a Muslim. The rules of slavery inside of Islam, and there are many rules, is that it is good to free slaves because that brings a great merit with Allah, but you don't free a kafir slave. So perhaps Francis could have converted to Islam and been freed through that path. But Francis Bok wanted to be a Christian. He did not want to be a Muslim so he had to take the only path open to him, which was flight.

The full history of slavery is not taught in any university in the United States. Nor is it easy to find books written that include the fact of Islam's role in world slavery. The only acceptable history of slavery is the 200 year white man theory and while we're talking about the white man and slavery, it was the white man who actually did the most to stop the international slave trade. The British Navy was commanded to intercept all slave ships. This did not stop the Islamic enslavement of Africans.

Out of the 25 million slaves that were taken out of Africa, 11 million were sold in the Americas. The other 14 million were sold in West and North Africa where Islam is and in the rest of Asia.

There was a terrible side effect of slavery. For every slave captured, the slavers had to kill others. For instance, Francis Bok's parents were killed. The slavers showed up with armed troops, and kill all those who could defend their tribe. When the slavers finally killed all the defenders, they could then take the best of the survivors as slaves. The old, the sick and the very young were left behind, because they couldn't take the forced march that comes

right after capture. The estimate of the collateral damage there was from taking one slave varies. Some of those who visited Africa during the peak slave trading days said that as many as ten had to die to produce one slave in the wholesale market. Others said no, only five. So using the lower figure we can see that out of the 25 million enslaved, there were over 100 million Africans, as much as 120 million Africans, who have died over the 1400 year period and that includes today. These figures never get talked about.

Now then, let's talk about Mohammed's role in slavery. He had slaves in his family. His first wife, Khadijah, owned slaves. Indeed one of Mohammed's first converts was a Black slave and Mohammed himself owned Black slaves. Mohammed was deep into slavery. As a matter of fact, slavery was one of the chief ways he financed Jihad. He was involved in having kafir men killed so their women and children could be made slaves. He sent his own Jihadists out on slave missions. He gave away slaves as gifts. He owned all kinds of slaves including males, females and Black slaves. He passed around slaves for the purpose of sexual pleasure of his companions - men who were his chief lieutenants. He stood by and prayed while others beat slaves. He shared the pleasure of forced sex with female slaves after conquest. He captured slaves and wholesaled them to raise money for Jihad. One of his favorite sexual partners was a slave who bore him a son. He got slaves as gifts from other rulers. The very pulpit he preached from was made by a slave. Some of his cooks were slaves. He was treated medically by a slave. He had a slave tailor. He declared that any slave who ran away from his master would not have his prayers answered. Now that didn't work out for Francis Bok because he did escape from slavery. His prayers were answered because his prayers were to be free.

It is interesting to note how slavery falls into the line of Islam's two fundamental principles-- submission and duality. Submission because who is more submissive than a slave? And duality because the Islamic doctrine creates a separate legal classification, an ethical classification for the slave.

It's no wonder that for all these years Islam has been involved in slavery because Allah likes a slave and Allah wants Muslims to enslave others, because after you keep them as a slave long enough, they will convert to Islam and if they don't, then their children will. The Koran and Islam see slavery as a great good.

Now you say to yourself, "if it's in the Koran, why don't they still do it?" In fact, Muslims are still involved in slavery. Women who are brought in from the Philippines to work in Saudi Arabia are treated as slaves, their

passports taken away and they may never get back home. So Islam has always been involved in the slave trading business. It's there, it's in the Koran, it's in the Sunnah and the only reason they don't do it openly anymore is they're simply not militarily strong enough. But slavery cannot be removed from the Islamic doctrine because unlike our constitution for instance, Islamic doctrine is eternal. It's permanent. It's forever.

When David Livingston was in Africa he saw the slave trade up close. He said that the paddle wheels on the boat he was on frequently hit slaves who had drowned in the river or the bodies of those who were killed in the process of trying to get slaves. He described a peculiar disease among slaves that the slave owners told him about. "The strangest disease I have seen in this country really seems to be broken heartedness and it attacks kafirs who have been captured and made slaves. Speaking with many who later died from it, they ascribe that their only pain was to the heart and place the hand correctly on that spot. Some slavers expressed surprise to me that these men would die seeing that they had plenty to eat and no work. It really seems that they died of a broken heart."

He spoke with slave traders a long time about what they did and the Muslims told him that their object in capturing slaves is to get them into their possession and make them of their religion.

Now this history is quite sad, but the saddest thing about this whole history of Islam and slavery is that it's not taught. Our universities don't teach it. The universities don't even teach how white people were enslaved or how many Hindus were sold into slavery. It is not enough that slavery has been in our past. We must teach the complete history of slavery in our schools and universities. Only then can we fully understand this dreadful history.

Every Muslim is a slave of Allah. Slavery is Islam's dark secret. Islam has enslaved Europeans, Africans and Asians. Unfortunately, the Western intellectuals, including blacks, are determined to cover up Islam's crimes against humanity.

Ethics

If you can only know one thing about Islam, the most important is Islamic ethics. Islamic ethics do not share anything with our ethics. Islamic ethics are dualistic. They have one set rules for themselves and another set of rules for everyone else, the kafirs. Kafirs can be deceived, robbed, murdered and raped. There is even a word for sacred deceit.

Ethics is the great divide between Islam and all other cultures, but before we look at Islamic ethics, let's look at ours. Our ethics are based upon the Golden Rule, treat others as you would be treated. Who are the others? The others are ALL others. There's no elimination of someone because of race, sex, ethnicity, religion. In our politics everyone is to be treated fairly and equally before the law and the Golden Rule leads to the concepts of what we call fair and what we call equal. Some may jump up and say, "but we don't do that all the time do we?" Here's what's important. No, it is true that we do not do that all the time because every person is pulled between two contradictory ideas. One is to treat others as they should be treated. The other idea is purely selfish and only look to ourselves. When we dwell on our own personal needs too much and start hurting or harming others, we can be corrected and brought back by saying that is not fair and the fairness is based upon the Golden Rule.

So the Golden Rule lies behind our legal and ethical system.

Islam does not follow the Golden Rule. Indeed Islam explicitly denies the Golden Rule. The Koran never addresses humanity as a whole. Instead humanity is always divided into the kafir, the unbeliever and the believer, the Muslim. The Koran is very clear that the kafir is to be treated differently from the unbeliever and this treatment can be very violent. So this division into kafir and believer eliminates the possibility of having a Golden Rule.

Islam therefore is dualistic. It has one set of rules for itself and another set of rules for the kafir. There is no one humanity.

The other difference between Islamic ethics and ours is that fundamentally there is not the concept of right and wrong in Islam. All ethics in Islam are based upon what Mohammed did and did not do, therefore the concepts inside of Islamic ethics are not right and wrong but what is permitted and what is forbidden. Mohammed is viewed as the perfect ethnical pattern. Every Muslim is to follow him and do what he did and say what he said. The ethics of Islam are determined by what Mohammed did and said, his Sunna. The rest of the ethics are found in the Koran.

Let us examine Islamic ethics through deceit. Let's read some ideas that have been given to us by Muslims. This is a quote from Ali Al Timimi, an internationally known Muslim scholar and imam who had government clearance. He even worked with former White House Chief of Staff and was invited to speak to the military about Islam.

Publicly the imam denounced Islamic violence and said: "My position against terrorism and Muslim inspired violence against innocent people is well known by Muslims." But privately another picture emerged. Five days after the attacks on September 11th he called them legitimate and rallied young Muslim men in his mosque to carry out more Holy war and violent Jihad.

Another Islamic leader in this country, Abdurahman Alamoudi, who developed the Pentagon's Muslim chaplain corps and acted as a good will ambassador for our State Department, also, denounced terror. "We are against all forms of terrorism" he claimed. Our religion is against terrorism." Privately he raised major funds for Al-Qaeda and was caught on tape grumbling that Osama bin Laden had not killed enough kafirs in the U.S. Embassy bombings.

In our culture we would call these men liars. But this does not apply inside of Islamic ethics because what these men were practicing was deceit. They were talking to kafirs when they said those things. Let's see what Mohammed said about deceiving the kafir.

In Medina there was a Jew named al-Ashraf. Al-Ashraf wrote a poem in which he condemned Mohammed and Mohammed at the mosque asked "who will rid me of Ashraf, the enemy of Allah and his prophet?" One of the Muslims said he would but a few days later Mohammed noticed that the task of killing al Ashraf had not been done so he went to the man and said "what are you doing?" The man said, "Mohammed, in order to kill Ashraf I will have to tell a lie". Then Mohammed said "Say whatever you need to say."

The Muslim took a couple of his friends and went to al-Ashraf and said they were getting a sick and tired of Mohammed, but before they could leave, they needed to have a little money and were wondering if al Ashraf could help. They wanted to borrow some money. Al Ashraf said he would need some collateral to loan you money. And so they suggested that perhaps they could bring him their weapons - their swords and knives - and leave them in pawn. He agreed.

So the next night the three Muslims showed up, their weapons in hand. But al-Ashraf was not concerned. They had come to pawn the weapons. They chatted with him in a friendly way and said, " it is night, a pleasant night, let us go for a walk and discuss things". So they did. But in the middle of the walk after they had recited some poetry, one of them grabbed him by the

hair of the head, said to the other, "kill him", and they knifed him in the stomach and killed al-Ashraf.

When they came back to Mohammed, Mohammed was delighted at the death of the enemy of Allah and the prophet. He had given them permission to lie because they were dealing with a kafir and the lie advanced Islam. Here we have dualism. A Muslim is told not to another Muslim, but with a kafir there is an option. The Muslim can tell the kafir the truth or he can tell him a lie if it will advance Islam. And this was repeated many times in Mohammed's life. So much so at one point he said, Jihad is deceit.

Now let's go back to the idea that Islam does not use terror. And let's take another story. This one happened in Russia in Beslan, where there was a school and the school had roughly a thousand people in it including the children and the personnel. Some Muslim Jihadists attacked the school and took it over and held everyone in it. The Jihadists took all of the children and put them in the gymnasium. They were kept there for days without food or water. Finally the Russian special forces decided that they needed to go in. There was chaos, and as the children jumped out the windows and ran for safety, the Jihadists shot them in the back.

The attack continued. Once it became clear that they were going to lose the building the Jihadists fell back on their original plan. They had brought explosives and placed them in such a way that when they detonated them, the roof fell in on the children. This was the way that most of the children were killed. This was a terrible attack, but what happened after the attack was this.

Muslim scholars and Muslim imams all said the same thing, "that was not Islam. In Islam we are forbidden to kill women and children." And that is true, there are Hadith which state that women and children are not to be killed. However, there are other Hadiths in which they're getting ready to attack a tribe and the reason they're attacking is these people are kafirs, they had done nothing wrong. They decided to attack at night and they asked Mohammed what if they made a mistake in the dark and wound up killing women and children and Mohammed said, "they are from them."

Well now we have a contradiction. We have Mohammed saying-- do not kill women and children and we have Mohammed saying kill them, they are from them. This is dualism. We have contradictory facts, but both of them are true. The Jihadists can choose whichever they want and what did the

Jihadists in Beslan do, they chose to kill the children. Why? They are from them. That is, they are kafirs.

In Mohammed's time, in which he developed the ethics of Jihad, he always had the kafirs confused. The Arabs, just like everyone else, had rules for warfare. Since Mohammed was an Arab they kept expecting him to follow the rules, but Mohammed did not follow the rules. He made them up as he went.

So far as terror not being Islamic, Mohammed said in one of the most famous Hadiths, "I have been given five things that have never been given to anyone before me." One of these things that he was given was is that Allah allowed him to spread Islam by awe and terror.

Jihad is terror. So when Muslim scholars say terror is not the way of Islam, they are practicing deceit. Indeed the practice of deceit even has a special name in Arabic, taqqyia. It means sacred deception. To even have the concept of sacred deceit is an amazing ethical thought.

Here's another example of deceit in Jihad. In modern times we have grown used to the fact that a Muslim Jihadist can strap on dynamite and walk into a room filled with people, kafirs, and kill himself and everyone else. Muslim clerics say that is not Islam because suicide is forbidden in Islam. And this is true. Suicide is forbidden in Islam. But there is a very famous Hadith in which Mohammed said that killing yourself while trying to kill kafirs sends you straight to heaven, therefore the ethical expectation of the person who kills himself in the face of killing others is that he will go straight to heaven. He is a martyr.

In the very term martyr in Islam, we see the distance between the West and Islam, because the word martyr in Islam means someone who dies while killing kafirs, whereas in our language the martyr is the one who is killed because of what he believes.

Here's another example of the ethical divide. Currently in America there is debate over whether water boarding is torture. Indeed what constitutes torture is being talked about in the media. There is however, no debate inside the Islamic world about torturing kafirs, and the reason is Mohammed tortured kafirs. There's a famous story when he attacked a tribe of Jews. After the Jews had surrendered they took the leader of the Jews and staked him out on the ground at Mohammed's orders. The reason they did this was they knew that the Jews had a buried treasure. Mohammed had a small fire built on the old man's chest but he would not speak. He would not give up the

secret of the treasure so finally Mohammed said cut him loose and he took him over to a Jihadist who had lost a brother in the attack on the Jews. And he gave the brother the pleasure of killing the leader of the Jews. So as a consequence, inside of Islam there are no questions about whether torture can be used against kafirs. It is Sunna. It is the way of Mohammed to torture the kafir.

Islamic ethics are clearly laid out in the Hadith. Here are some statements about Islamic ethics found in various traditions. A Muslim is to never cheat another Muslim in business. A Muslim does not lie to another Muslim. A Muslim does not kill another Muslim. A Muslim does not bother another Muslim's wife. These statements are very dualistic because this behavior is only reserved for other Muslims. A Muslim is a brother to other Muslims. Anyone who knows Muslims says "wait a minute, I know a lot of Muslims and they don't lie to me and they don't cheat me in business. They don't come to work with dynamite and kill themselves and other people." This is duality. The kafir has two ways of being treated. He can be treated just as a human being. The Golden Rule can even be applied to him if it will advance Islam, but the truth does not need to be told. The truth can be shaded. The most common form of this deceit is for Muslims to only discuss the Koran of Mecca. Only talking about the Koran of Mecca is telling a half-truth, not telling the whole truth.

In our courts, we swear to tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Nothing but the truth prohibits direct lies. But it's equally important to tell the whole truth because telling half a truth is just another form of a lie. So when a Muslim will discuss with a kafir the Koran of Mecca, the good Koran, this is a form of deceit. All Muslims obey an ethical code which is quite different from our ethical code.

Islamic ethics support how Muslims treat women. For instance, women can be beaten. Women are set apart in their own separate code. There is an ethical system for slavery. Mohammed was the perfect slave master. His Sunna laid out all the ways that slaves are to be treated. There is an ethical system for the treatment of the dhimmi, that strange political creature who is not quite a slave, but certainly not a citizen.

So Islamic ethics lie behind everything that a Muslim does, but it does bring up political questions. If a Muslim does not have to tell the kafir the truth, why would we use Muslim translators for Arabic documents inside of the FBI and the CIA? Muslim translators take an oath, but Islam has a very unique interpretation of oaths, that is, an oath can always be changed by a

Muslim for something better, and there is a Hadith which explicitly states this. But the Hadith does not really say what is better. That is the choice of the Muslim. So if we have a Muslim policeman or a military man who takes an oath to serve and protect, he can change it anytime he wishes. And for that matter, this same changing of oaths is applied to treaties, political treaties. If the Muslim nation signs a treaty with a kafir it can be abrogated at any time as long as Islam comes out on top.

To deal with Islam, it is critical that we understand its ethics. We assume that they're the same as ours but this assumption is based upon ignorance because Islamic ethics are very different from ours. Ours are based on the unitary law of treating all people the same. Islamic ethics are based upon the idea of kafirs and believers and having a separate set of ethics for each one. One cannot understand Islam without understanding its ethical duality.

The Koran

Our next lesson is on the Koran. The Koran must surely be the world's most famous book that has not been read. How many people do you know who can say "I have read the Koran and understood it"? It turns out that there are two Korans. Once you understand how they differ, you will understand Islamic duality and why Islam always has two stories about any subject.

The word Koran is an Arabic one and it means recitation. According to Islam, the Koran is perfect, complete, universal and final. It contains not the slightest error since it comes directly from Allah, the only God of the universe. It is in his exact words. The Koran was created before the universe was created and it sets on an emerald table at the right hand of Allah.

The Koran we have today was created or brought together by the 3rd caliph Uthman. It is said that Muslims were beginning to say that there were many versions of the Koran and there would soon be error. So Uthman, as absolute ruler, called in all of the Korans and turned them over to a secretary. It was the secretary's job to compile the new Koran. After it was put together Uthman did something that was very telling. He burned all the original source material.

Now ask yourself a question. Why did he burn the original source material if the reason that they had put together a new Koran was that there were variations?

As a result of the burning of all the source Korans, Muslims like to boast today that their Koran has no variations, that it was delivered in this exact

form from Allah and the lack of variations shows its perfection. And then they point to variations in Biblical texts as proof of corruption of the texts.

Since Islam means submission, this argument that the Koran is perfect and the New Testament and Old Testament are corrupt and contain variations is another assertion that demands submission from the Christian and the Jew.

The Koran contains 114 Suras or chapters. If you pick up a Koran and thumb through it, you will notice very quickly that the long chapters are in the beginning and the short chapters are all at the end. That is the way that the Koran is arranged and this leads to one of the major difficulties in understanding it. Imagine if you took a mystery novel and cut off the spine and then you rearranged the chapters - you put the longest chapter up front and the shortest chapter at the back, then you took and rebounded this book and handed it to a friend and told him, "this is a great mystery novel, read this." Your friend would try to read it and say, "I can't understand this, when I turn the page I seem to go back in time or sometimes forward in time. I don't understand, there's no story to this. There's no plot." And that is the way the Koran is arranged. Now if you take the Koran and put it in the right time order, then it is a much more logical book.

Another thing about the Koran that's confusing is that the stories in many cases are not complete. Every story has a beginning, a middle and an end, but most of the stories in the Koran many times are like you walked in halfway through the story. You don't know what the beginning is. This is odd since the Koran has obviously derived many of its stories from the Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament and they are wonderfully told, but not so with the Koran. There is not one really complete story in all of the Koran. There's always something missing.

Another thing that's interesting about the Koran is how repetitious it is. This becomes very tiring when you're trying to read it. As an example, the story of Moses and the Pharaoh is repeated in some fashion 39 times. The repetition is so intense in the Koran that if you remove all of the repetition, it is cut in half and that does not leave a very big book, since the Koran is about the same size as the New Testament.

There's another thing that's a little odd about the stories. They fall into two classifications. There is some retelling of old Arabic stories and then there are the retelling of the Jewish stories-- Adam, Noah, Moses, all of these characters appear in the Koran, but if you're familiar with the stories in the

Jewish Bible, the Torah, they're not the same. They merely have the same characters. For instance, in the Koran it is the purpose of Moses not to free the Jews as slaves, instead to get the Pharaoh to admit that Moses is the prophet of Allah. The same is true with the story of Noah. The whole story of Noah centers around making the people of the earth admit that Noah is the prophet of Allah and because they would not admit that Noah was the prophet of Allah and do everything that he said, Allah destroyed the earth. So the stories are similar to the stories in the Old Testament, but they've all been changed so that they proclaim one theme - those who do not recognize the prophets of Allah will be destroyed.

The other thing that becomes apparent when you read the Koran is how much of it is devoted to the kafir, the unbeliever. As a matter of fact, 61% of the Koran is devoted to the kafir. That only leaves less than 39% to be devoted to being a Muslims. And that 39% is filled with repetition. So, the Koran is not a very big book at all when you get down to what does it mean to be a Muslim. There is not enough information in it to practice the religion of Islam. For a work which claims to be complete, it is remarkably incomplete. Of the Five Pillars of Islam, the Koran does not give enough information on to perform it. The perfect and complete Koran does not teach how to be a Muslim. That information comes from the Hadith, the Traditions of Mohammed. Mohammed is the one who tells a Muslim how to worship, not Allah.

The other thing that strikes people who press on through and read the Koran is that it is very contradictory. It says things that are completely opposite. So much so that in the days of Mohammed some of the kafirs pointed this out to Mohammed, "you said this earlier, now you're saying that, they're opposite, which is it?" The Koran says Allah can replace a verse with one which is better. Let's dwell on this a moment. Replace it with a verse which is better means that the better one comes later. To deal with contradiction, you need to know which verse was written earlier or later. This time order is known to scholars. Although the Koran you buy in the bookstore has it arranged from longest chapter to shortest chapter, since the beginning Muslims have known which the right order is in terms of time. This cancellation of one verse by another is called abrogation. But abrogation does not cancel or negate the verse because if the earlier verse was by Allah then that verse is true because, Allah by definition, cannot tell a lie. So this leaves the Koran a very peculiar book. It is contradictory but both sides of the contradiction are true.

This turns out to be an insight into the mind of Islam because it means that Muslims can hold in their mind two contradictory ideas and accept both of them as true. This explains how Muslims after September 11th were able to say Islam is a peaceful religion. A peaceful religion doesn't send out Jihadists to kill 3,000 people. That is a contradiction. But if you are a Muslim you have been trained to accept contradictory facts and so as a result these contradictions do not bother you at all, they don't cause you any mental problem. The Koran is a dualistic document. This dualism runs very deep into the Koran. If you arrange it in the right time order, the Koran written in Mecca is a radically different Koran than the one written in Medina. They are so different that you could take a class of college students and in one hour's time teach them how to pick out a verse taken at random and tell you whether it was written in Mecca or Medina. The two Korans are that different.

The earlier Koran is more religious. There are 147 different references to hell. Now there are more than 147 verses about hell, but taking it topic-by-topic, there are 147 of them. 94% of these say that the reason that the kafir is burning in hell is because he did not believe that Mohammed was the prophet of Allah. The remainder are people in hell for morals charges - that is, theft, greed, hate. What does that tell us about Islamic hell? It's a political prison for the intellectual dissenters who do not believe that Mohammed is the prophet of Allah and indeed the great majority of the Meccan Koran is devoted to that theme. Indeed the entire Meccan Koran can be summarized in one sentence. Mohammed is the prophet of Allah and if you don't believe it you're going to suffer.

Now the Koran written in Medina continues with the same hatred of the kafir but it manifests in a totally different way. There's not much mention of hell in Medina because a new form of suffering for the kafir is introduced. In Mecca the kafir suffers after he dies. In Medina he suffers in this life. He can be tortured, beheaded, robbed and worse. The Medinan Koran has the same kafir hatred but this time there is jihad, where the kafir suffers and dies in this life. So the Medinan Koran is very political.

The Medinan Koran introduces Mohammed's greatest innovation and that is jihad. It also introduces dhimmitude, the political subservience of the Christian and the Jew. Now as sure as someone brings up the violence in the Koran, someone is going to say "oh, well the Koran is no different than the Old Testament, the Old Testament has a lot of violence in it as well." Yes, there is violence in the Old Testament but it's enormously different from the

violence in the Koran. The violence in the Old Testament is local and temporary, it is against a neighboring tribe and for a certain period of time. This is not true of the violence in the Koran. The violence in the Koran is universal and eternal. The jihad is to go on until the last kafir leaves the face of the earth. There's a great deal of difference between temporary and local violence and a universal eternal violence.

Although jihad is called Holy War, it is really better described as simply political war. Why? Because the only reason in the Koran that people are attacked and killed is they do not agree that Mohammed is the prophet of Allah. That's an intellectual idea and so jihad is political war against the kafir.

The Koran is an Arabic document. More than once it refers to its Arabic nature. That's very clear. Since the Koran was written before the creation and in the Arabic language, that implies that Allah is an Arab. This is a very important part of the Arabic hegemony, that is, the Arab culture must dominate all other world cultures.

When you bring up something negative about the Koran, a Muslim quickly responds, "Oh, but did you read it in the Arabic?" And then he will say, "Well you can't really understand the Koran unless you read it in Arabic." Now let's stop and think about this statement for a moment. The Koran claims to be universal. That is, it applies to all people. But since only a small portion of the world reads Arabic that means these ideas must be understandable in the languages other than Arabic or they would not be universal. So which is it? Can the ideas be understood in any other language or not, because if the ideas in the Koran cannot be understood in other languages, then the Koran is not universal.

The other weakness to the, "Oh but you don't understand Arabic" is this. The great majority of Muslims today don't speak Arabic, so the Koran has been translated into their language and they're fully practicing Muslims.

Now, many Muslims recite the Koran in classical Arabic, but the classical Arabic is not the Arabic language of today. Languages change over time and a modern Arab cannot pick up a random Koran verse and read it and understand it. It's like if you study Chaucer. Chaucer wrote in the English of his day, but the English is very difficult for us to understand. It is the same with a native Arab speaker picking up the Koran and reading it. He, too, is not fully aware of what it means. He, too, has to have the classical Arabic translated into modern Arabic. The fact is that Arabic is no barrier to understanding the Koran. It's been translated into many languages.

In the end, the Koran is a document about the kafir. 61% of it is about hating the kafir and how the kafir must be subdued, therefore the Koran is primarily a political document, not a religious document.

Now what does the Koran bring to the table that is new? It brings two new ideas. Mohammed is the prophet of Allah and Jihad can be practiced against those who do not believe that is true. Everything else in the Koran is derivative. There are old Arabic stories, stories from the Old Testament that have been reworked, ideas from the Zoroastrian religion, and ideas from the local Arabic religion at the time of Mohammed. It is interesting that the Koran claims to be the work of a universal God, but the horizon of the Koran goes no further than Mohammed's eyes.

Until recently the Koran has been a document that is difficult to read. That is no longer true. The work of scholars has now produced a book called A Simple Koran and all the verses are in the right order, they've all been grouped so you eliminate most of the repetition, and Mohammed's life has been woven through the Simple Koran, so the reader can see that although the Koran claims to be a complete document, there are many, many things in the Koran that cannot be understood unless one knows the life of Mohammed. For instance, which verse comes earlier, which verse comes later? If you know Mohammed's life, it is easy to tell which one is earlier and which one is later. It is Mohammed's life that gives meaning to the Koran. The Koran does not make any sense without Mohammed's life. The Koran cannot be understood on its own. And yet, it claims to be complete.

Here's a small example. In the Koran there is a remark about the destruction of the palm trees. The verse just comes out of nowhere. If you weave Mohammed's life into the Koran then you know what it means. Mohammed was given authority to burn the palm trees, because it was only a few days earlier that he had attacked the Jews. They had a date palm plantation which he burned, contrary to the rules of war. The Arabs condemned him for violating the rules of war. Hence, the Koran declares that it was good to burn the palm trees.

This is an example of how Mohammed's life gives meaning to the Koran and indeed when Mohammed's life is woven into the Koran, the Koran becomes an epic story. It depicts Mohammed's rise to power from being an orphan and a businessman to the supreme ruler of all of Arabia with a goal of becoming the supreme ruler of all of the world. So the Koran is a great epic story. You should read it and understand it.

The Koran has been made to seem complicated. It is actually a simple text that contains only two new ideas-Mohammed is the final prophet and jihad may be used to harm kafirs. The main idea in the Koran is the division of humanity into believer and kafir and the triumph of Islam over all kafirs.

Sharia

Islam is a political system, a culture and a religion. The political system has a legal code call Sharia law.

When most people think about Islam and danger to our civilization, they think of Jihad. But there is something that is far more dangerous than Jihad-- Sharia law, Islamic law, but Sharia is not law in the sense that we think of it.

Sharia not only covers the normal legal things that you might think of - contracts, wills, criminal law, how people are to be punished, but it also includes rules on how to run a family, have sex, worship, pray, say hello and other ideas that we would call religious and cultural. This is because Sharia law is based upon the Koran and the Sunnah. The Sunna is found in the Sira (Mohammed's biography) and the Hadith (his Traditions). Sharia law is a compilation of the directives found in the Sunna and the Koran.

Sharia law is an attempt to form all societies to a society that duplicates Arabia in the days of Mohammed. Sharia law can be seen as a "paper Mohammed" devoted to forcing every person to be like an Arab of Medina in 632 AD. Therefore, it goes into all the details of human life that Mohammed dictated and includes the regulation of sex, food, worship, travel and all legal details. Since Mohammed set rules for the smallest detail of life, so does Sharia.

Why is Sharia more dangerous than Jihad?

What most people mean by jihad is the jihad of the sword, violence. We can use police and military to protect ourselves against violence, but there is a soft Jihad that comes from money, the pen and the tongue. The soft jihad is devoted to us allowing Sharia law to function in our society. Muslims want Sharia law because only under Sharia law is can Muslims practice pure Islam.

Sharia dictates the form of government and its laws. Real Islam cannot be practiced in America today because we have a Constitution. But our Constitution is ignorant, man-made, garbage according to Sharia law. The work that Jefferson, Adams, Benjamin Franklin and all of the other founding fathers is an offense to Islam. The Declaration of Independence and the

Constitution are pure ignorance because they violate Sharia law and Islam. Why?

Because Benjamin Franklin and all the other people who put together our Constitution had no knowledge of any sort of all. How could they? Because according to Islam and Sharia law the only real knowledge comes from the Koran and the Sunnah. There's no actual knowledge outside of those three books - Koran, Sira, Hadith. And therefore only laws that are based upon Koran, Sira and Hadith can be true or real because man made laws, our Constitution, all of our legal theory - they're nothing. They're all a part of Jahiliya - ignorance.

Our legal system is based upon two principles-the Golden Rule and critical thought. The Golden Rule is a unitary ethical system-all people are to be treated the same. When we say do unto others, as you would have them do unto you, we mean ALL others, without regard to sex, race, or age. It is unitary because there is one rule, one basis of ethics.

Islam is based instead on dualistic ethics-there is one set of rules for Muslims and another set of rules for kafirs. In the same way there is one set of laws for men and another set of laws for women.

Islam is not based upon critical thought, but authoritative thought. Truth is found by looking it up in the only authoritative texts-Koran, Sira and Hadith. This means that Sharia cannot change, since the foundational texts cannot change. Sharia does not adapt, Muslims adapt and therefore, we must adapt to Sharia.

The other basis of Islamic thought, ethics and legal code is submission-all kafirs and their institutions must submit to Islamic law. We used to have submissive laws in this country, since slavery is based upon one race submitting to another. But that violates the unitary ethics of the Golden Rule and so we ended slavery.

Islam sneers at our Constitution because it violates all of Sharia law. Therefore as Islam comes to America, Sharia law must be triumphant.

Enough about theory, let's take some of our freedoms and see how they violate Islamic law. Pretend that you just woke up this morning and it is a Sharia world. What is changed?

If you said that Mohammed made his living by taking other people's money, you would go to jail. There is no freedom of speech in Islam. To contradict Islam violates Sharia law. This is because Mohammed would not

tolerate being told he was wrong. When he conquered Mecca, after he prayed, he issued death warrants against those intellectuals and artists who had disagreed with him. Since Sharia is a paper Mohammed, it dictates death to those who disagree with Mohammed.

Freedom of the press is like freedom of speech. Sharia law must control the media and all artistic expression. We saw this in the Danish Mohammed cartoons. The cartoons made fun of Islamic violence. When Muslims saw them, they turned violent and burned cities and killed people. The violence induced fear and all of the kafir newspapers submitted to Islam and dropped their freedom of the press. Sharia law prevailed over our constitution.

Sharia law forbids any and all artistic expression that is offensive to Islam. This means that movies, TV, the net and all art must conform to Islam in a Sharia world.

Equality of the sexes is part of our laws, but Sharia is very clear that women and men are treated differently under the law. since more than 95% of the references to women in the KSH; the woman is subjugated to the man. Under Sharia, women must submit to men.

4:34 Allah has made men superior to women because men spend their wealth to support them. Therefore, virtuous women are obedient, and they are to guard their unseen parts as Allah has guarded them. As for rebellious women, admonish them first, and then send them to a separate bed, and then beat them.

So the Koran says that women can be beaten. Mohammed struck his wife, and said that no one should ever ask a man why he beats his wife. So Sharia lays out exactly how a wife is beaten. What precedes the beating, where and how she is to be struck.

The submission of women does not stop with the beating, in Sharia law women's testimony in court is half that of a man's testimony. Women receive half as much as a man in an inheritance. Men have full right of divorce, but not women. The Sharia goes on and on about how to subjugate women.

Women are completely subjugated inside of Sharia law. Why should we tolerate the Sharia's subjugation of women?

In America, all categories of people can carry weapons, but under Sharia law, kafirs are forbidden to carry weapons; only Muslims may be armed. This illustrates both dualism and subjugation. Dualism separates kafir from Muslim. Submission means that the kafir must be in a weaker position.

Under Sharia law an apostate, one who leaves Islam, can be killed. Apostasy is the worst crime in Sharia. So much for freedom of religion. Under Sharia law, no one can proselytize Muslims, but Muslims can proselytize everybody. The principle of submission is very clear here.

In every case there is dualism and subjugation. Dualism because there are always two sets of laws and subjugation because the separated class, kafir, women, apostates must submit to Islam.

Our freedoms will have to go because they are offensive to Allah. Mohammed never allowed Freedom of thought; freedom of speech, freedom of religion or freedom of the press and Sharia does not allow those freedoms.

Our Constitution, the Declaration of Independence and bill of rights are the result of critical thinking based upon the Golden Rule, which is foreign to Sharia law. Sharia law is based upon one principle authority-the Trilogy of the Koran, the Sira and Hadith. The only true form of government and laws is Sharia. All of our civilization is jahiliya, ignorance.

Now the way it starts is this. Muslims say: our Sharia is so precious to us; our laws are so beautiful to us that we want to be governed by our laws. Now we, of course, are here today to follow your laws. But in matters of family, because family in Islam is a very special, the laws of Allah can only rule our families. So let us use our religion and govern our own families in matters such as wills, estates, divorce, domestic abuse, adoption - all of these things which are nothing to you how we run our community because we are separate from you. We want our own special laws to govern the special people, the best of people.

Now this seems innocent enough to Dhimmis, to politicians, to professors who know nothing of Islam. In the process of welcoming it, we are submitting to it, since Islam wants to do things its way. And what does it matter to us how a Muslim writes a will? Hmm, seems like a small thing, nothing to worry about. So in the light of this, in England for instance, there are many Sharia courts set up to rule over Muslims. England has entered into legal dualism and has given up sovereignty.

Sharia is the longest wedge in the world and the thin end of is in place in England, but it is also already in place in America. Sharia law is being implemented here in America.

In America in cities where Muslims congregate to create their own empires, ghettos, Sharia law is already in place.

In certain areas of America today, a Muslim woman does not call the police if she is beaten, because the Muslim community will turn against her. A Muslim husband can beat his wife by Sharia law. The Islamic community enforces Sharia in the areas it controls. This is implementation of Sharia law in America.

Factories that employ many Muslims find that they must obey Sharia law and set aside prayer rooms and give time off. Sharia law has started in America. It starts with prayer, but it does not end with prayer. In time, there will be no kafir supervisors in the company, because Sharia does not allow a Muslim to be subordinate in anyway. It will take a few centuries, but one day in our kafir civilization, when Sharia law is in force 100%, the days of a kafir boss over a Muslim will not even be a memory. This is the nature of Sharia law.

And added to the long list of Sharia horrors is the dhimmi. The Sharia lays out all of the rules for the dhimmis-how they are to be taxed, regulated, subjugated and humiliated. Of course, Sharia calls the non-Muslims, kafirs-the people that Allah and Mohammed hated.

Our symbolism of justice is a woman holding scales in her hands and she is blindfolded in order that the personalities and particulars of whoever is in the court based upon our law of the Constitution. Our justice attempts at being blind. Now we may not always succeed in that but that is the ideal. But the ideal in Islam is not that justice is blind. The first thing justice wants to know in Sharia is, is it a kafir, a dhimmi, a woman, a man, a slave because justice for all these people - man, woman, dhimmi, kafir, slave, is different. The civil penalties are different. Different fines are levied. Criminal codes are different. If a Muslim kills a kafir then he is not subject to the same penalty as if he killed a Muslim.

Now, since the entire Sharia law is built upon submission and duality that means that the entire purpose of Sharia law is subjugation. Why should we tolerate any aspect of it?

Why should we allow any part of Sharia law including Sharia finance to exist in our civilization? All of the Sharia is permeated by subjugation and duality. Every single law inside of Sharia in some way is about subjugation and duality. We should have zero tolerance for Sharia law because every element of it violates every one of our principals of how to be a human being.

We should not tolerate anything about Sharia law. Halal, food, who cares? Footbaths in the bathrooms in America to comply with Sharia law?

We don't want to implement anything about Sharia law because every single aspect of it is an affront to our whole way of being. Sharia is designed to annihilate the host culture. Why should we allow any part of a barbaric legal system to exist here?

Sharia law in every way is against everything that our civilization is based upon in terms of law and legality, how we treat a fellow human being, and the definition of justice. Sharia law destroys all of these things.

So, we must learn what Sharia law is. We must resist it at every level. We should detest Sharia law because it is inhuman. It is not a sacred law; it is oppression, duality and subjugation. We must oppose it at every turn.

Submission and Duality

Islam is based upon two principles - submission and duality. When you understand how these principles work you'll understand the political doctrine of Islam.

Islam's first principle is submission and that is declared in the very name Islam and Muslim. Islam means to submit and Muslim is one who has submitted.

Islam is a chain of submission. The ranking of authority is Allah, Mohammed, the Muslim, the kafir, the dhimmi and the slave. In this country we are beginning to see how submission works. We're not as far along as Europe, but Muslims have immigrated here and have started making their demands. The first thing they have demanded is this. All that is in the textbooks of America must conform to their way of teaching about Islam. No kafir is allowed to write in the textbooks of America something that is critical of Islam. It all has to be vetted by Islam. Our textbook system has already submitted.

But submission is not enough to explain the success of Islam. Its most powerful principle is duality. Duality is the second major principle of Islam. We see duality in how the Koran and Mohammed's life are divided. First comes Mecca, the preacher, the religion--you have your religion, I have mine. Then comes Medina. Medina is Jihad. You must submit in this life or Islam has the option of harming you. The two positions contradict each other, but both of them are equally true.

This duality explains Islam's overwhelming success. Islam has two faces that it presents to the world. The face of Mecca and the face of Medina. Medina is the violent phase, the political phase. Mecca is the nice phase.

What we have is that the Koran of Mecca is used as a shield. It's the Teflon coating. It's the public face of Islam. Mecca is what Muslims always talk about when they talk about Islam to kafirs. This duality, this subtlety is what makes Islam so powerful because you can't just jump up and condemn Islam as being totally violent. Most Muslims are not violent at all, so therefore this charge doesn't work.

Duality is when Muslims say that anything that is based upon the Koran of Medina is not the real Islam--Osama bin Laden, 9/11, al Qaeda--oh that's not the real Islam. But the duality of Islam is that two contradictory things are both true. The Muslim friend, the nice Muslim at work, they're only one-half of Islam. The real Islam actually includes the Muslim friend and Osama bin Laden. The real Islam includes the Koran of Mecca (religious) and the Koran of Medina (political).

In our courts of law if you take an oath as a witness, you swear: I will tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth. The nothing but the truth prohibits lies. But the whole truth prohibits something that's equally a lie, a half truth. The whole truth of Islam includes the half-truth of Mecca and the other half-truth of Medina.

So the religious Koran of Mecca is the Teflon coating. It's the Medina version that's always denied in public, but inside of Islam it is known that Medina outranks Mecca. This outranking of Medina over Mecca is what explains another phenomena in Islam. When something dreadful happens such as the 9/11 destruction of the World Trade Towers, the London bombings, the Mohammed cartoon riots - when that happens Muslims say, "Oh, that is not the real Islam". It is, but they do not protest, they merely deny. Why don't they protest against the Medinan Muslims, the Jihadists? Because they are outranked. The Medinan Koran that celebrates war and political power is higher and more powerful than the Meccan Koran. In the Wizard of Oz movie when they see there's a little man behind the curtain and the voice says "oh no, no, do not look at the man behind the curtain," that is the way the duality of Mecca and Medina works. Mecca says "oh no, do not look at the Medinan Koran behind the curtain: we don't. And we're fooled.

We need to see the entire truth of Islam. The whole truth, not the half-truth. That is the reason that understanding the principle of duality is an absolute necessity. If you do not understand the principle of duality you will always be fooled by the Koran of Mecca.

Let's see how duality can work in real life. There is a retired military man who is a devout Christian. He had some Muslim friends. They pointed out to him the verses in the Koran of Mecca that sounded very good to him and they said, "This is Islam." He says, "This is very good. This is like Christianity. I like this. And besides, the Muslims are such moral people, they don't drink, their women are very modest, they don't gamble. This must be the real truth of Islam." And off he goes into the market place of ideas proclaiming that Christianity and Islam are perfectly compatible. Indeed they're like brothers. Because of duality he does not understand that there is another truth, the truth of Medina. But his logic is a Western logic and it works like this. The Jihad is contrary to the peace of Islam, so the Jihad must be false because I believe in the truth of the peace of Mecca. Dualism has fooled him.

But dualism is used in all the words of Islam. They use the same words we do but they have entirely different meanings. Let's take for an example the word peace. Salaam. Now that sounds very nice, but when you understand what Islam means by peace it's not nice at all.

Peace in Islam comes only after you have submitted to Islam. The submission can be brought about by jihad. So here we have again the Koran of Mecca covers the Koran of Medina. That is, our common understanding of the word peace hides the fact that jihad can be used to achieve Islamic peace.

Here's another example of dualism--women's rights. Muslims are very quick to use the phrase women's rights and say that, Islam grants women rights. And this is true, but they are the rights to be beaten, the rights to inherit half as much, and the rights to have their testimony be worth half that of a man in court. This dualism allows a Muslim to look straight at a problem and not see the other half. After 9/11 Muslims protested, "Oh we are the religion of peace." They were able to maintain that because they're so used to having a dualistic view. They can accept the religion of peace as being absolutely true, whereas they know that jihad is one of the teachings of Islam. Dualism allows a Muslim to have a totally compartmentalized mind in which the Koran of Medina never interferes with the Koran of Mecca. But deep within the political doctrine of Islam we have duality and the kafir.

Jihad demands complete submission from the kafir and creates the kafir as a completely separate social and political class. Islam allows its women to be beaten. Submission - Duality. A separate set of rules for women. That separate category, kafirs and women, must submit.

Let's take a look at how the principles of submission and duality work with so many Islamic concepts. For instance, slavery. We've already gone over in great detail Islamic slavery and its fundamental principles. Submission and duality completely explain the whole process of slavery. Who submits more than a slave? Who is so separate and apart from us? Slaves fall under a separate moral code. So submission and duality completely explain slavery.

Dhimmi and dhimmitude. Again we have the duality of a social and political class. The dhimmi exists within an Islamic political system in which he is subjugated and not given full legal rights.

And of course the grand duality of all Islam - Mecca and Medina. Mecca must submit to Medina and the duality here is that you have two separate Korans that contradict each other, but both of them are completely true. We see submission and duality in Islam's ethics where we have one set of rules for the believer and another set for the kafir. Islamic politics are dualistic. Mohammed, of course, is the chief dualist. His entire life divided into the preacher which did not work so well, and the successful jihadist - politician. Now Islam says it worships one, and only one, God, but that God, Allah, is the God of duality and the God of submission whom everyone is to fear. The Koran says over 300 times that we are to fear Allah.

All of Islam can be explained by the principles of duality and submission. That's the beauty of knowing the two principles. Once you understand duality, once you understand submission, you really no longer have any need of the doctrine because everything that happens in Islam can be explained by those two principles.

Every political system has fundamental principles that underlie it. Our political system of democracy has the Golden Rule as a foundation. The Golden Rule underlies everything that we do in government. It is our moral and political guide. Treat others as you wish to be treated. Some may jump up and say "we don't always follow that principle, do we?" No, but we use the Golden Rule to criticize our own behavior and if we can clearly point out that something is unfair and abuses others, then the Golden Rule is the principle we use to fix that. It is our guiding principle, even if it is not something that we can always fulfill.

Islam denies the truth of the Golden Rule because the Golden Rule is the same for every person and Islam has two sets of behavior - one for the kafir and the other the believer. Islam divides humanity into Muslims and kafirs.

We need to understand that there cannot be a compromise between submission and duality, and the Golden Rule. We would like to think that everyone can coexist peacefully, but Islam does not work like that. Islam demands submission. There is simply no compromise between a system that wants to use the Golden Rule and be democratic and another system which says that everyone has to submit. When they say everyone has to submit, Islam means everyone. Let's take some political examples.

What we now call Afghanistan used to be a Buddhist nation. It was a nation of peace and wealth. Then Islam invaded. Today in Afghanistan there is not a single Buddhist to be found. Not one. The only place you can find any Buddhism in Afghanistan is if you dig into the dirt like an archaeologist and you may be able to find the remnants of Buddhism.

Islam keeps working until 100% of a civilization gives way to Islam. Today in Turkey it's 99.7% Islamic. Islam is working very hard to make sure that the other .3 of 1% disappears. Over a period of time every single Christian in Turkey will be gone. They will have immigrated or been killed in a street riot. Islam does not cease until submission is 100%. The entire time that it's making the kafir submit; it keeps proclaiming the truth of Mecca.

The principles of submission and duality contradict and deny the Golden Rule. So how can it be if they contradict that they can both coexist? We're going to have to study the laws of duality and submission. Once you understand duality you will not merely understand half a truth and then proclaim that that is the entire truth. You will understand that Islam is grinding away very slowly at our own democratic rights.

Islam has an overwhelming advantage over the kafir. Islam has a thousand year plan. Duality and submission are part of a thousand year plan. Islam's duality and submission are like gravity. It never sleeps. It's always there. Always pressuring, always pushing. Submission must occur with the kafir. If not now, tomorrow. Islam is very patient. Mohammed said in war patience is a virtue. Muslims study Mohammed. They know that submission may take time, but Islam is very patient.

In Turkey it's taken them 400 years to get to the 99.7% mark. They're not in a hurry. They can keep fooling the Europeans and say we're very democratic, but there you have another use of the word by Islam that does not mean what we mean. Democratic in Turkey includes the elimination of all of the kafirs. True democracy is not what Islam practices. True democracy would mean that the kafir has an equal say with the believer. The Koran of

Medina says that cannot happen. The kafir must submit to the Koran of Medina. So democracy in Turkey is a sham and a fraud. It is a tool used as a way of submission but in the public face of the political councils of Europe, the Koran of Mecca stands up and says we are a modern state--the veil or Teflon coating, the Koran of Mecca. Meanwhile the sword of the Koran of Medina is working. More Christians immigrate from Turkey all the time, just like they do in Iraq. In Iraq they form 3% of the population and 30% of the immigrants because they're unable to deal with submission inside of Iraq.

But in our country which is still yet free of duality and submission, we keep believing the Koran of Mecca. We are historically ignorant of the principle of duality. We only see one end of the stick. We don't see the other. We don't look at the man behind the curtain. We're fascinated by the cape and ignore the sword. The sweet words of the Koran of Mecca pour out of our media and our universities and our politicians' mouth and we think this is good, we don't have to worry, a peaceful Islam is here, a reformed Islam is here, we can relax, we can go back to sleep.

Tears of Jihad

The Tears of Jihad refers to the deaths of 270 million people over a 1400 year period. They were all killed for the same reason. They did not believe that Mohammed was the prophet of Allah.

After Mohammed died, Abu Bakr was elected caliph, Supreme Ruler of all Islam. This included both a spiritual guidance and a political guidance. So he was a combination of pope and king. Abu Bakr spent his three years in office making sure that Muslim Arabs did not leave Islam. The apostasy wars continued during his entire time in office. An apostate is one who wants to leave his religion and it is a killing offense in Islam.

Umar was the second caliph after Abu Bakr died. He picked up where Mohammed left off because Mohammed's last efforts were all directed towards attacking the Christians north of Arabia. They were kafirs. They had not submitted to Islam.

At this time, the Middle East was not remotely what we think of now. It was basically a Greek culture. What had happened was the Greeks were sailors and businessmen and so the Greek culture spread all around the rim of the Mediterranean, including Syria, and Northern Egypt. North Africa was a Greek culture. And, of course, all of Anatolia (Turkey) was Greek. It was highly sophisticated culture but it had overwhelming problems and those problems were: Age, degeneracy and decay.

The Greeks had been at war with the Persians for a long time. This continual war left both the Persians weak and the Greeks weak, so the 900 year rule of Greek culture in the Mediterranean was coming to an end. The Greeks were also very divided along religious lines. Christianity had several variations and the Greeks in Constantinople had a different kind of Christianity than was held in Jerusalem, Syria and Egypt. These divisions were strong enough to cause ill will. So this was the world that Umar invaded and conquered.

The conquest went so fast that Umar was not really left able to govern what he had, but he now had enormous wealth because Syria fell, Persia fell, Iraq, Egypt and North Africa. In thirty years' time all of the Greek culture except that that was in Anatolia was destroyed. An entire new world order came about.

At first the Christians were left pretty much to govern themselves and only send taxes to Medina. After the consolidation of the empire under Uthman, things began to change. Islam was no longer conquering more territory, Instead it was consolidating. The age of the dhimmi had arrived. Being a dhimmi involved paying heavy taxes, but it also began to involve being a second class citizen in your own home country. In Egypt, for instance, the Coptic culture was especially despised. Now the Copts, the descendants of the Egypt of the Pharaohs, had become Christians. The Coptic language was thousands of years old. If as a Christian you spoke the Coptic language in front of your new Arab masters, your tongue was cut out. That was the life of the dhimmi.

North Africa became Islamic. 600 years of Christianity disappeared. The culture of the Greeks, the Romans, the Europeans, was annihilated. Then the pressure started up against Greek Anatolia.

The Arab Muslims despised the Christians with a special fervor. You may say 'But in the Koran it speaks well of the Christian.' Religiously that may be true but that was written when Mohammed was in Arabia.

Now then everywhere the Muslims looked, they saw Christians who were wealthy, educated and very sophisticated. The Arabs were none of these things. They just wanted to crush the Christian kafirs. The 900 year old world of the Middle East completely changed. And notice something, it has not changed in the last 1400 years except to become even more Islamic.

The Christians had no idea what hit them. They never called the invaders Muslims, instead they called them Arabs or Saracens. Here are some of the words they left behind.

The sword of the Saracen, beastly and demonic savages. Evil God-hating Saracens destroyed crops, burned cities and drove the survivors before them.

This was the world that was created by Islam and would later cry out to the Christians in Europe "Help us!" Indeed the treatment of the Christians was a little better than slaves.

After the Middle East was conquered, Arabia looked towards Constantinople in Anatolia. This became a long term goal which took a few hundred years to accomplish. Their first step was to kill Armenians. In one town they brought together all of the Armenian leaders, took them down to the church and burned the church and it fell in on top of them.

In another town in Anatolia, when you came to pay your dhimmi tax, you got a special brand from a hot iron on your arm. If you were found and you did not have a brand, the first thing they did was to cut off the arm that should have held the brand. It didn't hurt very long because the next thing they did was to cut off your head.

There was one Greek Bishop who offered to debate the Muslims with regards to Islam and Christianity. The Muslims listened to his debate for two hours then they cut off his head.

Another Bishop invited them to a debate so they too, debated for the afternoon. When the debate was over the Muslims took the bishop, cut out his tongue, hauled him out to the desert and left him to die.

Needless to say acts like this began to teach the Christians what their place was in this new order. It was a place of the dhimmi, a semi-slave. They could still have their church buildings, those that were left. Christianity could not be seen or spoken of beyond the church or the home. For a Christian to try to convert a Muslim was a death sentence.

Christians were actually forbidden to read the Koran. This element is important because it helps to ensure an ignorance of the Christian by his Islamic rulers. This has had a 1,400 year effect. Christians or other kafirs still do not study either the history or the doctrine of Islam. To not study the history or doctrine of Islam makes anyone including a Christian, a dhimmi.

Dhimmitude starts with ignorance. The cure for dhimmitude is knowledge. Once a dhimmi becomes aware of the doctrine of persecution

and the history of persecution, the dhimmi's eyes are opened and the dhimmi becomes a kafir.

The destruction in Anatolia took several hundred years. We have one accounting from a Muslim historian who gladly reports the figure of the destruction of 30,000 church buildings. Now some of the better church buildings had a special fate reserved for them. Those sites became mosques. When it conquers, Islam has built its mosques on top of where the best church building or temple was. It is ever thus because this is the way of Mohammed or Sunna.

Destroying religious art is also the way of Mohammed. As soon as Islam conquered any town, the churches were desecrated. The Christians could move back into them later if Islam decided to let them stand. Art, in particular religious art, is an affront to Islam. Mohammed's first act on returning to Mecca, after he prayed, was to destroy all the religious art. We see this in Egypt for instance where the nose of the Sphinx has been knocked off. We see this along the silk route where all of the Buddhist murals in caves have had the eyes pecked out and the mouth taken out. It was Islam who invented the word deface.

There was an interesting side effect for those who had already been conquered as the conquest ebbed and flowed in Constantinople. If the Arabs lost a battle in Constantinople, back in Egypt, for example, there would be riots of anger that the Christians had beat the Muslims and the Christians would be killed.

This persecution was what set the stage for the Christians in the Middle East to cry out to their brothers in Europe, please help us, and the response of the Europeans in crusade was to try to help them. So the history of the crusades is one of the few times where Christians tried to help other Christians in the Middle East. The crusades should be a point of pride and should be studied to see what can be done to help Christians against Islam.

In the East, jihad was not just against the Christians, it was against everyone. The Persian Empire at this time had already been crushed. Zoroastrianism, the religion of the Persians was annihilated. It was annihilated to such a degree today historians are not really sure of the true nature of the Zoroastrian religion because so many of their sacred texts, were destroyed.

Islam moved towards Hindustan. Due to jihad, what we think of as India today is about half of its original territory. But on the way to Hindustan, Islam stopped off in Afghanistan and destroyed the Buddhism that was there.

They then turned to the Hindus. The attack against the Hindus was similar to the ones against the Christians, Buddhists and Persians. When Islam started attacking the Persians, there was a parlay, a conference before the battle and the Persian general asked "who are you and why are you here?" because the Persians had never really fought the Arabs. And here, in a hadith, is what Islam told him. "Our prophet, the messenger of our Lord has ordered us to fight you until you worship Allah alone or pay the jizyah, the dhimmi tax, and our prophet has informed us that our Lord says whoever amongst us is killed shall go to paradise and lead a life of great luxury. Whoever amongst us remain alive will become your master." This is the perfect statement of Jihad.

Now here is a statement by one of the conquering Muslim generals of India, Tamerlane. "My principle aim in coming to Hindustan has been to accomplish two aims. The first is to war with the kafirs, the enemies of Mohammed, and by this holy war, be able to claim a reward in paradise. The other was that the army of Islam may gain by plundering the wealth of the kafirs. Plunder in war is as lawful as a mother's milk to a Muslim."

You can see that the reason for invading Hindustan was exactly the same reason as invading Persia and it was the same reason for invading Anatolia and the Middle East. It's important to realize this because many times people think that when the Muslims invaded maybe the people there got what was coming to them in some way. No, the only way you had to be, the only fault you had to have was to be a kafir and the Hindus were kafirs.

Just as the culture of the Middle East was crushed, the culture of the Hindu was crushed. You need to know that the Hindu that we see of today is not the Hindu as of before Islam. Islam changed the Hindu. Before Islam the Hindus had been a proud culture. They were a leader in intellectual theory, mathematics and philosophy. And they were very wealthy.

Hindustan had been an Empire for a thousand years and it had been relatively peaceful. In times of peace you accumulate a great treasure. That was one of the things that happened in Afghanistan with the Buddhists. They were very prosperous because they had given up war. It turns out that the Buddhist show what happens when you deal with Islam on the basis of we are peaceful people, we will do whatever you want. What happened to the

peaceful Buddhist was that the pacifists were annihilated. Witness the fact that half of the Hindu culture still remains behind because it had a warrior caste. None of the Buddhist culture remains in Afghanistan.

Here is a typical story. 20,000 Jihadists and thousands of mercenaries laid siege to a city in Hindustan. A traitor in the city for money gave them a clue as to how they could place ladders up against one particular portion of the wall and penetrate the city. The Muslims poured into the city. For three days they did nothing but kill. They didn't even rob the bodies. It's very interesting. The General gave the job of killing the Hindus to only his most religious men and after three days they stopped the killing and then began to rob the bodies. While the killing was going on, the women, children, were raped, because rape always accompanies Jihad.

In the end the Hindus were crushed. Half their territory was gone. They were sold into slavery. There are some remnants of this in the geography books. There is in Afghanistan a mountain range called the Hindu Kush. Hindu Kush means the 'funeral pyre of the Hindu'.

What we now call Pakistan was an original part of India. Of course the petition of Pakistan so that it would become purely Islamic and this happened under the British. It led to the destruction of about a million Hindus in the partition that led to the creation of the state of Pakistan.

It was Gandhi, the secular saint, whose pacifism and dhimmitude led to the deaths of the million Hindus. It was Gandhi who said that although all of the Hindus had to leave Pakistan, none of the Muslims in India had to leave. Today, those Muslims are devouring India from the inside. Gandhi was the great betrayer of Hindu culture.

Both Gandhi and the Buddhists of Afghanistan show how pacifism leads to total annihilation in the shortest time.

At the other end of India in Bangladesh the Islamization goes on today. In 1947 Bangladesh was still about a third Hindu. Today it is about 10% Hindu. And that reduction of the Hindu has come at a terrible cost. Women and men who are left in Bangladesh are persecuted on a daily basis, dreadfully, and the police turn a blind eye when some Muslim throws acid in a Hindu woman's face. Why does he throw the acid? Her face isn't veiled. The police will not investigate because the police are Muslim.

We do not have time in this brief accounting to tell the terrible story of the conversion of Anatolia to Turkey. Nor do we have time to tell the terrible

persecution of the Orthodox Christians in Eastern Europe. Their persecution was dreadful but they fought on and on to their credit.

The first September 11th was in 1683 when the Europeans drove the Muslims from the gates of Vienna. Of course some years later we would have another September 11th. Now what is important about that is this. Islam never forgot that on September 11th they had been turned back from the gates of Vienna and the proud Turkish Army defeated. They never forgot.

Here's what's important. On September 11th in America we had no idea why that date was chosen. We were clueless and in that we see the nature of Islam and the kafir. The kafir never remembers the history that went with the expansion of Islam. Islam never forgets.

Since 9/11 nearly 58,000 people around the world died in 9,000 attacks. 87,000 have been injured in 39 countries. All of this suffering goes on around the world and you never hear about it because our press does not want to report the terror of what is happening politically around the world with Islam.

But we can't blame our press because none of our schools teach this history, not even the Christian schools teach the dreadful history of the destruction of 60 million Christians. No schools teach the deaths of 10 million Buddhists, 80 million Hindus and 120 million Africans.

And since we don't know the history we are doomed to repeat it. Islam continues to kill the kafir and the kafir just says "oh well, we'll take care of that problem by pretending it is not there. And the reason we won't turn our attention to it is complicated but part of it has to do with the shame of the history because the kafir has been defeated time and again by Islam. We absolutely refuse to admit that this is a culture that is devoted to the annihilation of kafir culture. Because now when you go to Iraq, you don't find a Christian Iraq. When you go to Egypt, you don't find a Christian Egypt. It is Islamic.

There's only one way to stop this. The history of the Tears of Jihad must be taught in kafir schools. How can it be that the history of the expansion of the empire of Islam is treated as a glorious history and the history of suffering, the suffering of the dhimmi and the death of 270 million, is never reported? Until this changes, we're doomed to continual annihilation both here in America and abroad.

Conclusion

All politics must submit to Islam. It is the purpose of Islam to replace the U.S. Constitution with Islamic law called *shariah*.

We are now ready for our final lesson.

In the introduction, we spoke about the problem of the good Muslim and said that we would deal with it after we had learned something about Islam.

But, before we tackle the good Muslim, let's talk about "*what is a Muslim?*" From these talks, you know that every Muslim can act in two different ways. The first is based upon the Meccan Koran and Meccan Sunna. The second way is the Medinan Koran and Medinan Sunna. But a Muslim also has a third way of acting.

Kafir civilization is very strong in many ways. Nearly everything you can pick up and hold in your hand comes from kafir civilization. Nearly all products are based upon patents and copyrights. The Islamic world does not produce any significant work in the world of ideas. All democratic politics and most media and culture are based upon kafir thought. The modern world is kafir and Islam exists inside of that. So every Muslim is also part kafir. It is almost impossible for a Muslim not to be part kafir.

Every Muslim is part Meccan-Muslim, part Medinan-Muslim and part kafir-Muslim. So what any Muslim does is based upon which type of Muslim he is. A Muslim is a person who makes personal decisions, so it is never possible to predict what a person who calls himself a Muslim will do or say.

If you have a Muslim friend or an associate at work and he is a nice person you must have more than once said this doctrine can't be right because the person I know at work is such a nice person and all of this doctrine of Islam sounds so dreadful. Well, let's stop and ask what you mean by "a good Muslim." Is he a good Muslim or is he a good person? Those are separate questions because quite frankly until you know the doctrine of Islam and until you know the history of Islam, you really can't make any judgments as to whether or not the person at work or your friend is a good Muslim or not. Being a good Muslim does not depend upon anything about the kafir and the kafir's judgments. No. Whether a person is a good Muslim or not depends upon the doctrine of Islam. It is the doctrine of Islam that makes a Muslim. We must compare the Muslim with the doctrine, not the Muslim with what we think as good.

For example, Osama bin Laden is a good Muslim. He strictly follows the Koran of Medina, the greater Koran, the one that was written later, the one

that Allah said abrogates the earlier. What you may mean when you say he's a good Muslim is that he is simply a good person. Let's consider this.

Even in Mohammed's day, there are many references to the fact that Muslims did not want to engage in Jihad. Those Muslims were called hypocrites. Perhaps your friend who is such a good person is not really a "good" Muslim. And there's another thing about the good Muslim - you say he is your friend. How does his friendship stack up against the fourteen verses in the Koran which clearly and explicitly state that the kafir is never the friend of the Muslim?

What you probably have in your friend is a good person. A good Muslim follows the doctrine of Islam and following the doctrine of Islam means seeing you as a kafir. Your friend is a human being before he is a Muslim and the Golden Rule exerts a powerful force upon everyone, including those who profess the Islamic faith. Perhaps what you have in your friend is merely someone who is naturally following the Golden Rule and is therefore a good person. But notice as long as he is actually really your friend then he is not a good Muslim. Contradictory, isn't it? And not only is it contradictory, it's very sad.

Most Muslims are part Meccan Muslim, part Medinan Muslim and part kafir Muslim, just like your friend.

In the introductory talks, you were told that the Five Principles of Political Islam could be used as a tool to understand Islam. Let's review the Five Principles and then see how to use them to analyze Islam by asking the right questions.

The first principle is that every word and action by Islam is based on the Koran, Sira and Hadith. In short, it is all based on Mohammed.

So in analyzing anything Islamic, ask the question: What did Mohammed do or say that relates to this? Is this Meccan or Medinan Islam?

The second principle is that if it deals with kafirs, it is political, not religious. The question is: how are kafirs involved? How is the religious "Teflon shield" being used?

The third principle is that all non-Muslims are kafirs.

The question is: how is this based on the division between Islam and kafirs? Kafirs are always wrong and Muslims are always right. Ask questions like: how is it all the kafir's fault. How is the problem not Islam's fault?

The fourth principle is: dualism means that Islam can treat you two different ways.

The question is: How is dualism working here? What are the two opposing choices available here? What is the other side of the contradiction that is not being talked about?

The fifth principle is that the kafir must submit to Islam in politics and public matters. The question is: what is the pressure to yield to Islamic values and dictates?

Really, all of the five principles can be summarized in two sentences. Everything that Islam does to kafirs is political and is based upon the Trilogy, the Koran and Mohammed. The treatment of kafirs is dualistic and kafirs must submit to political Islam.

Or the five principles can be reduced to five words: Trilogy, politics, kafir, duality, submission.

Let's apply these principles by looking at an old problem -the so called Israel-Palestinian problem.

First, there is a massive amount of the Trilogy about the Jews. Do you ever hear any news report that quotes either Mohammed or the Koran?

Is the interaction between the Palestinians and Israelis political or religious?

The Jews of Israel are kafirs. The kafirs are always wrong and the Muslims are always right. In any of the reporting of the conflict, do you ever read any self-examination by the Palestinians?

Duality: What is the whole truth? What are the two different ways that Islam has in dealing with Jews?

Submission: How are the '*kafir* Israelis' being asked to yield or submit to Islam? What are the demands on kafirs? How is it that Islam will not change?

In order to understand the five principles, you have to know Mohammed. If you know Mohammed, then you know Islam; if you do not know Mohammed, you do not know Islam. The five principles will allow you to persuade and debate about Islam based upon its own doctrine and history.

We must have a clear and analytic study of Islam. What we want to do is to respect this ideology by giving it a cold, hard, analytic look. We need to understand that the religion is of no concern to the kafir. The religion is simply for those who want to go to Islamic heaven or avoid Islamic hell. We

must take an analytic look at Islam and see its political nature and its political history.

Political Islam will continue to have its way if we don't learn about it. What is its way? It is clearly politically expansive. Our Constitution must fall according to the Doctrine of Islam. Now you laugh and say 'well, that's impossible, I mean we're so strong, nothing could affect our Constitution'. But the power of Islam grows daily in this country, and it feeds upon ignorance. The Koran of Mecca is used as the Teflon shield as more and more politics in Washington, D.C. are affected by the religion of peace. Ignorant people, diplomats, congressmen, senators don't know any better. We must demand that they educate themselves. We must demand that our leadership change and understand political Islam.

We have to ask this question: Why do our tax dollars fund universities which are formally ignorant of the doctrine of political Islam? It is not taught at any university. How can this be? Why can't our tax dollars be used to teach the history of 270 million dead? Why can't our tax dollars be used to teach the real complete history of slavery?

By educating yourself, you are making a difference. By encouraging others to learn about political Islam, you can make a huge difference. This war is not a war against terrorism. This war is a war against ignorance. And the enemy is not Islam. Islam is simply a doctrine. The enemy is our own passive ignorance. That is our enemy. We must do battle against ignorance because this is a case in which the truth is on the side of the kafir.

It is not that Islam is so strong. The problem is that our ignorance makes us weak.